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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Design Concept Report (DCR) Update describes the development, evaluation, and recommendation for reconfigurations of four existing Traffic Interchanges (TII) along SR 101L from Pima Road to Shea Boulevard (MP 36.54 to MP 41.08), of the original DCR PIMA FREEWAY (SR 101L) PRINCESS DRIVE TO RED MOUNTAIN FREEWAY (SR 202L) GENERAL PURPOSE LANES (GPL), Project No. 101L MA 5.54) to th ( 36.54 ) to the Red Mountain Freeway (Milepost 51.75). This project is located within the Arizona Department of Transportation's (ADOT's) Central District within Maricopa County in central Arizona.

Growing traffic demand has caused the SR 101L corridor to become increasingly congested during the morning and evening peak travel periods, and growth projections indicate the congestion will worsen in the future. Additional GPL would increase the freeway capacity and help alleviate increased levels of traffic congestion in the future.

The Arizona State Transportation Board has approved funding in the Five-Year Transportation Facilities Construction Program. The current approved Regional Transportation Plan Freeway Program (RTPFP) for fiscal years 2020-2024 Life Cycle Construction Program includes funding for the following phases of this project:

| Milepost | Location | Type of Work | Funds Source | Funding Amount | Fiscal Year |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 36.49 | SR 101L Pima <br> Princess to <br> Shea | Right-of-Way and <br> Utilities | Regional Area Road <br> Fund (RARF) | $\$ 525,050$ | 2021 |
|  | Construct General- <br> Purpose Lane | National Highway <br> Performance Program <br> (NHPP) and RARF <br> Match | $\$ 81,154,243$ | 2023 |  |

The Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA), and ADOT have collaborated to develop a comprehensive plan for the Regional Freeway System that is included in the Regional Transportation Plan 2040 (RTP) updated February 2020. This project is included in the MAG 2040 RTP Plan Group 1.

The voters of Maricopa County passed Proposition 400 in November 2004, which authorized the continuation of the existing half-cent sales tax for 20 years (2006-2026) to be used for implementing the MAG RTP. A portion of the revenues collected from the half-cent sales tax extension are deposited into the RARF to fund the RTPFP Life Cycle Construction Program projects.

The purpose of this project is to reduce congestion, enhance regional mobility, improve movement of goods and services, and improve access to residential and commercial developments by increasing the capacity of SR 101L by providing an additional GPL in each direction as identified in the RTPFP. The project will also include reconstruction of two existing Tls at Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard and Raintree Drive to increase capacity and improve traffic operations. Minor improvements are recommended within this report for Princess Drive and Shea Boulevard.

## The alternatives analysis includes the evaluation of the following improvements:

- Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard Improved Single-Point Urban Interchange (SPUI)
- Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard Tight Diamond Interchange (TDI)
- Raintree Drive Improved SPUI
- Raintree Drive TDI
- Raintree Drive Dual Roundabouts Interchange (DRI)
- Princess Drive TDI: convert to triple lefts and extend storage
- Shea Boulevard SPUI: extend right-turn lane

The No-Build and build alternatives were evaluated and the Recommended Alternative is presented in Appendix C. The Recommended Alternative is based on an evaluation of the conformance with the RTP, benefits to traffic operations, geometric design criteria, right-ofway acquisition requirements, utility impacts, environmental considerations, construction costs, and public agency input.

The Recommended Alternative includes updates to the 2010 DCR with an addition of a GPL in both the northbound and southbound directions through widening outside as well as reconstruction of the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI to a TDI, improvements to the Raintree Drive SPUI, and lane improvements along Shea Boulevard and Princess Drive. The study also evaluated interchange reconfigurations at the Frank Lloyd Wright TI and Raintree Drive TI. Evaluated alternatives included a TDI and an improved SPUI at each location, and a roundabout alternative at Raintree Drive TI.

The acquisition of new right-of-way is anticipated for the Recommended Alternative at several locations. Temporary Construction Easements (TCEs) will be required and the locations and limits will be finalized during final design.
Continuing coordination for this project will be required with the following public agencies: ADOT, MAG, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), and the City of Scottsdale.
Coordination with concurrent construction projects may be required for this project. Coordination will also be required with several utility companies, and Central Arizona Project (CAP).
Mitigation measures for the Recommended Alternative are identified in the ADOT 2010 DCR. The Categorical Exclusion (CE) will include all final mitigation and coordination requirements for the Build Alternative.

Additional reports prepared as part of this DCR include an Initial Traffic Report, and a Draft Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance and Feasibility Report. Additional reports prepared as part of the 2010 DCR include an American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Controlling Design Criteria Report, Initial Traffic Report, Initial Onsite Drainage Concept Repot, Ar Quality Analysis Techical Repor, Mole Soure Air Toxis (MSAT) Materials Inventory, Biology Evaluation, and CE.

The total estimated cost for the Recommended Alternative is $\$ 121,435,000$, which includes $\$ 114,285,000$ for construction, $\$ 650,000$ for right-of-way acquisitions, and $\$ 6,500,000$ for design. The current programmed amount for SR 101 L construction from Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard is $\$ 88,179,293$, which is $\$ 81,154,243$ for construction, $\$ 525,050$ for right-of-way acquisitions and utility relocations, and $\$ 6,500,000$ for design, which come from the RARF and NHPP funding sources. The detailed cost estimates are provided in Section 6 of this report.

## ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

list of mitigation measures
See ADOT 2010 DCR. Updates to this were not included for analysis or review within the scope of this document. Therefore, no additional measures are included with the preferred alternatives.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. FOREWARD

This Design Concept Report (DCR) Update describes the development, evaluation, and recommendation for reconfigurations of four existing Traffic Interchanges (TIS) along SR 101L from Pima Road to Shea Boulevard (MP 36.54 to MP 41.08), of the original DCR PIMA FREEWAY (SR 101L) PRINCESS DRIVE TO RED MOUNTAIN FREEWAY (SR 202L) GENERAL PURPOSE LANES (GPL), Project No. 101L MA 36.5 H687401L (completed in 2010). The ADOT 2010 DCR provides additional GPL on the Pima Freeway from Princess Drive (Milepost 36.54 ) to the Red Mountain Freeway (Milepost 51.75). This project is located within ADOT's Central District within Maricopa County in central Arizona. The project location and project vicinity map are shown in Figure 1.1 and Figure 1.2.

SR 101L is classified as limited-access Urban Principal Freeway/Expressway and is on the National Highway System (NHS). The posted speed on this section of SR 101 L is 65 miles per hour (mph).
he purpose of this report is to update any required information of the ADOT 2010 DCR which evaluated the safety and operation characteristics of the existing SR 101L freeway and provided additional GPL as identified in the RTPFP. The report update will also include recommendations for the reconstruction or modifications of four existing Tls at Princess Drive, Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive and Shea Boulevard to increase capacity and improve traffic operations. Only minor lane improvements are suggested within this report for Princess Drive and Shea Boulevard.

The alternatives analysis includes the evaluation of the following improvements:

- Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard Improved SPUI
- Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TDI
- Raintree Drive Improved SPU
- Raintree Drive TDI
- Raintree Drive DRI
- Princess Drive TDI: convert to triple lefts and extend storage
- Shea Boulevard SPUI: extend right-turn lane

An Environmental Overview (EO) is provided in the ADOT 2010 DCR. Individual CE and related technical reports for the Build Alternative will be developed during the final design phase of the project
1.2. NEED FOR THE PROJECT

The Pima Freeway (SR 101L) is a major element of the MAG-adopted RTPFP. This segment of SR 101L accommodates traffic from the Red Mountain Freeway (SR 202L), Price Freeway (SR 101L), State Route 51 (SR 51), and Interstate 17 (I-17). The project is located within the City of Scottsdale and is adjacent to Scottsdale Airport and Scottsdale Community College
Maricopa County has been one of the fastest growing regions in the United States. In 2017, more people moved to Maricopa County Maricopa County has been one of the fastest growing regions in the United States. In 2017, more people moved to Maricopa County
than any other county in the country, according to the U.S. Census Bureau population estimates, released in March 2018. Maricopa County's population jumped by nearly 74,000 people - a 1.7 percent increase. Maricopa County is the fourth most populous county in the country with over 4.3 million residents.

The growing traffic demand has caused the SR 101L corridor to become increasingly congested during the morning and evening peak travel periods, and growth projections indicate the congestion will worsen in the future. Additional GPL would increase the freeway travel periods, and growth projections indicate the congestion wit worsen in

At the Princess/Pima TI, MAG evaluated a diverging diamond interchange (DDI) TI alternative in 2013 and also performed a study that included Texas U-turns and flyover directional ramps for northbound (NB) off-ramps and southbound (SB) on-ramp movements and minor capacity and safety improvements in 2017. At the Frank Lloyd Wright TI, the 2017 MAG Traffic Alternatives Study recommended
a TDI and a 2019 City of Scottsdale Arterial Life Cycle Program (ALCP) Report recommended minor capacity and safety improvements. Previous studies were performed at the Raintree Drive TI also. A TDI was recommended in the 2014 City of Scottsdale Raintree DCR 2017 MAG Traffic Alternatives, and in the 2019 City of Scottsdale ALCP Report. At the Shea Boulevard TI, a 2019 City of Scottsdale ALCP Report recommended minor capacity and safety improvements.

The MAG, RPTA, and ADOT have collaborated to develop a comprehensive pla
the 2040 RTP that was adopted by the MAG Regional Council in February 2020 .

The voters of Maricopa County passed Proposition 400 in November 2004, which authorized the continuation of the existing half-cent sales tax for 20 years (2006-2026) to be used for implementing the MAG RTP. A portion of the revenues collected from the half-cent sales tax extension are deposited into the RARF to fund the RTPFP Life Cycle Construction Program projects. This project is included in the MAG 2040 RTP Plan Group 1.
1.3. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CORRIDOR

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 1.3.
1.3.1. Roadway Characteristics

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 1.3.1
1.3.2. Transit Facilities and Routes

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 1.3.2
1.3.3. Land Use and Ownership

### 1.3.3.1. General Land Use and Ownership

Adjacent land uses along Frank Lloyd Wright and Raintree are entirely commercial and industrial See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 1.3.3.
1.3.4. Right-Of-Way

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 1.3.4. Utilities
See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 1.3.5
1.3.5. Drainage

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 13.

AロロT


### 1.3.5.1. Off-Site Drainage Systems

ADOT has completed the construction of storage capacity Improvements to the outlet basins of three box culverts located immediately northwest of the project limits. The structural enhancements provide added stability to the outlet basins that are designed to spread out the flows that are concentrated on the upstream side by inlet forebays. These enhancements did not affect any roadway facilities. See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 1.3.6.1
1.3.6. Structures

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 1.3.7.
1.3.7. Signing and Lighting

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 1.3.8.
1.3.8. Freeway Management System

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 1.3.9.
1.3.9. Speed Monitoring System

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 1.3.10.
1.3.10. Geotechnical Conditions

The generalized subsurface conditions for this segment of SR 101L were determined based on review of previous geotechnical studies performed for various design segments completed for SR 101 .

The project site is situated within the southern Basin and Range physiographic province characterized by broad intermountain alluvial valleys and intervening fault-bounded and uplifted mountain ranges, often with well-developed pediments and alluvial fans. Generally, the mountain ranges and valleys trend in a north-south to northwest-southeast direction. The typical modern Basin and Range landscape was formed by late Tertiary (Miocene-Pliocene) extensional tectonics and high-angle normal faulting, followed by subsequent erosion of the uplifted mountains and deposition of the sediments in the newly formed basins.
The generalized site geology consists of relatively flat-lying surficial Holocene alluvial plain sediments in the Paradise Valley basin of The generalized site geology consists of relatively flat-lying surficial Holocene alluvial plain sediments in the Paradise Valley basin of
central Arizona between the McDowell and Phoenix Mountains to the northeast and southwest, respectively and alluvial soils which vary from fine to coarse depending mainly upon the proximity to the sand, gravel and cobble laden Salt River stream bed south of the project terminus. The bedrock in the McDowell and Phoenix mountain ranges consists predominately of late-Proterozoic metasedimentary and metavolcanic rocks. Paradise Valley basin bedrock occurs in unconformable contact beneath the unconsolidated clastic sediments at depths of up to approximately 4,800 feet below the current ground surface.

From an engineering standpoint, the subgrade conditions can be grouped into one general description. The soils consist predominantly of firm to hard, finer grained, low to medium plasticity silty to clayey sands and sandy clays. Typically, these soils are firm in the upper $5^{\prime}$ of firm to hard, finer grained, low to medium plasticity silty to clayey sands and sandy clays. Typicaly, these soils are firm in the upper $5^{\prime}$
to $20^{\prime}$, becoming hard (refusal blow count $N$-values) and more cemented with depth. Isolated pockets of relatively clean, dense, sand and gravel layers were encountered at depth within some of the borings.

Groundwater was not encountered within previous test borings advanced throughout the project corridor (maximum depth of 90 feet). Groundwater is not anticipated to affect construction of this project.

### 1.3.10.1. Land Subsidence and Earth Fissures

Depletion of groundwater resources in deep alluvial basin aquifers in the western United States is causing land subsidence. Land subsidence can severely and adversely impact infrastructure by changing the ground elevation, ground slope (grade) and through the development of ground cracks, known as earth fissures, which can erode into large gullies. Earth fissures have the through the development of ground cracks, known as earth fissures, which can erode into large gullies. Earth fissures have the area has historically experienced less than 50 to 100 feet of groundwater withdrawal (Schumann and Genauldi 1986). While it is possible that some ground subsidence has resulted from that groundwater depletion, significant ground subsidence in the project area has not been reported in scientific or professional literature (Galloway et al 1999).

Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (InSAR) is a satellite-based technology that can detect ground subsidence in the range of 0.2 inches. The Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) has a program that monitors land subsidence in Arizona utilizing InSAR. InSAR data from 2017 to 2019 (ADWR 2020) indicates that the project site has experienced land subsidence ranging from 0.0 to 0.4 inches.
There are no reported earth fissures within the project corridor. The nearest reported earth fissures to the project site is located 4 miles to the southeast near the McDowell Mountains (AZGS 2019).
1.3.11. Pavement Structural Sections

Record drawings for the SR 101L, from Scottsdale Road to McDonald Drive were reviewed to determine the existing mainline, and inside and outside shoulder pavement sections. For the SR 101L mainline, Portland cement concrete pavement (PCCP) with thicknesses ranging from $10.75^{\prime \prime}$ to $12^{\prime \prime}$ over $4^{\prime \prime}$ of Class 2 Aggregate Base (AB) were utilized. Asphalt Concrete Base (ACB) was used in place of AB within depressed freeway areas. Table 1.1 presents a summary of the existing pavement sections within the various constructed roadway segments.

Table 1.1 - Existing Pavement Structural Sections

| Project <br>  <br> TRACS | Item | AR- <br> ACFC <br> (inches) | Plain <br> PCCP <br> (inches) | AB <br> (Class 2) <br> (inches) | ACB <br> (inches) | Total <br> Thickness <br> (in) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pima Road <br> To Shea <br> Boulevard* <br> H4083 01C | Mainline <br>  <br> Outside <br> Shoulder | 1.0 | 10.75 | 4.0 | - | 15.75 |
|  |  <br> Outside <br> Shoulder | 1.0 | 10.75 | - | 4.0 | 15.75 |
|  | Ramps \& Gores | 1.0 | 9.75 | 4.0 | - | 14.75 |
| Rrincess <br> Drive to Shea <br> Boulevard <br> H6936 01C | HOV <br>  <br> Inside Shoulder | 1.0 | 12.0 | 4.0 | - | 17.0 |
| HOV <br>  <br> Inside Shoulder | 1.0 | 12.0 | - | 4.0 | 17.0 |  |

1.3.11.1. Previous Projects

Based on the ADOT Milepost Strip Map, the following projects have been completed within the study area:
Table 1.2 - Previous Projects

| Project Number and/or <br> TRACS Number | Begin <br> Milepost | As-Built <br> Date | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 101-B-NFA H7699-01C | 29.8 | 2010 | Freeway Management System <br> SR 51-Princess Drive |
| 101-MA-031 H7208-01C | 31.3 | 2009 | Construct High-Occupancy Vehicle <br> (HOV) Lanes <br> Tatum Boulevard-Princess Drive |
| RAM-600-1-564 <br> 101-MA-034 H3230-02C | 34.5 | 2003 | Construct Roadway <br> Scottsdale Road-Pima Road |
| RAM-101-B-501 <br> 101-MA-034 H5543-01C | 34.5 | 2001 | Construct Roadway <br> Scottsdale Road-Pima Road |
| 101-B <br> H6802-01C | 35.5 | - | Construct Roadway <br> Auxiliary Lanes |
| 101-MA-036 H6939-01C | 36.6 | 2010 | Construct HOV Lanes <br> Princess Drive-Red Mountain TI |
| RAM-600-1-544 <br> 101-MA-036 H4083-01C | 36.6 | 2002 | Construct Roadway <br> Pima Road-Shea Boulevard |
| RAM-600-1-544 <br> 101-MA-036 H4083-01C | 36.6 | 2002 | Construct Roadway <br> Pima Road-Shea Boulevard |
| 101-MA-040 H6874-01C | 40.6 | 2017 | Construct Outside GPL <br> Shea Boulevard-Red Mountain TI |
| 101-MA-041 H5823-01C | 41.0 | 2002 | Highway Lighting <br> Shea Boulevard-Thomas Road |
| RAM-600-1-542 <br> 101-MA-041 H4060-01C | 41.5 | 2002 | Construct Roadway <br> Shea Boulevard-McDonald, Part A |
| RAM-600-1-542 <br> 101-MA-041 H4060-01C | 41.5 | 2002 | Construct Roadway <br> Shea Boulevard-McDonald, Part B |

## 2. TRAFFIC AND CRASH DATA

This section summarizes the initial traffic report update. The full initial traffic report update can be found in Appendix E.

## 21. CRASH ANAIYSIS

Historical crash data was obtained from the ADOT crash database for the segment of the SR 101L corridor from Princess Drive to south of Shea Boulevard and the SR 101L TIs of Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard. The analysis evaluated reported crashes between January 1, 2015 and December 31, 2019.
2.1.1. Mainline Crash Analysis

The mainline analysis evaluated the SR 101L corridor within the project limits. A total of 928 crashes was reported between January 1 , 2015 and December 31, 2019. The following is a summary of the mainline crash characteristics:

- Of the 928 crashes reported, $42 \%$ ( 390 crashes) occurred in the NB direction and $58 \%$ ( 538 crashes) occurred in the SB direction
- 675 crashes resulted in property damage only ( $73 \%$ ), 250 resulted in injuries ( $27 \%$ ) and 3 resulted in a fatality ( $<1 \%$
- Fifty-six percent ( 522 crashes) were rear-end crashes, $21 \%$ ( 198 crashes) were sideswipe crashes, and $17 \%$ ( 154 crashes) were single-vehicle/fixed object crashes. The remaining $6 \%$ of crashes involved less common manners of collision (e.g., angle, head-on, rear-to-side, other/unknown)
- Seventy-five percent of the crashes occurred during daylight hours, $3 \%$ occurred at dusk or dawn, and the remaining $22 \%$ occurred during hours of darkness
Historical traffic count data was referenced to calculate crash rates, which are summarized for each segment in Table 2.1. The crash rates are depicted by year and by segment in Figure $\mathbf{2 . 1}$ and Figure 2.2. The crash rates are expressed in million vehicle miles (MVM).

Table 2.1 - SR 101L Mainline Crash Summary, 2015-2019

| Freeway Segment | Segment Length (mi.) | Northbound SR 101L |  | Southbound SR 101L |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. of Crashes } \\ \text { (Jan } 2015 \text { - Dec 2019) } \end{gathered}$ | Crash Rate (Crashes/MVM) | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. of Crashes } \\ \text { (Jan } 2015 \text { - Dec 2019) } \end{gathered}$ | Crash Rate (Crashes/MVM) |
| Princess Drive/Pima Road to Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | 1.26 | 98 | 0.65 | 72 | 0.47 |
| Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd to Raintree Drive | 0.80 | 37 | 0.39 | 81 | 0.76 |
| Raintree Drive to Cactus Road | 1.40 | 105 | 0.57 | 229 | 1.04 |
| Cactus Road to Shea Boulevard | 1.08 | 150 | 0.89 | 156 | 0.85 |

The 2010 SR 101L Design Concept Report analyzed crash data from 2002 to 2006. The comparison of crash rates from the previous analysis is summarized in Table 2.2

Table 2.2 - SR 101L Mainline Crash Rate Comparison to 2010 SR 101L Design Concept Report

|  | Segment <br> Fength | Northbound SR 101L <br> Crash Rate <br> (Crashes/MVM) |  | Southbound SR 101L Crash <br> Rate (Crashes/MVM) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $2002-2006$ | $2015-2019$ | $2002-2006$ | $2015-2019$ |
| Princess Drive/Pima Road <br> to Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | 1.26 | 0.51 | 0.65 | 0.54 | 0.47 |
| Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd to <br> Raintree Drive | 0.80 | 0.44 | 0.39 | 0.72 | 0.76 |
| Raintree Drive to Cactus <br> Road | 1.40 | 0.54 | 0.57 | 1.22 | 1.04 |
| Cactus Road to Shea <br> Boulevard | 1.08 | 0.78 | 0.89 | 1.38 | 0.85 |
| Weighted Average |  | $\mathbf{0 . 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 9}$ |

Historical crash rates in Arizona were reviewed to compare to the values calculated in this analysis. Crash rate data was identified in the Arizona Motor Vehicle Crash Facts Report (published annually), the 2035 MAG RTP (2014), and in local crash rate reporting.

- The Arizona Motor Vehicle Crash Facts Reports (2014 to 2018) indicates a statewide crash rate based on the total number of crashes and the estimated number of vehicle miles traveled each year. This data includes crashes from all roadway types, from local roadways to interstate freeways. This data source provided an average crash rate of 1.88 crashes per MVM based on the five-year period of data from 2014 to 2018.
- In 2010, citywide crash rate reports were prepared by the City of Scottsdale and the City of Phoenix. Scottsdale and Phoenix reported average segment crash rates of 1.63 crashes per MVM ( 2000 to 2008) and 2.24 crashes per MVM (2006 to 2010), respectively. This data represents arterial and collector roadways and does not include freeway segments. It is noted that freeway segments typically have lower crash rates than arterial segments, due to the nature of uninterrupted flow on freeways.
- The 2035 MAG RTP identified segment crash rates on various freeway corridors within the MAG region. The analysis evaluated crash data from 1999 to 2011 on the following freeway corridors: I-10, I-17, SR 51, SR 101L, SR 202L, and US 60. The average freeway segment crash rate ranged from 1.30 to 2.10 crashes per MVM. From 1999 to 2011, SR 101L had an average crash rate of approximately 1.36 crashes per MVM
The 2015 to 2019 SR 101L crash rates from Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard are generally lower than the other regional crash rates reviewed.

A spatial heat map of the SR 101L mainline crashes, based on crash frequency, is shown in Figure 2.3. During the 2015 to 2019 analysis period, the location of greatest crash frequency occurred on SR 101L between Thunderbird Road and Shea Boulevard. The crash trends observed on the spatial heat map are consistent with the crash summaries provided in Table 2.1. Spatial maps of injury crashes along from Fisu 2.4 ad Figure 2.5 to dinay fre are summarized in Figure 2.6.

Widening SR 101L to four GPLs is expected to reduce crashes related to congestion, particularly on SR 101L NB south of Shea Boulevard where the segment currently tapers from four GPLs to three GPLs.


Figure 2.1 - SR 101L Mainline Crash Rate by Year, Princess Drive to Thunderbird Road, 2015-2019
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Figure 2.3-SR 101L Mainline Crash Heat Map, 2015-2019
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Figure 2.5-SR 101L Mainline Crash Severity, Thunderbird Road to Shea Boulevard, 2015-2019

SR 101L Mainline, 2015-2019

2.1.2. Traffic Interchange Crash Analysis

Historical crash data was evaluated at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard TIs. For each interchange, the crash analysis area included a 300 -foot section in each direction on the east-west legs of the arterials and the north-south ramps. All offset measurements were taken from the centerline of roadway intersections. During the five-year crash analysis period, a total of 774 crashes occurred at the three TIs. Historical traffic count data from ADOT and the City of Scottsdale was referenced to calculate crash rates, which are summarized in Table 2.3. The crash rates of each TI are shown by year in Figure 2.7 and are expressed in terms of Million Entering Vehicles (MEV).

> Table 2.3 - SR 101L Traffic Interchange Crash Rates, 2015-2019

| Traffic Interchange | Daily Entering Volume (Average, 20152019) | No. of Crashes (2015-2019) | Intersection Crash Rate (Crashes/MEV) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 101L / Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | 78,205 | 338 | 2.43 |
| SR 101L / Raintree Drive | 67,431 | 161 | 1.36 |
| SR 101L / Shea Blvd | 87,760 | 275 | 1.74 |

A spatial diagram of the crashes by collision manner is provided in Figure 2.8. at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard TIs. Crash characteristics are summarized for these three TIs in Figure 2.9, Figure 2.10, and Figure 2.11, respectively, with aggregated results for all three TIs summarized below:

- Of the 774 crashes reported at the three TIs, 603 resulted in property damage only ( $78 \%$ ), 168 resulted in injuries (22\%), and 3 resulted in a fatality ( $<1 \%$ ).
- Sixty-four percent ( 496 crashes) were rear-end crashes, $15 \%$ ( 117 crashes) were sideswipe crashes, $11 \%$ ( 86 crashes) were angle crashes, $5 \%$ ( 35 crashes) were single-vehicle/fixed object crashes, and $3 \%$ ( 23 crashes) were left-turn crashes. were angle crashes, $5 \%$ ( 35 crashes) were single-vehicle/fixed object crashes, and $3 \%$ ( 23 crashes) were left-turn crashe
The remaining $2 \%$ of crashes involved less common manners of collision (e.g., head-on, rear-to-side, other/unknown).
- Eighty-four percent of the crashes occurred during daylight hours, $3 \%$ occurred at dusk or dawn, and the remaining $13 \%$ occurred during hours of darkness.
Expected safety characteristics of the TI configuration alternatives (No-Build and Improved SPUI, TDI, DRI) include the following:
- No-Build SPUI: contains 28 potential conflict points, including 12 crossing points, and prohibits wrong-way travel by signage
- Improved SPUI: contains 28 potential conflict points, including 12 crossing points, and prohibits wrong-way travel by signage; a slight reduction in the overall crash rate is expected due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements
- TDI: contains 26 potential conflict points, including 10 crossing points, and prohibits wrong-way travel by signage; a slight reduction in the overall crash rate is expected due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements; a moderate reduction in the severe crash rate is expected due to the reduced number of crossing points
- DRI: contains 38 potential conflict points, including 10 crossing points, and prohibits wrong-way travel by raised concrete islands; a moderate reduction in the overall crash rate is expected due to a significant reduction in congestion from operational improvements; a significant reduction in the severe crash rate is expected due to the reduced number of crossing points and lower operating speeds

Figure 2.6-SR 101L Mainline Crash Summary, 2015-2019
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Figure 2.8-SR 101L Traffic Interchange Collision Manner Diagrams, 2015-2019


Figure 2.9 - Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd TI Crash Summary, 2015-2019


Figure 2.10 - Raintree Drive TI Crash Summary, 2015-2019

SR 101L / Shea Boulevard, 2015-2019

| Injury Severity | Rear End | Sideswipe | Angle | Leff-Turn | Single Veticle | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fatal |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Serious lijury | 1 |  | 3 | 1 | 1 |  | 6 |
| Minot Injury | 14 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 29 |
| Possibie Injury | 20 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 26 |
| No Injury | 150 | 33 | 14 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 212 |
| Total | 185 | 35 | 24 |  |  |  |  |



CRASHES BY MONTH


CRASHES BY WEEKDAY


2.1.3. Review of Previous Studies

The following studies conducted in the project limits were reviewed to summarize key safety findings and recommendations

- SR 101L/Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd and SR 101L/Raintree Drive Road Safety Assessment (RSA) (May 2011)
- Raintree Drive Extension Design Concept Report: Scottsdale Road to SR 101L (June 2014)
- Traffic Alternatives Study: State Route 101 from Princess Drive to Raintree Drive (May 2017)
- No prior relevant studies were identified that included safety findings and recommendations for the Shea Boulevard TI.


### 2.1.3.1. Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI

The 2011 RSA recommended several minor improvements related to yield-compliance and bicycle/pedestrian safety, along with separating out the shared NB and SB left-turn/through lanes.

The 2017 Traffic Alternatives Study recommended that the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI be converted to a TDI. The 2011 RSA indicated that converting the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI to a TDI should be given consideration. The conversion from a SPUI to a TDI is anticipated to address or improve the following safety issues identified in the RSA:

- High-speed eastbound (EB) and westbound (WB) right-turns onto the frontage road/Pima Road due to roadway geometry
- High-speed merging section of multiple movements at the entrance to the SR 101 NB and SB on-ramps
- Driver yielding and pedestrian conflicts in the crosswalks spanning the channelized $E B$ and WB right-turn lanes
- The need for additional EB and WB left-turn lane storage length/capacity
- U-turns from the outer lane of the NB and SB dual left-turn lanes due to driver confusion
- Skewed north-south crosswalks
- Narrow pedestrian refuge area within the north-south crosswalks


### 2.1.3.2. Raintree Drive T

Recommendations provided for the Raintree Drive TI included:

- The 2017 Traffic Alternatives Study recommended the addition of a WB right-turn lane.

The 2017 Traffic Alternatives Study recommended improved NB on-ramp pavement markings at the Raintree Drive TI. The recommendation to improve the NB on-ramp pavement markings was also discussed in the 2011 RSA. As the dual EB left-turn lanes transition to the NB frontage road/Pima Road, a lane drop creates a merge section approximately 100 feet north of the intersection. The left-side lane drop causes the inside left-turn lane to merge with the outside left-turn lane. In addition to the immediate merge of EB left-turning vehicles, a potential conflict exists as WB right-turning vehicles enter the merge section, and often merge into the left lane in anticipation of entering the freeway on-ramp farther north. Based on the roadway geometry and multiple merge conditions, the 2011 RSA recommended pavement marking and/or geometric improvements to this area
The 2011 RSA recommended several minor improvements related to yield-compliance and bicycle/pedestrian safety, including widening the pedestrian refuge area within the north-south crosswalks.

- The 2011 RSA recommended consideration of strategies to reduce driver confusion of stopping locations at the SPUI. Vehicles occasionally enter the intersection before realizing they need to stop due to a red signal indication. The 2011 RSA recommended evaluating the existing pavement markings within the intersection to give more visual cues of the intersection and the appropriate stopping positions on the interchange approaches.
2.2. EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS
2.2.1. Existing Traffic Volumes

Recent daily and peak-hour roadway traffic volume data for the SR 101L mainline and ramps at Princess Drive, Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, Cactus Road, and Shea Boulevard was obtained from the ADOT Multimodal Planning Division (MPD) Transportation Data Management System (TDMS) for 2018 (mainline volumes) and 2017 (ramp volumes). Mainline 2018 volumes were grown annually by $2.5 \%$ to represent 2020 existing mainline volumes. The $2.5 \%$ rate was based on the average growth rate between 2017 and 2018 for mainline segments on SR 101L. Ramp 2017 volumes were grown annually by $1.0 \%$ to represent 2020 existing ramp volumes. The $1.0 \%$ rate was based on the composite growth rate of ramps, TIs, and arterials within the study area

In addition, historical AM and PM peak-hour turning movement count (TMC) data was provided by the City of Scottsdale at

- Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI in 2016
- Raintree Drive TI in 2018
- Raintree Drive and 87th Street intersection in 2018
- Shea Boulevard TI in 2016

TMCs were collected on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday between 7:00 AM and 9:00 AM and between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM. Newer TMCs were not collected as part of the project effort due to recent drastic changes in travel patterns as a result of COVID-19. The provided TMCs were grown annually by $1.0 \%$ to represent 2020 existing TMCs.

Heavy vehicle percentages were assumed to be $7 \%$ ( $4 \%$ medium and $3 \%$ heavy vehicles) on the freeway mainline and $4 \%$ ( $3 \%$ medium and $1 \%$ heavy vehicles) on the ramps and TIs based on available ADOT Transportation Data Management System (TDMS) data.

Because of the use of count data from various times and sources, efforts were made to balance volumes between TMCs at TIs and the collected ramp volumes. In most cases, there were driveways or frontage road access between the TMC and ramp count location. Any olume imbalance in those situations was attributed to the driveways or frontage road. For the few locations (Shea Boulevard ramps and the Raintree Drive NB off-ramp) where there was a direct relation between the TMC and ramp volume, the volumes were balanced by adjusting the ramp volume. The mainline and ramp peak-hour volumes were balanced with the goal of minimizing volume adjustments and generally remaining conservative in the overall adjustment.
Additionally, a review of the mainline and ramp volume balancing revealed that the TDMS traffic count station between Cactus Road Additionally, a review of the mainline and ramp volume balancing revealed that the TDMS traffic count station between Cactus Road
and Shea Boulevard is believed to be over-counting traffic volumes. The mainline annual average daily traffic (AADT) count of 191,445 was adjusted to 162,000 to minimize the difference between the upstream and downstream count stations.

The 2020 existing daily and peak-hour link volumes for the freeway mainline and ramp volumes are shown in the previously referenced The 2020 existing daily and peak-hour link volumes for the freeway mainline and ramp volumes are shown in the previously referenced
Figure 2.12. The 2020 existing SR 101L mainline GPL daily volumes within the project limits range from approximately 61,000 vehicles Figure 2.12. The 2020 existing SR 101 L mainline GPL daily volumes within the project limits range from approximately 61,000 vehicles
per day (vpd) to approximately 83,000 vpd. The 2020 existing ramp volumes at the TIs range from approximately 6,000 vpd to approximately 21,000 vpd

The 2020 existing peak-hour TMC volumes at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard TIs, along with at the Raintree Drive and $877^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection, are shown in Figure 2.13


Figure 2.12 - Existing Freeway Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes


Figure 2.13 - Existing TI Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes
2.3. FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS
2.3.1. Description of Alternatives

For the SR 101L mainline, two alternatives were analyzed as part of the 2040 traffic analysis:

- No-Build alternative - where SR 101L remains as it currently exists
- Build alternative - where SR 101L is widened by adding one GPL in each direction throughout the project limits
- For the TIs, four alternatives were analyzed as part of the 2040 traffic analysis:
- No-Build alternative - where the TIs remain as existing SPUls with no improvements
- Improved SPUI alternative - where the existing SPUIs are improved/expanded at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard TIs
- TDI alternative - where the existing SPUIS are converted to TDIs at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard and Raintree Drive TIs only
- DRI alternative - where the existing SPUI is converted to a double-roundabout interchange at the Raintree Drive TI only


### 2.3.2. Traffic Volume Projections

### 2.3.2.1. $\quad 2040$ Baseline/No-Build Traffic Volumes and Geometry

Future 2040 traffic volumes developed for analysis were based on the 2040 regional travel demand model developed by MAG to evaluate the Phoenix metropolitan area's transportation system. The MAG regional travel demand model is based on projected socioeconomic, population, employment, origin-destination, and other regionally based data.

The following network model outputs were provided by MAG as part of this analysis:

- Baseline (also known as No-Build) - Existing roadway network plus near-term programmed improvements
- Improved (also known as Build) - Existing roadway network plus long-term anticipated improvements by 2040

The 2040 Baseline/No-Build MAG model assumes only minor improvements to the existing roadway network in the vicinity of the project limits, with the SR 101L mainline remaining unchanged between Princess Drive and Shea Boulevard. A 1.0\% average annual growth rate was determined for the mainline in the project limits by comparing MAG model estimated daily volumes for the 2020 No-Build scenario and the 2040 No-Build scenario. A 0.5\% average annual growth rate was determined to be the composite average growth rate of ramps, TIs, and arterials within the project limits between the 2020 No-Build scenario and the 2040 No-Build scenario. These growth rates were applied to the 2020 existing volumes to develop 2040 NoBuild volumes. 2040 No-Build heavy vehicle percentages were assumed to be $7 \%$ on the freeway mainline and $4 \%$ on the ramps and TIs, similar to existing heavy vehicle percentages.

The 2040 No-Build daily, AM peak-hour, and PM peak-hour link volumes and geometry for the freeway mainline and ramps are shown in Figure 2.14. The 2040 No-Build SR 101L mainline GPL daily volumes within the project limits range from approximately 74,000 vpd to approximately 101,000 vpd. The 2040 No-Build ramp volumes at the Tls range from approximately 7,000 vpd to approximately $23,000 \mathrm{vpd}$. The 2040 No-Build AM and PM peak-hour volumes and No-Build intersection geometry are shown in Figure 2.15.

### 2.3.2.2. $\quad 2040$ Improved/Build Traffic Volumes and Geometry

The 2040 Improved/Build MAG model assumes the SR 101L mainline is widened by one lane in each direction between Princess Drive and Shea Boulevard. A $1.2 \%$ annual growth was determined to be the average annual growth rate for the mainline in the project limits by comparing MAG model estimated daily volumes for the 2020 Build scenario and the 2040 Build scenario. A $0.5 \%$ average annual growth rate was determined to be the composite average growth rate of ramps, TIs, and arterials within the project limits between the 2020 Build scenario and the 2040 Build scenario. These growth rates were applied to the 2020 existing volumes to develop 2040 Build volumes. 2040 Build heavy vehicle percentages were assumed to be $7 \%$ on the freeway mainline and $4 \%$ on the ramps and TIs, similar to existing heavy vehicle percentages.

The 2040 Build daily, AM peak-hour, and PM peak-hour link volumes and geometry for the freeway mainline and ramps are shown in Figure 2.16. The 2040 Build SR 101L mainline GPL daily volumes within the project limits range from approximately $77,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ to approximately $105,000 \mathrm{vpd}$. The 2040 Build ramp volumes at the Tls range from approximately $7,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ to approximately $23,000 \mathrm{vpd}$.

The 2040 Build AM and PM peak-hour volumes at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard TIs, along with at the Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection, are shown in Figure 2.17, Figure 2.18, and Figure 2.19, respectively.

Figure 2.17, Figure 2.18, and Figure $\mathbf{2 . 1 9}$ also show the various recommended 2040 TI configurations for the Build alternatives, which includes the number of lanes, type of lanes, traffic control, and recommended storage lengths of those lanes. The geometry and traffic control of the Build alternatives was developed through an iterative process based on trying to promote safety and provide appropriate geometry to address level of service, delay, and queuing issues identified through an operational analysis of the 2040 alternatives. The 2040 operational analysis results (i.e., level of service, delay, and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues) using this assumed Build geometry are discussed in Section 2.4.2.4 of this document.



Figure 2.15-2040 No-Build TI Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes



Figure 2.17-2040 Build Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes


Figure 2.18-2040 Build Raintree Drive TI Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes
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Figure 2.19-2040 Build Shea Boulevard TI Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes
2.4. OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS
2.4.1. Freeway Operational Analysis

### 2.4.1.1. Analysis Methodology

An operational analysis was performed for the GPLs and ramp merge/diverge areas of SR 101L within the project limits. HOV lanes were excluded to simplify the analysis, although a preliminary review indicated they should operate below capacity through 2040. The operational analysis was conducted for the 2020 Existing, 2040 Baseline/No-Build, and $2040 \mathrm{Improved} / \mathrm{Build}$ scenarios.

The VISSIM microscopic traffic simulation software was used to provide a simulation of traffic conditions on the freeway within the project limits. VISSIM can provide measures of effectiveness for each link within the network. Average vehicle density results from VISSIM were used as the measure of effectiveness to come up with a level of service (LOS) for each analysis segment. Average vehicle speed results from VISSIM were also noted. VISSIM uses random seeds to better match how traffic congestion levels change slightly every day, so 10 model runs were conducted and then averaged together to provide the VISSIM model results.

The concept of LOS uses qualitative measures that characterize operational conditions for roadway segments. They are given letter designations from LOS A to LOS F , with LOS A representing uncongested free-flow conditions and LOS F representing an overcapacity condition with a high degree of congestion and vehicle delay. Each LOS grade represents a range of operational conditions. Table 2.4 shows the average freeway vehicle density ranges that correspond with each segment LOS letter grade for urban conditions. ADOT considers LOS D or better "acceptable" LOS for freeway operations in urban conditions.

$$
\text { Table } 2.4 \text { - Freeway Segment Vehicle Density Ranges and Level of Service }
$$



Definitions provided from the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), Exhibit 12-15, Transportation Research Board (TRB), 2016.

### 2.4.1.2. $\quad 2020$ Existing Freeway Traffic Conditions

The 2020 Existing freeway mainline operational analysis was based on the existing lane geometries and configurations of the The 2020 Existing freeway mainline operational analysis was based on the existing lane geometries and configurations of the
existing freeway as described in Section 2.2 of this document. The VISSIM-modeled average vehicle speed, vehicle density, and corresponding LOS for each segment and peak hour for the 2020 Existing scenario are presented in Table 2.5.

Per the 2020 Existing freeway mainline LOS analysis, all freeway segments within the project limits operate at LOS D or better during the 2020 AM and PM peak hours except for the NB segment between Shea Boulevard and the Shea Boulevard NB onramp (LOS E in AM), the NB Shea Boulevard on-ramp merge segment (LOS E in AM and PM), and the NB Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard on-ramp merge segment (LOS F in PM). The highest density in the project limits is 50 vehicles per mile per lane (vpmpl), which occurs at the NB Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard on-ramp merge segment in the PM peak hour. These results indicate most of the freeway segments in the project limits currently provide acceptable freeway traffic operations but there are a few locations with significant congestion.

Table 2.5-2020 Existing Freeway Mainline Level of Service by Segment

| Mainline Segment | 2020 Existing |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Speed } \\ & \text { (mph) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Density } \\ & \text { (ypmpl) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Speed } \\ & \text { (mph) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Density (pmpl) | LOS |
| Loop 101 Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West of Hayden EB On-Ramp | 59 | 35 | LOS D | 62 | 24 | LOS C |
| Hayden On-Ramp Merge | 64 | 25 | LOS C | 66 | 18 | LOS C |
| Between Hayden On-Ramp \& Princess On-Ramp | 65 | 28 | LOS D | 66 | 20 | LOS C |
| Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 59 | 30 | LOS D | 59 | 23 | LOS C |
| Between Princess Dr On-Ramp \& FLW Off-Ramp | 60 | 30 | LOS D | 63 | 22 | LOS C |
| Between FLW Off-Ramp \& Raintree Off-Ramp | 60 | 26 | LOS C | 66 | 18 | LOS B |
| Between Raintree Off-Ramp \& FLW On-Ramp | 65 | 27 | LOS D | 66 | 22 | LOS C |
| FLW On-Ramp Merge | 61 | 23 | LOS C | 61 | 21 | LOS C |
| Between FLW On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 65 | 24 | LOS C | 66 | 22 | LOS C |
| Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 60 | 29 | LOS D | 48 | 32 | LOS D |
| Between Raintree On-Ramp \& Cactus Road On-Ramp | 65 | 31 | LOS D | 56 | 33 | LOS D |
| Cactus Road On-Ramp Merge | 65 | 27 | LOS D | 64 | 27 | LOS D |
| Between Cactus Road On-Ramp and Shea Blvd On-Ramp | 66 | 21 | LOS C | 66 | 23 | LOS C |
| Shea Blvd On-Ramp Merge | 61 | 30 | LOS D | 64 | 27 | LOS D |
| Loop 101 Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Between Shea Blvd \& Shea Blvd On-Ramp | 50 | 36 | LOS E | 55 | 35 | LOS D |
| Shea Blvd On-Ramp Merge | 49 | 39 | LOS E | 48 | 39 | LOS E |
| Between Cactus Rd Off-Ramp \& On-Ramp | 61 | 34 | LOS D | 61 | 33 | LOS D |
| Cactus Road On-Ramp Merge | 60 | 22 | LOS C | 61 | 20 | LOS C |
| Between Cactus Road On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 60 | 22 | LOS C | 63 | 24 | LOS C |
| Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 65 | 21 | LOS C | 62 | 21 | LOS C |
| Between Raintree On-Ramp and FLW On-Ramp | 66 | 17 | LOS B | 65 | 21 | LOS C |
| FLW On-Ramp Merge | 62 | 19 | LOS C | 46 | 50 | LOS F |
| Between FLW On-Ramp and Princess Drive On-Ramp | 66 | 21 | LOS C | 65 | 25 | LOS C |
| Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 65 | 18 | LOS B | 63 | 23 | LOS C |
| West of Princess Drive | 66 | 21 | LOS C | 65 | 26 | LOS C |

### 2.4.1.3. 2040 Baseline/No-Build Freeway Traffic Conditions

An analysis was completed using the 2040 Baseline/No-Build freeway mainline volumes and geometry, as described in Section 2.3.2.1 of this document. The VISSIM-modeled average vehicle speed, vehicle density, and corresponding LOS for each segment and peak hour for the 2040 Baseline/No-Build scenario are presented in Table 2.6

Per the 2040 Baseline/No-Build freeway mainline LOS analysis, only about half of the freeway segments within the project limits are expected to operate at LOS D or better in the 2040 AM and PM peak hours. The highest density in the project limits is 116 vpmpl, which occurs at the SB Frank Loyd Wright Boulevard on-ramp merge segment in the PM peak hour. These results indicate many of the segments in the project limits will likely experience significant congestion by 2040 if no additional GPIs are provided.

Table 2.6-2040 Baseline/No-Build Freeway Mainline Level of Service by Segment

| Mainline Segment | 2040 No-Build |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Speed } \\ & \text { (mph) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Density (ypmpl) | LOS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Speed } \\ & (\mathrm{mph}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Density } \\ & \text { (nmpl) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS |
| Loop 101 Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West of Hayden EB On-Ramp | 27 | 81 | LOS F | 60 | 31 | LOS D |
| Hayden On-Ramp Merge | 52 | 34 | LOS D | 65 | 22 | LOS C |
| Between Hayden On-Ramp \& Princess On-Ramp | 60 | 34 | LOS D | 60 | 24 | LOS C |
| Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 53 | 37 | LOS E | 40 | 41 | LOS E |
| Between Princess Dr On-Ramp \& FLW Off-Ramp | 49 | 41 | LOS E | 33 | 50 | LOS F |
| Between FLW Off-Ramp \& Raintree Off-Ramp | 37 | 50 | LOS F | 20 | 69 | LOS F |
| Between Raintree Off-Ramp \& FLW On-Ramp | 25 | 78 | LOS F | 15 | 102 | LOS F |
| FLW On-Ramp Merge | 18 | 86 | LOS F | 11 | 116 | LOS F |
| Between FLW On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 20 | 81 | LOS F | 13 | 111 | LOS F |
| Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 27 | 61 | LOS F | 22 | 74 | LOS F |
| Between Raintree On-Ramp \& Cactus Road On-Ramp | 64 | 34 | LOS D | 52 | 35 | LOS D |
| Cactus Road On-Ramp Merge | 60 | 31 | LOS D | 64 | 27 | LOS D |
| Between Cactus Road On-Ramp and Shea Blvd On-Ramp | 65 | 26 | LOS C | 66 | 23 | LOS C |
| Shea Blvd On-Ramp Merge | 53 | 39 | LOS E | 64 | 27 | LOS D |
| Loop 101 Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Between Shea Blvd \& Shea Blvd On-Ramp | 14 | 112 | LOS F | 24 | 89 | LOS F |
| Shea Blvd On-Ramp Merge | 35 | 58 | LOS F | 38 | 57 | LOS F |
| Between Cactus Rd Off-Ramp \& On-Ramp | 59 | 37 | LOS E | 59 | 37 | LOS E |
| Cactus Road On-Ramp Merge | 59 | 26 | LOS C | 60 | 25 | LOS C |
| Between Cactus Road On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 59 | 24 | LOS C | 60 | 29 | LOS D |
| Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 63 | 21 | LOS C | 58 | 28 | LOS D |
| Between Raintree On-Ramp and FLW On-Ramp | 66 | 19 | LOS C | 59 | 29 | LOS D |
| FLW On-Ramp Merge | 59 | 23 | LOS C | 46 | 51 | LOS F |
| Between FLW On-Ramp and Princess Drive On-Ramp | 65 | 24 | LOS C | 64 | 29 | LOS D |
| Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 64 | 20 | LOS C | 61 | 27 | LOS D |
| West of Princess Drive | 65 | 25 | LOS C | 63 | 31 | LOS D |

### 2.4.1.4. $\quad 2040$ Improved/Build Freeway Traffic Conditions

An analysis was completed using the $2040 \mathrm{Improved} /$ Build freeway mainline volumes and geometry, as described in Section 2.3.2.2 of this document. The VISSIM-modeled average vehicle speed, vehicle density, and corresponding LOS for each segment and peak hour for the 2040 Improved/Build scenario are presented in Table 2.7.

Per the 2040 Improved/Build freeway mainline LOS analysis, all freeway segments within the project limits are expected to operate at LOS D or better in the 2040 AM and PM peak hours except for the NB Shea Boulevard on-ramp merge segment (LOS $E$ in AM and PM). The highest density in the project limits is 38 vpmpl, which occurs at the NB Shea Boulevard on-ramp merge segment in the PM peak hour. These results indicate that the addition of one GPL lane in each direction will generally provide acceptable freeway traffic operations through 2040, with some congestion present at the NB Shea Boulevard on-ramp merge segment in the PM peak hour. If LOS D or better is desired for all mainline segments in 2040 during all time periods, additional improvements would be required at the NB Shea Boulevard on-ramp merge segment.

Table 2.7-2040 Improved/Build Freeway Mainline Level of Service by Segment

| Mainline Segment | 2040 Improved/Build |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  | Speed (mph) | Density (ypmpl) | LOS | Speed (mph) | Density (vpmpl) | LOS |


| Loop 101 Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West of Hayden EB On-Ramp | 60 | 33 | LOS D | 62 | 24 | LOS C |
| Hayden On-Ramp Merge | 64 | 26 | LOS C | 66 | 19 | LOS C |
| Between Hayden On-Ramp \& Princess On-Ramp | 65 | 27 | LOS D | 67 | 20 | LOS C |
| Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 60 | 29 | LOS D | 62 | 22 | LOS C |
| Between Princess Dr On-Ramp \& FLW Off-Ramp | 58 | 31 | LOS D | 62 | 22 | LOS C |
| Between FLW Off-Ramp \& Raintree Off-Ramp | 58 | 28 | LOS D | 65 | 18 | LOS B |
| Between Raintree Off-Ramp \& FLW On-Ramp | 65 | 26 | LOS C | 67 | 21 | LOS C |
| FLW On-Ramp Merge | 62 | 23 | LOS C | 62 | 22 | LOS C |
| Between FLW On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 65 | 24 | LOS C | 65 | 22 | LOS C |
| Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 59 | 29 | LOS D | 56 | 25 | LOS C |
| Between Raintree On-Ramp \& Cactus Road On-Ramp | 65 | 30 | LOS D | 65 | 30 | LOS D |
| Cactus Road On-Ramp Merge | 63 | 28 | LOS D | 64 | 26 | LOS C |
| Between Cactus Road On-Ramp and Shea Blvd On-Ramp | 66 | 22 | LOS C | 67 | 22 | LOS C |
| Shea Blvd On-Ramp Merge | 60 | 30 | LOS D | 65 | 25 | LOS C |
| Loop 101 Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Between Shea Blvd \& Shea Blvd On-Ramp | 60 | 31 | LOS D | 52 | 34 | LOS D |
| Shea Blvd On-Ramp Merge | 61 | 37 | LOS E | 51 | 38 | LOS E |
| Between Cactus Rd Off-Ramp \& On-Ramp | 62 | 33 | LOS D | 62 | 33 | LOS D |
| Cactus Road On-Ramp Merge | 53 | 28 | LOS D | 57 | 25 | LOS C |
| Between Cactus Road On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 56 | 25 | LOS C | 63 | 25 | LOS C |
| Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 64 | 18 | LOS B | 63 | 23 | LOS C |
| Between Raintree On-Ramp and FLW On-Ramp | 66 | 18 | LOS B | 65 | 22 | LOS C |
| FLW On-Ramp Merge | 62 | 21 | LOS C | 60 | 26 | LOS C |
| Between FLW On-Ramp and Princess Drive On-Ramp | 66 | 21 | LOS C | 65 | 24 | LOS C |
| Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 65 | 19 | LOS C | 63 | 23 | LOS C |
| West of Princess Drive | 66 | 21 | LOS C | 65 | 26 | LOS C |

### 2.4.2. Traffic Interchange Operational Analysis

### 2.4.2.1. Analysis Methodology

An operational analysis was performed for all freeway ramp/arterial roadway intersections at the Frank Lloyd Wright, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard TIs, as well as at the Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection. The operational analysis was conducted for the 2020 Existing, 2040 Baseline/No-Build, and 2040 Improved/Build scenarios.

The VISSIM microscopic traffic simulation software was used to provide a simulation of traffic conditions at the TIs. Ten model runs were conducted and then averaged together to provide the VISSIM model results. Intersections were analyzed in VISSIM using the 2016 HCM methodology. For the DRI alternative at the Raintree Drive TI , the RODEL analysis software was used to model the LOS, delay, and queues.

## Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd

Similar to roadway segment LOS, each intersection, approach, or movement is given a letter designation from LOS A to LOS F, with LOS A representing uncongested free-flow conditions and LOS F representing an overcapacity condition with a high degree of congestion and vehicle delay. Each LOS grade represents a range of operational conditions.

Table 2.8 shows the average vehicle delay ranges for both signalized and unsignalized intersections that correspond with each LOS letter grade, along with average vehicle delay ranges and corresponding LOS letter grades for diamond TIs (for the TDI alternative), which are effectively two closely-spaced intersections that act as one. ADOT considers LOS D or better "acceptable" LOS for overall TI and intersection operations in urban conditions. Average vehicle queues in VISSIM that do not exceed available storage or do not block upstream driveways/intersections are generally considered to have acceptable queue lengths.

Table 2.8 - Average Vehicle Delay Ranges and Corresponding Level of Service

|  | Average Delay Range (seconds/vehicle) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Diamond <br> Interchanges | Signalized <br> Intersections | Unsignalized <br> Intersections |
|  | $\leq 15$ | $\leq 10$ | $\leq 10$ |
| B | $>15$ and $\leq 30$ | $>10$ and $\leq 20$ | $>10$ and $\leq 15$ |
| C | $>30$ and $\leq 55$ | $>20$ and $\leq 35$ | $>15$ and $\leq 25$ |
| D | $>55$ and $\leq 85$ | $>35$ and $\leq 55$ | $>25$ and $\leq 35$ |
| E | $>85$ and $\leq 120$ | $>55$ and $\leq 80$ | $>35$ and $\leq 50$ |
| F | $>120$ | $>80$ | $>50$ |

1. Definitions for diamond interchanges provided from the HCM, Exhibit 23-10, TRB, 2016.
2. Definitions for signalized intersections provided from the HCM, Exhibit 19-8, TRB, 2016.
3. Definitions for unsignalized intersections provided from the HCM, Exhibit 20-2, TRB, 2016

### 2.4.2.2. $\quad 2020$ Existing TI/Intersection Traffic Conditions

The 2020 Existing $\mathrm{TI} /$ intersection operational analysis was based on the existing lane geometries and configurations of the existing TIs/intersections as described in Section 2.2 of this document. Current signal timings were provided by the City of Scottsdale, which include a 120 -second cycle length for all analyzed intersections. The VISSIM-modeled delay, corresponding LOS, and queues at the project TIs/intersections for the 2020 Existing scenario are presented in Table $\mathbf{2 . 9}$ for the AM peak hour and in Table 2.10 for the PM peak hour.

Table 2.9-2020 Existing TI/Intersection Analysis Results: AM Peak Hour

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | E | D | C | - | D | F | B | - | F | D | B | E | D | B | D |
| Delay (sec) | 65 | 50 | 33 | - | 52 | 93 | 15 | - | 125 | 38 | 13 | 66 | 45 | 14 | 51 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 164 | 89 | 86 | - | 94 | 144 | 143 | - | 493 | 137 | 46 | 65 | 89 | 53 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | C | C | F | E | F | F | E | D | D | A | E | D | C | F |
| Delay (sec) | 150 | 32 | 21 | 152 | 60 | 117 | 286 | 64 | 52 | 53 | 7 | 63 | 40 | 22 | 92 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 889 | 801 | 683 | 889 | 250 | 1208 | 1208 | 250 | 43 | 36 | 11 | 168 | 85 | 36 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | A | - | D | D | C | - | B | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Delay (sec) | 52 | 50 | 7 | - | 51 | 54 | 27 | - | 11 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 4 | 4 | 3 | - | 13 | 29 | 45 | - | 166 | 166 | 166 | 190 | 217 | 67 | - |
| Shea Boulevard \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | - | A | - | D | - | B | - | D | C | B | F | C | B | C |
| Delay (sec) | 36 | - | 4 | - | 46 | - | 13 | - | 43 | 29 | 14 | 86 | 29 | 20 | 35 |
| . Queue (f) | 51 |  | 3 |  | 131 |  | 4 |  | 48 | 62 | 35 | 46 | 47 |  |  |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI currently operates at LOS D overall in the AM peak hour. The EB left-turn (EBL) queue of $493^{\prime}$ exceeds the 185 ' of available storage, impacting EB through (EBT) operations.

The Raintree Drive TI currently operates at LOS F overall in the AM peak hour. The NB left-turn (NBL) and U-turn (NBU) queue of $889^{\prime}$ exceeds the $475^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting NB through (NBT) operations. The SB through (SBT) and right-turn (SBR) queue of $1,208^{\prime}$ blocks upstream driveways and intersections, impacting upstream operations. The WB right-turn (WBR) queue of $36^{\prime}$ exceeds the $25^{\prime}$ ' of available storage, impacting WB through (WBT) operations.

The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {n }}$ Street intersection currently operates at LOS A overall in the AM peak hour. The EBL and EB right turn (EBR) queues of $166^{\prime}$ exceed the $125^{\prime}$ and $120^{\prime}$ of available storage, respectively, impacting EBT operations. The WB leftturn (WBL) queue of $190^{\prime}$ exceeds the $60^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.

The Shea Boulevard TI currently operates at LOS C overall in the AM peak hour. The WBL queue of 465' exceeds the $275^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations. The WBR queue of $285^{\prime}$ exceeds the $130^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.
These results indicate the Raintree Drive TI does not provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2020 Existing AM peak hour. The other project TIs/intersections provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2020 Existing AM peak hour. There are a few locations/movements that have congestion and queuing issues

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | D | C | - | D | F | B | - | E | E | D | F | E | B | E |
| Delay (sec) | 99 | 45 | 27 | - | 44 | 85 | 16 | - | 59 | 60 | 51 | 377 | 57 | 14 | 68 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 244 | 80 | 76 | - | 93 | 197 | 194 | - | 74 | 349 | 344 | 715 | 311 | 32 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | D | D | D | D | B | D | E | E | D | F | E | D | E |
| Delay (sec) | 42 | 53 | 40 | 43 | 43 | 40 | 15 | 42 | 60 | 57 | 43 | 156 | 74 | 51 | 60 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 65 | 108 | 140 | 65 | 34 | 42 | 35 | 34 | 103 | 105 | 354 | 574 | 372 | 253 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | F | F | - | F | E | D | - | D | F | E | B | A | A | F |
| Delay (sec) | 214 | 224 | 699 | - | 157 | 74 | 45 | - | 46 | 102 | 80 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 87 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 7 | 4 | 1638 | - | 104 | 18 | 28 | - | 6 | 942 | 942 | 0 | 6 | 0 | - |
| Shea Boulevard \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | - | A | - | D | - | B | - | D | C | A | E | C | E | C |
| Delay (sec) | 44 | - | 5 | - | 44 | - | 11 | - | 47 | 24 | 9 | 57 | 29 | 62 | 35 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 97 | - | 5 | - | 111 | - | 0 | - | 58 | 52 | 21 | 366 | 311 | 1083 | - |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI currently operates at LOS E overall in the PM peak hour. The EBR queue of 344 exceeds the $175^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting EBT operations. The WBL queue of $715^{\prime}$ exceeds the $245^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.

The Raintree Drive TI currently operates at LOS E overall in the PM peak hour. The EBR queue of $354^{\prime}$ exceeds the $250^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting EBT operations. The WBL queue of 574' exceeds the 210' of available storage, impacting WBT operations. The WBR queue of $253^{\prime}$ exceeds the $25^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.

The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection currently operates at LOS F overall in the PM peak hour. The NB right-turn (NBR) queue of $1,638^{\prime}$ blocks upstream driveways and intersections, impacting upstream operations. The EBT and EBR queue of $942^{\prime}$ blocks an upstream intersection, impacting upstream operations.
The Shea Boulevard TI currently operates at LOS C overall in the PM peak hour. The WBL queue of $366^{\prime}$ exceeds the $275^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations. The WBR queue of $1,083^{\prime}$ exceeds the $130^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.
These results indicate the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI, Raintree Drive TI , and Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection do not provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2020 Existing PM peak hour. The Shea Boulevard TI provides acceptable overall LOS in the 2020 Existing PM peak hour. There are a few locations/movements that have congestion and queuing issues.

### 2.4.2.3. $\quad 2040$ Baseline/No-Build TI/Intersection Traffic Conditions

An analysis was completed of the project Tis/intersections using the 2040 Baseline/No-Build volumes and geometry as described in Section 2.3.2.1 of this document. The VISSIM-modeled delay, corresponding LOS, and queues at the project TIs/intersections for the 2040 Baseline/No-Build scenario are presented in Table 2.11 for the AM peak hour and in Table 2.12 for the PM peak hour.

Table 2.11-2040 Baseline/No-Build TI/Intersection Analysis Results: AM Peak Hour

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | E | D | - | E | F | D | - | F | D | C | E | D | B | E |
| Delay (sec) | 115 | 60 | 44 | - | 59 | 147 | 41 | - | 167 | 47 | 23 | 66 | 48 | 17 | 68 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 330 | 196 | 195 | - | 203 | 312 | 319 | - | 1050 | 913 | 609 | 65 | 110 | 67 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | C | C | F | F | F | F | F | D | D | A | F | D | C | F |
| Delay (sec) | 151 | 35 | 22 | 153 | 93 | 244 | 341 | 100 | 54 | 55 | 8 | 88 | 47 | 29 | 110 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 886 | 751 | 614 | 886 | 739 | 1315 | 1315 | 739 | 51 | 40 | 15 | 454 | 252 | 156 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | A | - | D | D | C | - | B | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Delay (sec) | 55 | 50 | 8 | - | 54 | 54 | 30 | - | 12 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 4 | 3 | 3 | - | 16 | 35 | 52 | - | 8 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 0 | - |
| Shea Boulevard \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | - | A | - | D | - | B | - | D | C | B | F | D | C | D |
| Delay (sec) | 37 | - | 4 | - | 46 | - | 13 | - | 45 | 30 | 20 | 125 | 46 | 32 | 44 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 42 | - | 3 | - | 123 | - | 2 | - | 54 | 69 | 56 | 1259 | 620 | 1211 | - |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS E overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build AM peak hour. The SBR queue of $319^{\prime}$ exceeds the 235' of available storage, impacting SBT operations. The EBL queue of $1,050^{\prime}$ exceeds the $185^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway and intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operations. The EBT queue of $913^{\prime}$ blocks the upstream driveway and intersection, impacting upstream operations. The EBR queue of 609' exceeds the 175 ' of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway, impacting EBT and upstream operations.

The Raintree Drive $T 1$ is expected to operate at LOS F overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build AM peak hour. The NBL and NBU queue of $886^{\prime}$ exceeds the $475^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting NBT operations. The SBT and SBR queue of $1,315^{\prime}$ blocks upstream driveways and intersections, impacting upstream operations. The WBL queue of 454' exceeds the $210^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks an upstream driveway, impacting WBT and upstream operations. The WBR queue of $156^{\prime}$ exceeds the 25 of available storage, impacting WBT operations.

The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is expected to operate at LOS A overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build AM peak hour with no queuing issues. It should be noted that the 2020 Existing results showed slight queuing issues at this intersection while the 2040 Baseline/No-Build results do not show any queuing issues - this is likely due to the WBL queuing issues at the Raintree Drive TI blocking WBT vehicles from reaching the Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection.
The Shea Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build AM peak hour. The WBL queue of $1,259^{\prime}$ exceeds the $275^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks upstream driveways, impacting WBT and upstream operations. The WBT queue of $620^{\prime}$ blocks upstream driveways, impacting upstream operations. The WBR queue of $1,211^{\prime}$ exceeds the $130^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks upstream driveways, impacting WBT and upstream operations.

These results indicate the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI and the Raintree Drive TI are not expected to provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build AM peak hour. The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection and Shea Boulevard TI are expected to provide acceptable overall LOS in the PM peak hour. Several locations/movements are expected to have congestion and queuing issues.

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | D | D | - | D | F | D | - | E | F | E | F | E | B | F |
| Delay (sec) | 178 | 54 | 38 | - | 49 | 129 | 43 | - | 78 | 86 | 74 | 443 | 67 | 20 | 94 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 525 | 311 | 310 | - | 241 | 432 | 438 | - | 544 | 1225 | 1246 | 1036 | 876 | 34 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | F | F | D | D | D | B | D | E | E | D | F | F | E | E |
| Delay (sec) | 41 | 135 | 116 | 42 | 44 | 40 | 17 | 42 | 58 | 59 | 43 | 184 | 97 | 72 | 76 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 282 | 429 | 472 | 282 | 70 | 50 | 45 | 70 | 99 | 12 | 353 | 1007 | 965 | 915 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | F | F | - | F | F | E | - | D | F | F | C | A | A | F |
| Delay (sec) | 249 | 232 | 741 | - | 181 | 97 | 64 | - | 52 | 105 | 82 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 158 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 69 | 3 | 1650 | - | 154 | 54 | 68 | - | 980 | 980 | 980 | 1 | 8 | 1 | - |
| Shea Boulevard \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | - | A | - | D | - | B | - | D | c | A | E | D | E | D |
| Delay (sec) | 43 | - | 5 | - | 44 | - | 11 | - | 50 | 23 | 10 | 63 | 38 | 80 | 38 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 110 | - | 5 | - | 125 | - | 0 | - | 66 | 55 | 25 | 1120 | 975 | 1555 | - |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS F overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build PM peak hour. The SBR queue of $438^{\prime}$ exceeds the $235^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting SBT operations. The EBL queue of $544^{\prime}$ exceeds the $185^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway, impacting EBT and upstream operations. The EBT queue of $1,225^{\prime}$ blocks the upstream driveway and intersection, impacting upstream operations. The EBR queue of $1,246^{\prime}$ exceeds the $175^{\prime}$ ' of available storage and blocks the upstream intersection and driveway, impacting EBT and upstream operations. The WBL queue of $1,036^{\prime}$ exceeds the $245^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream intersection and driveways, impacting WBT operations.

The Raintree Drive TI is expected to operate at LOS E overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build PM peak hour. The NBU queue of $282^{\prime}$ exceeds the $225^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting NBL operations. The EBR queue of $353^{\prime}$ exceeds the $250^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting EBT operations. The WBL queue of $1,007^{\prime}$ exceeds the $210^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway, impacting WBT and upstream operations. The WBT queue of $965^{\prime}$ blocks the upstream driveway, impacting upstream operations. The WBR queue of $915^{\prime}$ exceeds the $25^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway, impacting WBT and upstream operations.

- The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is expected to operate at LOS F overall in the 2040 Baseline/NoBuild PM peak hour. The NBR queue of $1,650^{\circ}$ blocks upstream driveways and intersections, impacting upstream operations. The SBR queue of $154^{\prime}$ exceeds the $110^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting SBT and SBR operations. The EBL queue of 980' exceeds the 125' of available storage and blocks an upstream intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operations. The EBT queue of $980^{\prime}$ blocks an upstream intersection, impacting upstream operations. The EBR queue of $980^{\prime}$ exceeds the $120^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks an upstream intersection, impacting upstream operations.

The Shea Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build PM peak hour. The WBL queue of $1,120^{\prime}$ exceeds the $275^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks upstream driveways, impacting WBT and upstream operations. The WBT queue of $975^{\prime}$ blocks upstream driveways, impacting upstream operations. The WBR queue of $1,555^{\prime}$ exceeds the $130^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream intersection and driveways, impacting WBT and upstream operations.

These results indicate the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI, Raintree Drive TI, and Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection are not expected to provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build PM peak hour. The Shea Boulevard TI provides acceptable overall LOS in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build. Several locations/movements are expected to have congestion and queuing issues.

### 2.4.2.4. $\quad 2040$ Improved/Build-TI/Intersection Conditions

An analysis was completed of the project TIs/intersections using the $2040 \mathrm{Improved} / \mathrm{Build}$ volumes and geometry as described in Section 2.3.2.2 of this document. As was mentioned previously, the three Improved/Build alternatives analyzed were:

- Improved SPUI alternative - where the existing SPUls are improved/expanded at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard TIs
- TDI alternative - where the existing SPUls are converted to TDIs at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard and Raintree Drive Tls only
- DRI alternative - where the existing SPUI is converted to a DRI at the Raintree Drive TI only


## Improved SPUI Analysis

Improvements included in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative consisted of the following:

- At the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI , the assumed SPUI configuration improvements included exclusive dual NBL and SBL lanes (as opposed to a shared left-turn/through lane), adding a SBT lane, adding a NBR lane, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments
- At the Raintree Drive TI, the assumed SPUI configuration improvements included adding a NBR lane and SBR lane, additional WBR storage capacity, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments
- At the Raintree Drive and 87 th Street intersection, the only assumed improvements were signal timing At the Raintree Drive and 87th Street intersection, the only assumed improvements were signal timing
adjustments, where the EBL and WBL phasing was changed to permitted/protected and NBR overlap phasing was added
- At the Shea Boulevard TI, the assumed SPUI configuration improvements included extending the WBR storage to be 600' and associated signal timing adjustments; geometric constraints restricted the ability to improve the WBL movement

The VISSIM-modeled delay, corresponding LOS, and queues at the project TIs/intersections for the $2040 \mathrm{Improved} /$ Build SPUI alternative are presented in Table $\mathbf{2 . 1 3}$ for the AM peak hour and in Table 2.14 for the PM peak hour.

## Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd

Final DCR Update

Table 2.13-2040 Improved/Build SPUI Alternative TI/Intersection Analysis Results: AM Peak Hour

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | B | - | D | D | c | - | F | D | B | F | E | D | D |
| Delay (sec) | 51 | 53 | 10 | - | 37 | 51 | 21 | - | 95 | 53 | 16 | 82 | 74 | 51 | 54 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 126 | 92 | 10 | - | 70 | 62 | 44 | - | 299 | 194 | 69 | 78 | 505 | 387 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | c | B | F | D | D | D | E | D | E | B | E | D | B | D |
| Delay (sec) | 117 | 28 | 13 | 117 | 53 | 57 | 41 | 57 | 44 | 76 | 14 | 74 | 42 | 12 | 55 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 896 | 6 | 15 | 896 | 74 | 58 | 87 | 74 | 39 | 53 | 27 | 260 | 99 | 127 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | B | - | D | D | C | - | B | c | A | B | A | A | B |
| Delay (sec) | 42 | 40 | 13 | - | 47 | 45 | 25 | - | 22 | 35 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 2 | 17 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 3 | 3 | 4 | - | 14 | 27 | 43 | - | 71 | 71 | 71 | 73 | 149 | 3 | - |
| Shea Boulevard \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | C | - | A | - | D | - | B | - | E | D | C | E | C | C | C |
| Delay (sec) | 32 | - | 4 | - | 41 | - | 13 | - | 58 | 41 | 20 | 64 | 27 | 23 | 34 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 45 | - | 4 | - | 129 | - | 5 | - | 69 | 97 | 57 | 340 | 53 | 167 |  |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative AM peak hour. The EBL queue of $299^{\prime}$ exceeds the $185^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway and intersection, mpacting EBT and upstream operations. The WBT queue of 505 blocks the upstream driveway, impacting upstream operations. The WBR queue of $387^{\prime}$ exceeds the $150^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.

Rantree Drive TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternativ ' $210^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.
alternative AM peak hour with no queuing issues.
The Shea Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS C overall in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative AM peak hour. The WBL queue of $340^{\prime}$ exceeds the $275^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.

These results indicate all project TIs/intersections are expected to provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative AM peak hour. Only a few locations/movements are expected to have congestion and queuing issues.

Table 2.14 - 2040 Improved/Build SPUI Alternative TI/Intersection Analysis Results: PM Peak Hour

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | $u$ | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | D | C | - | E | E | B | - | E | D | C | E | D | B | D |
| Delay (sec) | 94 | 47 | 30 | - | 68 | 67 | 20 | - | 69 | 38 | 23 | 75 | 40 | 11 | 48 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 241 | 58 | 47 | - | 163 | 157 | 31 | - | 101 | 163 | 144 | 88 | 74 | 29 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | C | D | D | D | B | D | D | D | B | D | D | B | D |
| Delay (sec) | 50 | 41 | 26 | 46 | 45 | 41 | 18 | 47 | 53 | 46 | 21 | 51 | 51 | 10 | 38 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 76 | 7 | 118 | 76 | 73 | 40 | 14 | 73 | 106 | 89 | 202 | 92 | 79 | 80 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | E | F | - | F | D | B | - | E | E | D | c | B | A | D |
| Delay (sec) | 83 | 65 | 159 | - | 93 | 47 | 19 | - | 77 | 65 | 52 | 24 | 12 | 3 | 55 |
| Avg. Queue ( ft ) | 155 | 18 | 1023 | - | 75 | 30 | 44 | - | 956 | 956 | 956 | 1 | 61 | 5 | - |
| Shea Boulevard \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | c | - | A | - | C | - | A | - | D | D | B | E | E | E | D |
| Delay (sec) | 32 | - | 5 | - | 35 | - | 10 | - | 48 | 36 | 11 | 62 | 57 | 58 | 40 |
| g. Queue (ft) | 66 | - | 7 |  | 94 |  | 1 |  | 63 | 90 | 30 | 450 | 1515 | 16 |  |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative PM peak hour with no queuing issues.

The Raintree Drive TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative PM peak hour with no queueing issues.

The Raintree Drive and 87th Street intersection is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the $2040 \mathrm{improved} /$ Build SPU alternative PM peak hour. The NBR queue of $1,023^{\prime}$ blocks upstream driveways, impacting upstream operations. The EBL queue of $956^{\prime}$ exceeds the $125^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks an upstream intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operation The EBT queue of $956^{\prime}$ blocks an upstream intersection, impacting upstream operations. The EBR queue of $956^{\prime}$ exceeds the $120^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks an upstream intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operations.

The Shea Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the $2040 \mathrm{Improved} /$ Build SPUI alternative PM peak hour. The WBL queue of $450^{\circ}$ exceeds the $275^{\circ}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway, impacting WBT and upstream operations. The WBT queue of $1,515^{\prime}$ blocks the upstream intersection and driveways, impacting upstream operations. The WBR queue of $1,624^{\prime}$ exceeds the $600^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream intersection and driveways, impacting WBT and upstream operations.

These results indicate all project TIs/intersections are expected to provide acceptable overall LOS in the $2040 \mathrm{Improved} /$ Build SPUI alternative PM peak hour. Only a few locations/movements are expected to have congestion and queuing issues.

TDI Analysis
Improvements included in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative consisted of the following:

- At the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard $T$ I, the assumed TDI configuration improvements included the same number of approach lanes for each movement as the existing SPUI configuration along with adding a NBR lane, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments
- At the Raintree Drive TI, the assumed TDI configuration improvements included the same number of approach lanes for each movement as the existing SPUI configuration along with adding a NBR lane and SBR lane, additional WBR storage capacity, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments
- At the Raintree Drive and 87 th Street intersection, the only assumed improvements were signal timing adjustments, where the EBL and WBL phasing was changed to permitted/protected and NBR overlap phasing was added

The VISSIM-modeled delay, corresponding LOS, and queues at the project TIs/intersections for the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative are presented in Table 2.15 for the AM peak hour and in Table 2.16 for the PM peak hour.

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | B | A | - | D | C | A | - | E | C | A | E | C | B | C |
| Delay (sec) | 64 | 30 | 7 | - | 63 | 43 | 9 | - | 116 | 39 | 15 | 116 | 45 | 20 | 47 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 76 | 51 | 13 | - | 66 | 83 | 43 | - | 105 | 105 | 56 | 110 | 110 | 71 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | C | B | - | D | B | B | - | D | C | B | D | D | B | D |
| Delay (sec) | 130 | 37 | 19 | - | 69 | 30 | 30 | - | 81 | 40 | 17 | 53 | 64 | 16 | 56 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 845 | 9 | 30 | - | 50 | 53 | 63 | - | 42 | 42 | 21 | 117 | 117 | 25 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | B | - | D | D | C | - | B | D | A | B | B | A | B |
| Delay (sec) | 41 | 39 | 16 | - | 47 | 45 | 25 | - | 17 | 35 | 6 | 11 | 11 | 3 | 18 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 3 | 3 | 16 | - | 14 | 27 | 43 | - | 67 | 67 | 67 | 100 | 176 | 5 | - |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS C overall in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative AM peak hour with no queuing issues.
The Raintree Drive TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative AM peak hour. The NBL queue of $845^{\prime}$ exceeds the 475' of available storage, impacting NBT operations.
The Raintree Drive and 87th Street intersection is expected to operate at LOS B overall in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative AM peak hour. The WBL queue of $100^{\prime}$ exceeds the $60^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.
These results indicate all project TIs/intersections are expected to provide acceptable overall LOS in the $2040 \mathrm{Improved} /$ Build TDI alternative AM peak hour. Only a few locations/movements are expected to have congestion and queuing issues.

Table 2.16-2040 Improved/Build TDI Alternative TI/Intersection Analysis Results: PM Peak Hour

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | C | B | - | D | C | A | - | D | D | C | D | C | A | C |
| Delay (sec) | 64 | 32 | 17 | - | 62 | 39 | 9 | - | 79 | 68 | 53 | 70 | 38 | 11 | 49 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 86 | 38 | 22 | - | 79 | 77 | 85 | - | 751 | 751 | 988 | 76 | 76 | 26 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | B | B | - | D | C | B | - | D | C | B | D | D | A | C |
| Delay (sec) | 63 | 30 | 27 | - | 61 | 34 | 16 | - | 66 | 41 | 22 | 74 | 61 | 15 | 44 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 60 | 5 | 112 | - | 68 | 64 | 15 | - | 134 | 134 | 210 | 106 | 106 | 33 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | E | D | D | - | E | D | B | - | D | F | E | C | A | A | D |
| Delay (sec) | 62 | 41 | 37 | - | 117 | 67 | 19 | - | 51 | 104 | 75 | 24 | 9 | 2 | 50 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 48 | 15 | 97 | - | 217 | 82 | 97 | - | 970 | 970 | 970 | 1 | 53 | 3 | - |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS C overall in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative PM peak hour. The EBL queue of $751^{\prime}$ exceeds the $240^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway and intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operations. The EBT queue of $751^{\prime}$ blocks the upstream driveway, impacting upstream operations. The EBR queue of $988^{\prime}$ exceeds the 175 ' of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway, impacting EBT and upstream
operations. operations.
The Raintree Drive TI is expected to operate at LOS C overall in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative PM peak hour with no queueing issues.

The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative PM peak hour. The SBL queue of 217' exceeds the 110' of available storage, impacting SBT and SBR operations. The EBL queue of $970^{\prime}$ exceeds the $125^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks an upstream intersection, impacting EBT and upstream pperations. The EBT queue of $970^{\prime}$ blocks an upstream intersection, impacting upstream operations. The EBR queue of $970^{\circ}$ exceeds the $120^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks an upstream intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operations.

These results indicate all project TIs/intersections are expected to provide acceptable overall LOS in the $2040 \mathrm{Improved} /$ Build TDI alternative PM peak hour. Only a few locations/movements are expected to have congestion and queuing issues.

## Double-Roundabout Interchange (DRI) Analysis

Improvements included in the 2040 Improved/Build DRI alternative consisted of the following three scenarios for the SB Ramps roundabout:

- Scenario A: one SBR bypass lane and one SBU bypass lane
- Scenario B: two SBR bypass lanes
- Scenario C: two SBR bypass lanes and one SBU bypass lane

The RODEL-modeled delay, corresponding LOS, and queues at the project TIs/intersections for the 2040 Improved/Build DRI alternative are presented in Table $\mathbf{2 . 1 7}$ for the AM peak hour and in Table $\mathbf{2 . 1 8}$ for the PM peak hour.

| Leg Name | Number of Lanes |  | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (ft) Per Lane |  | Level of Service |  |  | Total Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entr |  | Bypas |  |  |  |
| L101 SB \& Raintree (A: 1 SB Rt Bypass, 1 SB U-Turn Bypass) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB SB | 2 | 1 | 32 | 365 | 215 | 275 | 5,400 | D | F | F | 19 | c | 271 | F | 73 | F |
| Raintree EB | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB NB |  |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 |  | 17 | - | 17 | 525 |  | c |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB \& Raintree (B:2 SB Rt Bypass) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB SB | 2 | 2 | 59 | 5 | 32 | 675 | 50 | F | A | F | 28 | 28 | 4 | A | 19 | c |
| Raintree EB | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB NB |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 |  | 17 | - | 17 | 525 |  | c |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB \& Raintree (C: 2 SB Rt Bypass, 1 SB U-Turn Bypass) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB SB | 2 | 2 | 32 | 5 | 17 | 275 | 50 | D | A | c |  | 19 | 4 | A | 14 | B |
| Raintree EB | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB NB |  |  | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 |  | 17 | - | 17 | 525 | - | c | - | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB \& Raintree (A:1 SB Rt Bypass, 1 SB U-Turn Bypass) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NBSB |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | . | - | - | 8 |  | 3 | A | 7 | A |
| Raintree EB | 2 |  | 3 | - | 3 | 25 | - | A | - | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB NB | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 25 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 11 | 275 | 0 | B | A | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB \& Raintree (B: 2 SB Rt Bypass) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB SB |  |  | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 14 | в | 3 | A | 11 | B |
| Raintree EB | 2 |  | 4 | - | 4 | 50 | - | A | - | A | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB NB | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 75 | 25 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 21 | 600 | 0 | D | A | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB \& Raintree (C: 2 SB Rt Bypass, 1 SB U-Turn Bypass) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB SB |  |  | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 8 |  | 3 | A | 7 | A |
| Raintree EB | 2 |  | 3 | - | 3 | 25 | - | A | - | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB NB | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 25 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 11 | 275 | 0 | B | A | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. L101 SB \& Raintree SB Bypass results were analyzed with separate models to accurately capture the opposing flow volumes.
2. L101 SB \& Raintree SB Approach results were analyzed with separate models due to RODEL coding limitations. The SB Approach capacity in RODEL was impacted by the SB Bypass configuration. The separate SB Approach models provided consistent capacity for the three alternatives.
3. L101 NB \& Raintree (1 SB Rt Bypass, 1 SB U-Turn Bypass) and (2 SB Rt Bypass, 1 SB U-Turn Bypass) alternative models and results are the same.
The Raintree Drive TI NB Ramps roundabout is expected to operate overall at LOS A for Scenario A, LOS B for Scenario B, and LOS A for Scenario C during the round Improved/Build DRI alternative AM peak hour. The only queuing issue is that in Scenario $B$ the WBT queue of $600^{\prime}$ blocks an upstream driveway, impacting upstream operations.

The Raintree Drive TI SB Ramps roundabout is expected to operate overall at LOS F for Scenario A, LOS C for Scenario B, and LOS B for Scenario C during the 2040 Improved/Build DRI alternative PM peak hour. In Scenario A, the SBR bypass queue of $5,400^{\prime}$ blocks the upstream intersections, driveways, and ramp junction, significantly impacting upstream operations - this is a potential fatal flaw due to the magnitude of the impact. In Scenario B, the SBT queue of $675^{\prime}$ blocks an upstream driveway,
impacting upstream operations. In Scenarios A, B, and C, the WBT queue of $525^{\prime}$ blocks the adjacent NB Ramps roundabout, significantly impacting operations within the NB Ramps roundabout - this is a potential fatal flaw due to the magnitude of the impact as it could gridlock the TI.

| Leg Name | Number of Lanes |  | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (ft) Per Lane |  | Level of Service |  |  | Total Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entries |  | Bypas | sses | To |  |
| L101 SB \& Raintree (A: 1 SB Rt Bypass, 1 SB U-Turn Bypass) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SBSB | 2 | 1 | 11 | 8 | 10 | 100 | 75 | в | A | B | 10 | A | 2 | A | 7 | 7 A |
| Raintree EB | 2 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 250 | 0 | B | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB NB |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 |  | 6 | - | 6 | 100 | - | A | - | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB \& Raintree (B: 2 SB Rt Bypass) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SBSB | 2 |  | 13 | 3 | 10 | 150 | 25 | B | A | B | 13 | в | 1 | A | 9 | 9 A |
| Raintree EB | 2 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 11 | 450 | 0 | c | A | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB NB |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 |  | 6 | - | 6 | 100 |  | A | - | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB \& Raintree (C:2 SB Rt Bypass, 1 SB U-Turn Bypass) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SBSB | 2 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 8 | 100 | 25 | B | A | A | 10 | A | 1 | A | 7 | A |
| Raintree EB | 2 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 250 | 0 | B | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB NB |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 |  | 6 | - | 6 | 100 | - | A | - | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB \& Raintree (A: 1 SB Rt Bypass, 1 SB U-Turn Bypass) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NBSB |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | A | 9 | A | 7 | A |
| Raintree EB | 2 |  | 7 | - |  | 125 | - | A | - | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB NB | 2 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 50 | 175 | A | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0 |  | 100 | 0 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB \& Raintree (B: 2 SB Rt Bypass) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB SB |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | A | 9 | A | 8 | A |
| Raintree EB | 2 |  | 8 | - |  | 175 | - | A | - | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB NB | 2 | 1 | 7 | 12 |  | 50 | 175 | A | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 150 | 0 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB \& Raintree (C: 2 SB Rt Bypass, 1 SB U-Turn Bypass) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB SB |  |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | A | 9 | A | 7 | 7 A |
| Raintree EB | 2 |  | 7 | - | 7 | 125 | - | A | - | A | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB NB | 2 | 1 | 6 | 12 |  | 50 | 175 | A | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 100 | 0 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. L101 SB \& Raintree SB Bypass results were analyzed with separate models to accurately capture the opposing flow volumes. 2. $L 101$ SB \& Raintree SB Approach results were analyzed with separate models due to RODEL coding limitations. The SB Approach capacity in RODEL was impacted by the SB Bypass configuration. The separate SB Approach models provided consistent capacity for
the three alternatives. 3. L101 NB \& Raintre

Raintree (1 SB Rt Bypass, 1 SB U-Turn Bypass) and (2 SB Rt Bypass, 1 SB U-Turn Bypass) alternative models and results are the same.

The Raintree Drive TI NB Ramps roundabout is expected to operate overall at LOS A for Scenarios A, B, and C during the 2040 Improved/Build DRI alternative PM peak hour with no queuing issues.
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The Raintree Drive TI SB Ramps roundabout is expected to operate overall at LOS A for Scenarios A,B, and C during the 2040 Improved/Build DRI alternative PM peak hour. The only queuing issues is that in Scenario B, the EBT queue of $450^{\prime}$ blocks the upstream Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection, impacting operations at that intersection.
2.5. PRINCESS TI ALTERNATIVE

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 2.5
2.6. SUMMARY OF OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS
2.6.1. SR 101L Widening Build Alternative

The following is a summary of the principal findings of the traffic analysis.

## SR 101L Mainline

- The only identified mainline crash issue was the concentration of NB crashes south of Shea Boulevard where the mainline currently tapers from four GPLs to three GPLs
- 2040 traffic volumes are projected to be approximately $25 \%$ higher than 2020 existing traffic volumes
- There will be significant mainline and ramp junction congestion by 2040 if additional GPLs are not provided on SR 101L
- Widening SR 101L to four GPLs is expected to reduce crashes related to congestion, particularly on SR 101L NB south of Shea Boulevard where the segment currently tapers from four GPLs to three GPLs
- By adding a GPL in each direction, SR 101L is expected to provide LOS D or better through 2040 throughout the project limits except at the Shea Boulevard NB on-ramp merge segment (which provides LOS E)


## Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI

- This TI had the highest crash rate of the TIs assessed within the project limits
- An improved SPUI is expected to provide a slight reduction in the overall crash rate due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements
- A TDI is expected to provide a slight reduction in the overall crash rate due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements and a moderate reduction in the severe crash rate due to the reduced number of crossing points
- Traffic LOS with the existing SPUI configuration is poor now (LOS E) during peak times and will get worse (LOS F) in the future if no improvements are made
- An improved SPUI is expected to provide LOS D through 2040 if exclusive dual NBL and SBL lanes, an additional SBT lane, an additional NBR lane, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments are provided, although there will still be long EB and WB queues
- A TDI with the same approach lanes as the existing SPUI along with adding a NBR lane and signal control for all right-turn movements is expected to provide LOS C through 2040, although there will still be long EB queues
- The improved SPUI and TDI are relatively similar in terms of anticipated traffic performance and both are considered viable improvements from a traffic standpoint


## Raintree Drive TI

- An improved SPUI is expected to provide a slight reduction in the overall crash rate due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements
- A TDI is expected to provide a slight reduction in the overall crash rate due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements and a moderate reduction in the severe crash rate due to the reduced number of crossing points
- A DRI is expected to provide a moderate reduction in the overall crash rate due to a significant reduction in congestion from operational improvements and a significant reduction in the severe crash rate due to the reduced number of crossing points and lower operating speeds
- Traffic LOS with the existing SPUI configuration is poor now (LOS F) during peak times and will get worse (LOS F with higher delays) in the future if no improvements are made
- An improved SPUI is expected to provide LOS D through 2040 if adding a NBR lane and SBR lane, additional WBR storage capacity, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments are provided, although there will still be long NB queues
- A TDI with the same approach lanes as the existing SPUI except with adding a NBR lane and SBR lane, additional WBR storage capacity, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments is expected to provide LOS D through 2040, although there will still be some long NB queues
A DRI is expected to provide LOS C or better through 2040 but the projected long WB queue at the SB Ramps roundabout will extend through the adjacent NB Ramps roundabout, significantly impacting operations - this is a potential fatal flaw due to the magnitude of the impact
- The improved SPUI and TDI are relatively similar in terms of anticipated traffic performance and both are considered viable improvements from a traffic standpoint
- Even though the DRI theoretically provides acceptable overall LOS, it is not considered a viable improvement due to the WB queuing issue that could potentially gridlock the TI


## Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street

- Traffic LOS is poor now (LOS F) during peak times and will get worse (LOS F with higher delays) in the future if no improvements are made
- Recommended improvements are limited to signal timing/phasing adjustments, namely EBL/WBL permitted/protected phasing and NBR overlap phasing
- With these signal timing/phasing improvements, the intersection is expected to provide LOS D through 2040, although there will still be long EB queues


## Shea Boulevard T

- An improved SPUl is expected to provide a slight reduction in the overall crash rate due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements
- Traffic LOS with the existing SPUI configuration is acceptable now (LOS C) during peak times and is still expected to be acceptable (LOS D) in the future if no improvements are made, but there are long WB queues
- Extending the WBR storage length to $600^{\prime}$ and signal timing adjustments will maintain LOS D in the future and will help reduce, but not eliminate, the WB queues
- Other WB improvements are not considered feasible due to geometric constraints at the $T$


### 2.6.2. Princess Drive TI

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 2.6.2.

## 3. DESIGN CONCEPT ALTERNATIVES

### 3.1. INTRODUCTION

In addition to the GPL widening as proposed in the 2010 DCR, design concepts and alternatives were developed for the Princess Drive TI, Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI, Raintree Drive TI, and Shea Boulevard TI. The Frank Lloyd Wright TI Alternatives evaluate an Improved SPUI and a TDI. The Raintree TI considered alternatives also included these TI types, as well as a dual roundabout alternative. Improved SPUI and a TDI. The Raintree TI considered alternatives also included these TI types, as well as a dual roundabout alternative. Shea Boulevard and Princess Drive TI were not evaluated for the TI type, but were evaluated for spot improvements to provide added purposes, fatal flaw considerations, and to list benefits of the TI's capacity and other features. See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 3.1.

### 3.2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Five screening criteria were developed to evaluate the SPUI, TDI, and DRI Alternatives. Each evaluation criterion is described below.

- Traffic Performance: This criterion evaluated the alternatives for operational safety including conflict points, crash frequency and severity, and wrong way prevention. Also evaluated are potential benefits to the operational performance for the design year of 2040 including improved LOS, queues, storage lengths, through lanes needed, and cross street impacts. Safety, crossing type and time, connectivity, and overall access and accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists were also considered.
- Ability to meet design criteria and standards: The alternatives were evaluated for the use of applicable geometric design criteria and standards as influenced by design speeds, skew angles, and sight distance and in providing required lane widths, ramp tapers, and turning radius. Structural and drainage impacts to existing infrastructure and replacement are also noted within this section.
- Environmental: This criterion evaluated the alternatives for its social and economic considerations, amount of disturbance to developed areas and vegetation, potential noise and air quality impacts, potential changes in the visual character and quality, potential impacts to cultural and biological resources, and hazardous materials issues. Also included was their Environmental Requirements such as documents required and timeframe for clearance if an alternative is implemented.
- Right-of-Way Requirements and Utility Impacts: The alternatives were evaluated based upon the amount of right-ofway and TCEs, acquisition requirements, relative cost, existing improvement and building impacts, and potential conflicts with existing, acquisic utilities and whether those impacts require relocations, extensive coordination, and the relative cost for utilities.
- Cost: This criterion evaluated the construction cost of the alternative which includes initial construction cost, ongoing maintenance costs, relative traffic control, right-of-way, and utility relocation costs.


## See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 3.3.

Public agencies that have been involved with this study update concerning the alternative development and evaluation process include ADOT, City of Scottsdale, MAG, and FHWA.
3.3. DESIGN CONCEPT ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED
3.3.1. SR 101L Widening Build Alternative

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 3.3.1. The last paragraph is revised to read: The order of magnitude cost for this alternative is updated to $\$ 116,970,000$ for the mainline widening which is presented in Table 6.2
3.3.2. Princess Drive TI Alternative

ADOT 2010 DCR Section 3.3 .2 was determined to no longer be applicable to this project.
3.3.3. No-Build Alternative

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 3.3.3
3.3.4. Evaluation of the SR 101L Mainline Widening Alternatives
3.3.4.1. SR 101L Widening Build Alternative

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 3.3.4.1
3.3.4.2. Princess Drive TI Alternative

Not Applicable.
3.3.4.3. Recommendations

The SR 101L Widening Build Alternative is recommended as the Preferred Alternative for the SR 101L mainline. In making this recommendation, the design team completed a multidiscipline screening process that included agency and public agency input.
3.4. SERVICE INTERCHANGES
3.4.1. Introduction

MAG published a Traffic Alternatives Study in May 2017 and the City of Scottsdale separately prepared a Raintree DCR in 2014, both of which suggested the 2010 ADOT DCR TI configurations may not meet future capacity needs at the Princess Drive, Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard interchanges. Therefore, interchange modification options for these four TIs were developed in order to optimize the geometric design elements of the ramps, frontage roads, and intersecting roadways, while minimizing environmental impacts, maintaining the improvements within the existing right-of-way, minimizing construction costs, and minimizing impacts to local traffic during construction.
3.4.2. Frank Lloyd Wright TI

The alternatives considered for development within this section of the report are for the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard Traffic Interchange.

### 3.4.2.1. Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard Improved Single-Point Urban Interchange

The widening of the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI Overpass (Structure No. 2505, MP 37.78) and bridge abutments would impact the existing Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI. This option for the reconfiguration of this interchange is shown on Figure 3.1.

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard horizontal and vertical alignments and approach lanes would be retained in their current configuration. This option widens the existing single-span bridge by widening the existing abutment and superstructure. The widened abutment would be placed in-line with the existing abutment. This bridge configuration would require all four of the existing ramps to be realigned to avoid the new piers/abutment as depicted on Figure 3.1.
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Left turning movements in the SPUI would be consistent with current recommendations of the ADOT Roadway Design Guidelines (RDG) since they must all be reconstructed due to realignment. All right turning movements would be modified to accommodate the WB-67 design vehicle. Left turning movements from SB \& NB SR 101L to Frank Lloyd Wright will be converted to dual lefts which, when implemented, require widening at the connection to the ramps as well as extending reconstruction/realignment down the ramps further than anticipated in the 2010 DCR configuration.

In accordance with the modified interchange design, medians, pedestrian facilities, and drainage connections will be reconstructed and the existing traffic signals would be relocated. The order of magnitude construction cost for this option is approximately $\$ 2,153,000$.
3.4.2.2. Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard Tight Diamond Interchange

The widening of the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI Overpass (Structure No. 2505, MP 37.78) and bridge abutments would impact the existing Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard SPUI. This diamond interchange option for the reconfiguration of this interchange avoids the widening and is shown on Figure 3.2A \& B

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard horizontal and vertical alignments would be retained in their current configuration. Existing pavement will be used and new pavement added to achieve the SPUI to TDI conversion. The left-turn lane extended storage and the tie-ins to the existing condition would require reconstruction and right-of-way near neighboring development as depicted in Appendix C.

In accordance with the modified interchange design, medians, pedestrian facilities, and drainage connections will be reconstructed, SPUI ramps sections removed, and the existing traffic signals would be relocated. The order of magnitude construction cost for this option is approximately $\$ 3,397,000$.
3.4.2.3. Frank Lloyd Wright TI - Evaluation of Alternatives

The evaluation of Alternatives is summarized in Table 3.1

Table 3.1 - Frank Lloyd Wright TI Alternatives Selection Matrix


### 3.4.2.4. Frank Lloyd Wright TI - Recommendations

Retaining the SPUI configuration of the existing TI and adding additional turn lanes provides similar capacity to the TDI alternative. Yet, the TDI provides the potential for better signal coordination with the frontage roads, combined with an improved environment for pedestrian and bike crossings. The project team therefore recommends the TDI as the Recommended Alternative for reconstruction of the Frank Lloyd Wright TI. The Recommended Alternative would achieve the traffic operational goals and engineering standard requirements established for this project.

The order-of-magnitude total project cost estimate for the Recommended Alternative for the Frank Lloyd Wright TI is approximately $\$ 3,397,000$. Additional information regarding the cost estimate is shown in Section 6.3.
3.4.3. $90^{\text {th }}$ Street Single-Point Urban Interchange

This Subsection is not applicable to this project.

### 3.4.4. Raintree Drive T

The alternatives considered for development within this section of the report are for the Raintree Drive Traffic Interchange.

### 3.4.4.1. Raintree Drive Improved Single-Point Urban Interchange

Adjustments to the Raintree Drive TI are not required due to SR 101L GPL widening. This option for the reconfiguration of this interchange based on arterial capacity improvements is shown on Figure 3.3.

The Raintree Drive horizontal and vertical alignments and approach lanes would be retained in their current configuration with one additional lane, a WB to NB right-turn lane for added capacity for NB SR 101L traffic. Since Raintree Drive passes over SR 101L, this option would not affect the existing bridge or abutments.

Implementing Performance Based Practical Design solution (PBPD), the left turning movements and lane widths in the SPUI would remain in their current configuration since they satisfy AASHTO criteria. All right turning movements would be modified to accommodate the WB-67 design vehicle. Exclusive right-turn lanes would be added at the NB and SB exit ramps as depicted on Figure 3.3.

In accordance with the modified interchange design, medians, pedestrian facilities, and drainage connections would be reconstructed for right-turn lane widening only and the existing traffic signals would be relocated. The order of magnitude construction cost for this option is approximately $\$ 583,000$.

### 3.4.4.2. Raintree Drive Tight Diamond Interchange

Adjustments to the Raintree Drive TI are not required due to SR 101L GPL widening. This option for the reconfiguration of this interchange based on arterial capacity improvements is shown on Figure 3.4 A \& B.

The Raintree Drive horizontal and vertical alignments would be retained in their current configuration yet with the left-turn lanes for the diamond configuration added, the through lanes would be widened out at the TI slightly. Tapering the intersection east and west to tie to the existing condition just a few hundred feet past the Freeway ramps. These impacts are shown on Figure 3.4A \& B.

In accordance with the modified interchange design, medians, pedestrian facilities, and drainage connections will be reconstructed, SPUI ramps sections removed, and the existing traffic signals would be relocated. The order of magnitude construction cost for this option is approximately $\$ 1,930,000$. The detailed estimate is contained in Appendix D.

### 3.4.4.3. Raintree Drive Dual Roundabouts Interchange

Dual roundabouts were considered as an alternative at Raintree Drive TI for potential traffic calming, improved operational Dual roundabouts were considered as an alternative at Raintree Drive TI for potential traffic calming, improved operational
performance, reduced crash rates, and lower maintenance costs (signals). The roundabouts were designed to a Case 3 design, performance, reduced crash rates, and lower maintenance costs (signals). The roundabouts were designed to a Case 3 design,
where WB-67s can traverse within the inside lane without tracking into the outside lane. A WB-50 was used for the outside lane. The layout is shown on Figure 3.5 A \& B

The Raintree Drive horizontal and vertical alignments would be realigned, and typical roundabout grading would need to be modified to closely match the $2 \%$ normal crown or the existing roadway to ensure the bridge does not take on additional loading (overlay). Approach lanes would be reconfigured through the roundabouts. This option does not require the widening of the bridge.

This alternative removes the sidewalk on the north side of the TI so that pedestrians must travel to the south side to cross the TI . Also, a U-Turn movement for SB to NB SR 101 L traffic is added.

In accordance with the modified interchange design, medians, pedestrian facilities, and drainage connections would be reconstructed for the entire TI and the existing traffic signals would be removed. The order of magnitude construction cost for this option is approximately $\$ 2,283,000$. The detailed estimate is contained in Appendix D.

### 3.4.4.4. Raintree Drive TI - Evaluation of Alternatives

The evaluation of Alternatives is summarized in Table 3.2

| Evaluation Criteria |  | No-Build Alternative | Alternative A | Alternative B | Alternative C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Single-Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) | Improved Single-Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) | Tight Diamond Interchange (TDI) | Double-Roundabout Interchange (DRI) |
| Traffic Performance | Operational Safety | - 28 conflict points, including 12 crossing points - Intersection crash rate of 1.36 crashes per million entering vehicles <br> - Severe crashes: angle (10\%), left-turn (1\%) <br> - Wrong-way travel prohibited by signage | O 28 conflict points, including 12 crossing points O Slight reduction anticipated in crash rate due to reduced congestion <br> O No change anticipated in percentage of severe crashes <br> O Wrong-way travel prohibited by signage | D 26 conflict points, including 10 crossing points <br> O Slight reduction anticipated in crash rate due to reduced congestion <br> O Moderate reduction anticipated in percentage of severe crashes due to reduced number of crossing points <br> - Wrong-way travel prohibited by signage | O 38 conflict points, including 10 crossing points <br> Moderate reduction anticipated in crash rate due <br> to significantly reduced congestion <br> Significant reduction anticipated in percentage of severe crashes due to reduced number of crossing points and lower speeds <br> Wrong-way travel prohibited by raised concrete islands |
|  | Traffic Operations (Design Year 2040) | - 2040 overall LOS of $F$ in the AM and E in the PM - Queues exceed available storage or block upstream driveways/intersections for the nb left-turn (NBL), NB right-turn (NBR), NB U-turn (NBU), SB left-turn (SBL), SB through (SBT), SBR, SB U-turn (SBU), EBR, WBL, WB through (WBT), and WB right-turn (WBR) movements - Nearby Raintree Dr/87th St intersection has 2040 overall LOS of A in the AM and F in the PM with queues that exceed available storage or block upstream driveways/intersections for the NBR, SBL, EBL, EB through (EBT), and EBR movements | C 2040 overall LOS of D in the AM and D in the PM © Queues reduced but still exceed available storage or block upstream driveways/intersections for the NBL, NBU, and WBL movements <br> (1) Nearby Raintree Dr/87th St intersection has 2040 overall LOS of B in the AM and D in the PM with queues that are reduced but still exceed available storage or block upstream driveways/intersections for the NBR, EBL, EBT, and EBR movements | (D 2040 overall LOS of D in the AM and C in the PM <br> © Queues reduced but still exceed available storage or block upstream driveways/intersections for the NBL movement <br> © Nearby Raintree Dr/87th St intersection has 2040 overall LOS of B in the AM and D in the PM with queues that are reduced but still exceed available storage or block upstream driveways/intersections for the SBL, EBL, EBT, and EBR movements <br> © SB-NB and NB-SB U-turns require two step movement | Q 2040 overall LOS of B in the AM and A in the PM at the SB Ramps roundabout 2040 overall LOS of A in the AM and A in the PM at the NB Ramps roundabout <br> * WB approach queues at the SB Ramps roundabout exceed available storage between the two roundabouts, blocking up the NB Ramps roundabout; to address this issue, three WB lanes would be needed at the SB Ramps roundabout |
|  | Pedestrian Accommodations | - Pedestrian crossings all have signal-controlled pedestrian phasing except for across the one-lane WBR and EBR movements, which are yield-controlled - Can take up to four signal cycles for pedestrians to cross the TI | O Pedestrian crossings all have signal-controlled pedestrian phasing except for across the one-lane WBR and EBR movements, which are yield-controlled O Can take up to four signal cycles for pedestrians to cross the TI | O Pedestrian crossings all have signal-controlled pedestrian phasing except for across the one-lane WBR and EBR movements, which are yieldcontrolled <br> - Can take up to two signal cycles for pedestrians to cross the TI | O Pedestrian crossings are all yield-controlled onelane or two-lane crossings, making it more challenging for those with disabilities to cross, although this is offset to some degree by the lower speed of vehicles at the crossings. Addressing this issue would require pedestrian crossings with pedestrian-actuated signals or pedestrian hybrid beacons, which will impede the traffic movement - Pedestrian crossings not provided on north side of TI due to the anticipated high speed of U-turn vehicles at potential crossing locations, requiring pedestrians that desire to go between the southeast and northwest quadrants of the TI to cross at the Raintree Dr/87th St intersection |
|  | Bicyclist <br> Accommodations | - Bicycle lanes provided on Raintree Dr through TI; bicyclists can also either use vehicle lanes or the sidewalk | O Bicycle lanes provided on Raintree Dr through TI; bicyclists can also either use vehicle lanes or the sidewalk | O Bicycle lanes provided on Raintree Dr through Tl ; bicyclists can also either use vehicle lanes or the sidewalk | - Bicycle lanes not provided on Raintree Dr through TI; bicyclists must either use vehicle lanes or the sidewalk |
|  | Access | $-87^{\text {th }}$ St signalized intersection and one driveway do not meet current RDG standards for access spacing near interchanges | O No change anticipated in access | O No change anticipated in access | O No change anticipated in access |
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### 3.4.4.5. Raintree Drive TI - Recommendations

Retaining the SPUI configuration of the existing $T 1$ and adding right-turn lanes provides similar capacity to the TDI alternative but has a distinct cost benefit over a TDI by reducing extensive intersection reconstruction required for the WB and EB traffic. The project team therefore recommends the Improved SPUI as the Recommended Alternative for reconstruction of the Raintree Drive TI. The Recommended Alternative would achieve the traffic operational goals and engineering standard requirements established for this project.

The order-of-magnitude total project cost estimate for the Recommended Alternative for the Raintree Drive Tl is approximately $\$ 583,000$. Additional information regarding the cost estimate is shown in Section 6.3
3.4.5. Princess Drive Tight Diamond Interchange

Adjustments of the Princess Drive TI are not required due to SR 101L GPL widening. This option for the reconfiguration of this interchange based on arterial capacity improvements is shown in the preliminary plans in Appendix C.

The Princess Drive horizontal and vertical alignments and approach lanes would be retained in their current diamond configuration and a third WB to SB left-turn lane for SB SR 101 L traffic would be proposed for added capacity. The existing roadway width already accounts for this third lane and is currently not in use. With this configuration the median west of the TI requires minor modification, and the median east is reconstructed to add additional storage for all three left-turn lanes and restriping as required to tie to existing conditions.

Since Princess Drive passes under SR 101L and the existing edge of roadway would not require widening, this option would not affect the existing bridge or abutments.

After reviewing the capacity improvement and cost of the triple left lane alternative, the project team therefore recommends modifying the existing Diamond Interchange with triple lefts as the Recommended Alternative for reconstruction of the Princess Drive TI. The order of magnitude construction cost for this option is approximately $\$ 297,000$. Additional information regarding the cost estimate is shown in Section 6.3.
3.4.6. Shea Boulevard Single-Point Urban Interchange

Adjustments of the Shea Boulevard TI are not required due to SR 101L GPL widening. This option for the reconfiguration of this interchange based on arterial capacity improvements is shown in the preliminary plans in Appendix C.

The Shea Boulevard horizontal and vertical alignments and approach lanes would be retained in their current configuration with the WB to NB right-turn lane extended for added capacity for NB SR 101 L traffic. Since Shea Boulevard passes over SR 101L, this option would not affect the existing bridge or abutments.

Implementing PBPD, the left turning movements and lane widths would remain in their current configuration. The WB to NB right turning movement would be extended to provide additional storage for turning vehicles.

### 3.4.6.1. Shea Boulevard TI - Evaluation of Alternatives

The evaluation of Alternatives is summarized in Table 3.3

Table 3.3 - Shea Boulevard TI Alternative Review Matrix

| Evaluation Criteria |  | No-Build Alternative | Alternative A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Single-Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) | Improved Single-Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) |
| Traffic Performance | Operational Safety | - 20 conflict points, including 8 crossing points - Intersection crash rate of 1.74 crashes per million entering vehicles <br> - Severe crashes: angle (9\%), leftturn (2\%) <br> - Wrong-way travel prevented by signage | O 20 conflict points, including 8 crossing points <br> O No net change anticipated in crash rate (reduced crashes due to reduced congestion offset by increased crashes due to driveway in middle of WBR lane) <br> O No change anticipated in percentage of severe crashes <br> O Wrong-way travel prevented by signage |
|  | Traffic Operations (Design Year 2040) | - 2040 overall LOS of D in the AM and $D$ in the $P M$ <br> - Queues exceed available storage or block upstream driveways/intersections for the WBL, WBT, and WBR movements | D 2040 overall LOS of C in the AM and D in the PM <br> Dueues reduced but still exceed available storage or block upstream driveways/intersections for the WBL, WBT, and WBR movements |
|  | Pedestrian Accommodations | - Pedestrian crossings all have signal-controlled pedestrian phasing except for across the onelane WBR, EBR, and SBR movements, which are yieldcontrolled <br> - Can take up to three signal cycles for pedestrians to cross the TI | O Pedestrian crossings all have signalcontrolled pedestrian phasing except for across the one-lane WBR, EBR, and SBR movements, which are yield-controlled <br> O Can take up to three signal cycles for pedestrians to cross the TI |
|  | Bicyclist Accommodations | - Bicycle lanes not provided on Shea Blvd through TI; bicyclists must either use vehicle lanes or the sidewalk | O Bicycle lanes not provided on Shea Blvd through TI; bicyclists must either use vehicle lanes or the sidewalk |
|  | Access | - Two driveways do not meet current RDG standards for access spacing near interchanges | - No change anticipated in access, but one driveway is located along extended WBR lane |
| Ability to Meet Design Criteria and Standards | Roadway Geometry | - Meets current AASHTO but not RDG standards | O Meets current AASHTO standards |
|  | Structures | - No impact | O No walls or bridges impacted |
|  | Drainage/Floodplains | - No impact | O Minor impacts to portion of existing drainage system due to extension of storage for WBR lane |
|  | Earthwork | - No impact | (1) Minimal amount of earthwork required |
|  | Constructability | - No impact | Construction restriction on existing WBT and WBR lanes and affected driveway for short duration, with closures only anticipated for restriping |
| Environmental | Environmental Requirements | - No impact | O CE Re-evaluation required |
|  | Environmental Impacts | - No impact | O No fatal flaws anticipated |



### 3.4.6.2. Shea Boulevard TI - Recommendations

After reviewing the capacity improvement and cost of the extended right-turn lane alternative, the project team therefore recommends modifying the existing SPUl with an extended WB to NB right-turn lane as the Recommended Alternative for reconstruction of the Shea Boulevard TI. The order of magnitude construction cost for this option is approximately $\$ 189,000$ Additional information regarding the cost estimate is shown in Section 6.3 .


Figure 3.1 - Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard Improved Single-Point Urban Interchange

Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd
Final DCR Update
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Figure 3.3 - Raintree Drive Improved Single-Point Urban Interchange

Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd
Final DCR Update
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Figure 3.4B - Raintree Drive Tight Diamond Interchange


Figure 3.5A - Raintree Drive DRI


Figure 3.5B - Raintree Drive DRI

## 4. MAJOR DESIGN FEATURES OF THE RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE (GENERAL PURPOSE LANE WIDENING)

### 4.1. DESIGN CONTROLS

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.1, except that the design year has been updated to 2040.
4.2. SR 101L WIDENING ROADWAY CONFIGURATION

## SB SR 101L Mainline

A design concept was developed to construct one additional GPL on SR 101L from Princess Drive to SR 101//SR202L TT as is presented in the 2010 ADOT DCR, Appendix G. Preliminary plans for the auxiliary lane at Shea Boulevard Ramp B on SB SR 101 L are presented in Appendix C.

The Shea Boulevard existing SB exit ramp would be designed with a tapered exit configuration from the outside GPL. Four GPL and one HOV lane would continue to the south. Due to constraints caused by existing combination/specialty wall at the Shea Boulevard Ramp B on the outside of the ramp, the SB roadway section would be transitioned to provide a $10^{\prime}$ median shoulder, $12^{\prime}$ HOV and GPL, a $12^{\prime}$ to $1^{\prime}$ outside shoulder transition just north of Ramp B, and then returning to $10^{\prime}$ between the Shea Boulevard TI exit and entrance ramps. See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.2.
4.3. HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL ALIGNMENTS

The preliminary plan and profile sheets for the updated Shea Boulevard Ramp B is provided in Appendix C. See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.3.
4.4. ACCESS CONTROL

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.4.
4.5. RIGHT-OF-WAY

The corridor has additional right-of-way acquired as part of previous projects which would be turned back to the City of Scottsdale near Frank Lloyd Wright and Bell Road.

See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.5.
4.6. STRUCTURES
4.6.1. Introduction

Four mainline overpasses will be widened to accommodate the additional new GPLs and auxiliary lanes associated with the Build Alternative. The overpasses that would be widening include the following structures:

- Pima Road TI Overpass (Structure No. 1459 \& 2656, MP 36.59)
- Bell Road TI Overpass (Structure No. 2510 \& 2511, MP 37.06)
- CAP Canal Bridge (Structure No. 2506 \& 2507, MP 37.66)
- Frank Lloyd Wright TI Overpass (Structure No. 2505 \& 2512, MP. 37.78)

The existing underpasses shown below would not be modified as a result of the proposed improvements. There are five underpass structures with two structures founded on stub abutments with slope paving, and the other three structures founded on full-height
abutments. Retaining walls may be necessary adjacent to the abutments of the underpasses to accommodate the additional freeway lane. Although the Shea Boulevard underpass structure has full-height abutments like Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI and Cactus Road TI , they still may limit the amount of roadway widening at this location.

- Raintree Drive TI Underpass (Structure No. 2501, MP 38.59)
- Thunderbird Road Underpass (Structure No. 2504, MP 39.05)
- Sweetwater Ave. Equestrian Underpass (Structure No. 2503, MP 39.55)
- Cactus Road TI Underpass (Structure No. 2502, MP 40.09)
- Shea Boulevard TI Underpass (Structure No. 2480, MP 41.10)

See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.6.1.
4.6.2. Possible Bridge Widening Alternatives

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.6.2.
4.6.3. Design and Constructability Requirements

## Bridge Barriers

All of the SR 101L mainline bridges within the project limits would use a 38 " Single Slope Bridge Concrete Barrier at the edge of the bridge deck per ADOT Standard Detail SD 1.10. These bridges do not warrant a $42^{\prime \prime}$ Single Slope Concrete Barrier as they do not pass over another freeway.

## Concrete Strength

Normal weight precast, prestressed concrete members shall have a maximum 28 -day compressive strength ( $f$ ' c ) of 9,000 psi. Normal weight cast-in-place post-tensioned box girder bridges shall have a maximum 28 -day compressive strength ( f ci ) of $6,000 \mathrm{psi}$.

## Design Code

All of the widened bridges will be designed following ADOT Bridge Practice Guidelines and AASHTO Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) Bridge Design Specifications, 8th Edition with interims.

## Design Loads

The widened structures shall be designed with following HL-93 loading with provisions for an additional 25 pounds per square foot of deck area for a future wearing surface.

See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.6.3.
4.6.4. Evaluation of Existing Structure Widening Alternatives See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.6.4.
4.7. RETAINING WALLS, NOISE WALLS, AND BOX CULVERTS See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.7.

## Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd

4.7.1. Retaining Walls

## Shea Boulevard Ramp B Wall

The existing Shea Blvd Ramp B wall (Wall No. SH-W1) is a combination/specialty wall located along the western edge of Ramp B. This wall has extensive and unique rustication patterns and colors. During final design this wall will remain intact. Delete Shea Ramp B, Wall R17, from Table 27 in the ADOT 2010 DCR. See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.7.1 for other walls applicable to this project

### 4.7.2. Noise Walls

## Shea Boulevard Ramp B Wall

The existing Shea Blvd Ramp B wall (Wall No. SH-W1) is a combination/specialty wall located along the western edge of Ramp B. This The existing Shea Blvd Ramp B wall (Wall No. SH-W1) is a combination/specialty wall located along the western edge of Ramp B. This N 2 , from Table 28 in the ADOT 2010 DCR. See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.7.2 for other noise walls applicable to this project.
4.7.3. Box Culverts

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.7.3.
4.8. DRAINAGE

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.8.
4.9. EARTHWORK

The earthwork required for the project mainline widening and ramps would include approximately 89,006 cubic yards of excavation and 150,620 cubic yards of embankment. Applying a $15 \%$ shrink factor, the project therefore requires import of approximately 74,965 cubic yards.
4.10. TRAFFIC DESIGN
4.10.1. Signing and Pavement Marking

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.10.1.
4.10.2. Traffic Signals

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.10.2.
4.10.3. Lighting

The existing continuous freeway lighting utilizes high pressure sodium (HPS) fixtures throughout the project limits. These fixtures will be removed and replaced with 3000 K correlated color temperature (CCT) light-emitting diode (LED) fixtures. The existing median poles with dual high-mast LED fixtures will be sufficient to illuminate the widened roadway. Where existing ramp light poles conflict with the proposed alternative, new aluminum type $H$ and type $T$ poles will be installed with 3000 K CCT LED fixtures.

The lighting levels for this project are based on the American National Standard Practices for Roadway Lighting ANSI/IES RP-8-00 (2000). This publication identifies nationally recognized design criteria for roadway lighting and has been adopted by ADOT. Listed in AASHTO (1984) An Information Guide for Roadway Lighting, is the following criteria that was utilized for lighting analysis:

- Average maintained horizontal illuminance:
- Minimum illuminance:
- Average to minimum uniformity ratio:
- Light loss factor (LLF):
0.6 to 0.8 foot-candles (fc)
0.2 foot-candles

3:1 to 4:1
0.80

The existing Type-V lighting load centers
See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.10.3.
4.10.4. Freeway Management System

The existing Freeway Management System (FMS) includes an integrated system of Dynamic Message Signs (DMS), pull boxes, mainline detectors, closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras, and ramp meters placed throughout this segment of the SR 101L corridor. These FMS features are connected to the ADOT Traffic Operation Center (TOC) by fiber optic cable using $3-3^{\prime \prime}$ conduits that are located along the NB side of the SR 101L freeway. These FMS devices and pathways will be required to be relocated within the limits of the freeway widening. The existing ramp meter detection for FLW NB on-Ramp consists of in-pavement detection pucks with wireless. This detection system will be replaced with the ADOT standard sawcut detection loops communications to the ramp meter cabinet.

The current FMS Design Guidelines will require the removal, replacement, and addition of the following FMS devices and pathways along this segment of the SR 101 L corridor:

- Remove and replace existing CCTV cameras to provide full $100 \%$ coverage of SR 101L, TI crossroads, and DMS within project limits
- Remove the existing Tubular Frame DMS Structures and install new DMS Butterfly Structures at the following locations: Raintree Drive TI , Cactus Road TI, and Shea Boulevard
- Remove and replace the existing ramp meters detection at every on-ramp location with new sawcut pavement loops
- Replace existing ramp meter controllers with adaptive ramp meter controllers
- Addition of wrong-way detection at every off-ramp location with cabinet and illuminated wrong way sign
- Remove and replace existing FMS conduit pathways and trunkline fiber optic cabling along the NB side of the SR 101 L
- Remove and replace the existing Scottsdale fiber optic cabling and branch cables connected to each TO traffic signal

The existing FMS system must always remain operational during the construction of this project and will be removed once the new FMS system is tested and accepted by ADOT. A temporary ITS system should be designed to maintain the FMS backbone cable, critical networks, and communications to existing DMS, CCTV cameras, and City of Scottsdale traffic signal cabinets.
4.11. CONSTRUCTON PHASING AND TRAFFIC CONTROL

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.11.

## Smart Work Zone

A queue warning smart work zone would be beneficial during full closures where queues on mainline SR 101L may occur outside of typical times and may catch drivers unaware. Queue warning systems comprise portable, trailer-mounted radar sensors connected wirelessly to one or more changeable message boards. When traffic speeds slow, the system will illuminate the changeable message board with a message warning incoming drivers of slow traffic ahead. This system should conform to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) with Arizona Supplement, the ADOT Traffic Control Design Guidelines, and Section 710 of the ADOT Standard Specifications.

It is anticipated that this construction will be considered a significant project and that a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) will be needed. The TMP will include a temporary traffic control plan that is compliant with the 2009 MUTCD and the Arizona Supplement to the MUTCD, a traffic operations component that identifies strategies to mitigate impacts of the work zone on the operation and management of the transportation system, and a public information component that includes strategies to inform affected road users,
the general public, area residences and businesses, and appropriate public entities about the project, the expected work zone impacts, and the changing conditions of the project. The selected communications method(s) should include project characteristics, expected impacts, closure details, and commuter alternatives.
4.12. UTILITY COORDINATION

The mainline utility conflicts are summarized in the original 2010 DCR. Utility relocations and adjustments will be required to accommodate the proposed improvements. No new manholes shall be located within the PCCP areas unless approved by ADOT. See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.12.
4.13. GEOTECHNICAL AND PAVEMENT DESIGN

### 4.13.1. Modification of Bridge Structures

With respect to the widening of bridge structures, the site soils are generally considered to be well suited for the use of either shallow spread foundations or drilled shaft foundations. Spread footings should provide adequate support for widened structure elements which are currently supported on shallow foundations, and which would not be subjected to scour. Allowable bearing pressures of 3 to 6 ksf would be anticipated for shallow spread foundations supported on the finer grained surficial soils. Drilled shaft foundations would derive
significant support (both in shear and end bearing) from the very firm to hard, fine grained soils present at significant support (both in shear and end bearing) from the very firm to hard, fine grained soils present at depth.

Table 4.1 provides a listing of the structures to be widened, the existing foundation conditions and expectations for foundations required for the widened structures.
4.13.2. Retaining Wall Structures

Numerous retaining or noise barrier walls exist along the subject project alignment. The majority of walls are supported on spread footings founded within the firm to very firm alluvial soils present along the project alignment. Retaining walls, either supported by drilled shaft foundations or constructed as soil-nail walls exist at or near the Shea Boulevard TIUP.

The majority of new walls can likely be constructed as standard walls with spread footings at relatively low to moderate allowable soil bearing pressures. Variations of the actual wall types selected will likely be based more upon constructability versus soil conditions. Standard wall footings should be constructible provided the new walls are located a sufficient distance from existing walls (laterally and vertically). In areas of deep cut and/or limited right of way, such as near Shea Boulevard, other types of walls, including soil-nail and vertically. In areas of deep cut and/or limited right of way, such as near Shea Boulevard, other types of walls, incluading soili-nail and
drilled shaft (with or without tie- backs) should work based on the soil conditions and previous history of those types of walls being drilled shaft (with or without tie- backs) should work based on the soil conditions and previous history of those types of walls being
constructed in that area. Other spread-footing types, such as L-footings may be used in areas where excavations behind the walls need constructed in that area. Other spread-footing types, such as L-footings may be used in areas where excavations behind the walls need
to be limited, but that otherwise favorable soil support conditions exist. The use of drilled shafts may be preferred in some locations depending on proximity to existing structures and in isolated areas as dictated by poor subgrade conditions. Other special design walls, such as $L$-shaped footing walls, may be needed due to the proximity of new walls to existing structures.

Table 4.1 - Summary of Existing and Preliminary Recommended Foundation Types for Widened SR 101L Bridges

| Bridge | Existing <br> Foundations | Recommended <br> Foundation for <br> Widening | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pima Road | Abutments on <br> Drilled Shafts, <br> Piers on Spread <br> Footings | Abutments on <br> Drilled Shafts, <br> Piers on Spread <br> Footings | Shafts and Footings to be <br> founded in firm to hard soils <br> below 10' |
| Bell Road OP | Abutments on <br> Drilled Shafts, <br> Pies on Spread <br> Footings | Abutments on <br> Dirled Shafts, <br> Piers on Spread <br> Footings | Shafts and Footing to be <br> founded in firm to hard soils <br> below 10' |
| CAP Canal Bridge | Abutments and <br> Piers On Drilled <br> Shafts | Abutments and <br> Piers on Drilled <br> Shafts | Shafts to be founded in firm to to <br> hard soils below 5' to 10' at <br> abutments, below 10' to 30' at <br> the piers |
| Frank Lloyd Wright <br> Boulevard TI OP | Abutments on <br> Spread Footings | Abutments on <br> Drilled Shafts | Shafts to be founded in firm to <br> hard soils below 12' |

From a preliminary basis and with concurrence from ADOT Roadway, it is recommended that the widening of the SR 101L mainline pavements match the adjacent existing HOV structural pavement section for mainline and existing ramp \& gore sections. ADOT is d Pating the PCCP pavement surface and is anticipated on this project in lieu of AR-ACFC. Table 4.2 provides the recommended pavement structural sections.

Table 4.2 - Preliminary Recommended Pavement Structural Sections by Location

| Location | AB <br> (Class 2) <br> (inches) | ACB <br> (inches) | Plain <br> PCCP <br> (inches) | TOTAL <br> (inches) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mainline SR 101L <br> (Elevated) | 4 | - | $12.0^{*}$ | $16.0^{*}$ |
| Mainline SR 101L <br> (Depressed) | - | 4 | $12.0^{*}$ | $16.0^{*}$ |
| Ramps | 4 | - | $100^{*}$ | $14.0^{*}$ |
| Gores | 4 | - | 10.0 | 14.0 |
| *PCCP will be diamond grinded |  |  |  |  |

*PCCP will be diamond grinded
4.14. SCOTTSDALE AIRPORT COORDINATION

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.14.
4.15. FUTURE HOV CONNECTOR RAMPS

This section does not apply to this project.
4.16. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE

New landscape, irrigation components, landform graphics, and aesthetic treatments will be required to restore the landscape area after roadway construction and to create a context-sensitive, integrated, and cohesive visual experience through the corridor. The goal for landscape and aesthetics is to preserve and restore to the original design intent, adapt to meet the new available spaces, and maintain the level of quality and density as documented in the original design for all landscape areas.

## Pima Freeway（SR 101L）：Princess Dr to Shea Blvd

## Planting Materials

Within the project limits，all salvageable Saguaro，Barrel Cacti，Ocotillos，and specimen native tree species with a caliper of 4 inches or greater，measured 6 inches above existing ground，that will be impacted by construction activities shall be identified，salvaged，and incorporated back into the final planting design．During the final design stage，the Consultant may coordinate with the ADOT Project Manager，in cooperation with ADOT Roadside Development，on the salvageability of existing trees．Should ADOT determine that salvageability of existing trees is not required，minimum 15 －gallon nursery grown trees shall be proposed．
he overall plant palette developed for this project shall be comprised of plant species that match the types，size，and quality of the plant materials included in the original project record drawings．Trees shall be used in mass plantings and groups，where possible，to provide vertical structure and relief，vegetative texture and accent，and seasonal interest，while breaking up the monotony of the horizontal plane．Tree plantings（deciduous and evergreen）shall be used to focus desirable views while screening undesirable ones．Shrubs （deciduous and evergreen）shall be planted in masses of like variety and shall be used to provide a year－round layer of texture and color at shall serve to articulate the ground plane and provide intermediate vertical relief．Flowering shrubs and accent plantings shall be解 available，mass plantings of shrubs／accents shall be provided．

## Topsoil

The top 2 feet，at a minimum，of existing topsoil shall be removed from the landscape areas and stockpiled for future reuse within the project limits．The existing topsoil will need to be tested and amended，as required，to comply with Section $806-2.05$ of the ADOT standard Specifications．Should an alternative material，such as asphalt millings，be used as part of the embankment material，topsoil plating shall be installed to a depth of 4 feet to provide enough appropriate medium for plant growth．

## Decomposed Granite and Granite Mulch

All landscape areas shall be plated with inert materials（decomposed granite，granite mulch，and rock mulch）．Granite mulch shall be paced in ADOT－maintained portions of the project；decomposed granite shall be placed in the portions maintained by the City of Scottsdale．All inert material type shall be new and from a single source to ensure uniformity of color．Within ADOT maintained landscape areas，the acceptable selection of granite mulch shall be Cheyenne， $1-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ minus，from Pioneer Landscape Materials，as established in the Certification Letter for single source granite mulch（Appendix H）．Within the City of Scottsdale maintained areas along the cross streets，the acceptable colors for consideration shall be Coral．Where existing granite mulch and decomposed granite is not disturbed by construction activities，these areas shall be top dressed with new granite mulch and decomposed granite to a minimum depth of one inch for consistency of material within the landscape areas．Top dressed and newly plated granite mulch and decomposed granite areas shall be blended together to create a uniform appearance．

## Maintaining Existing Landscape and Irrigation During Construction

Continuous maintenance of existing landscape plantings and existing landscape irrigation systems will be required during both the construction Phase and the Landscape Establishment Phase of the project．Areas to be maintained shall extend from the project beginning limits to the project end limits，from right－of－way to right－of－way．Landscape shall be routinely maintained on a monthly or bi－ monthly basis，maintained to preconstruction conditions．The care for all existing planting stock shall be in accordance with acceptable horticultural practices；replacing any dead or damaged plant material；keeping areas free of weeds，grasses，and construction related debris；repairing erosion issues；applying all irrigation water；repairing public or weather related damage；furnishing and applying sprays， dust，and／or cages to combat vandalism，disease，insects and other pests；and the testing，adjusting，repairing，and operating of irrigation systems．

The control of weeds shall be accomplished either with herbicides or by manual methods．The types of herbicide to be used and the methods of application shall conform to Environmental Protection Agency（EPA）requirements and labeling instructions．

## Landform Graphics

New landform graphics will be required to replace the existing landform graphics located on the west side of SR 101L，between Shea Boulevard and Cactus Road．Existing landform graphics shall be documented for size，location，dimensions，configuration，position， material type，and colors．New landform graphics shall match the original replacement in material types，color，form，shape，and configuration，but may be proportionally adjusted in size，location，and dimensions on the slope to work within the available area and to maximize the sear apeare after roadway construction．Some adjustments in orientation and shape may be required to fit with the available space．

## Aesthetics

Rustication is considered an aesthetics treatment．Rustication is defined as any change in the pattern or texture of a built structure as compared with a standard smooth finish．All new structures within the project limits shall receive rustication as an aesthetics treatment Existing rustication shall be documented for dimension，shape，orientation，texture，depth，and color．New rustication treatments shal match the original treatment in material，color，form，shape，and configuration，but may be proportionally adjusted in size，location，and dimension to work within the available canvas area of the new structure to maximize the visual appearance after construction．

Rustication patterns shall be constructed in a manner so that no joints or seams are visible within the pattern at any locations other than the required construction joints as provided in the final construction details．The rustication patterns shall be constructed through the use of full－size form liners（as well as any mockups）and shall be constructed using a type of construction that matches the origina project．The final rustication pattern shall be uniform，smooth，free of any secondary vertical and horizontal seams，and shall be one unit from top of wall to bottom of wall for the full length of one full－size panel（approximately $28-\mathrm{ft}-30-\mathrm{ft})$ ．No $8-\mathrm{ft} \times 10-\mathrm{ft}$ ， $4-\mathrm{ft} \times 8-\mathrm{ft}$ ，etc．o similarly sized non－full wall height form liner panels will be acceptable．Masking with paint or other filler material will not be acceptable

Paint colors shall match the control set as provided by ADOT Roadside Development．This is an updated control set from the origina project，based on color selections from the SR 101L，Shea Blvd－SR 202L，Red Mountain project（Project No． 101 MA H6874 01C）．Pain color brand may be Sherwin Williams，Dunn Edwards，PPG，or approved equal，so long as the paint colors demonstrate equivalent color effects with the control set．

## Irrigation

Landscape areas shall be irrigated by means of an automatic non－pressure compensating drip emitter system for ADOT landscaping．The irrigation design shall distribute water to all existing protected in place plants，salvaged and replanted plants，and new nursery stock plants installed throughout the Project Limits．

Irrigation system components shall be replaced，upgraded，or repaired at each of the existing irrigation points of connection，at multiple locations as shown in Appendix G

## Maintenance Responsibilities

The City of Scottsdale shall maintain all landscape，equestrian trail，and aesthetic features，as identified and in accordance with the current IGA／JPA 00－207．Any improvements and additions to the freeway aesthetics requested by the City of Scottsdale shall be paid for by the City of Scottsdale at the time of construction．Maintenance of aesthetic improvements and additions requested by the City of Scottsdale shall be maintained by the City of Scottsdale．

## 5. MAJOR DESIGN FEATURES OF THE RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVES (TRAFFIC INTERCHANGES)

The design alternative presented in Section 5 and Appendix H of the ADOT 2010 DCR is no longer being considered for this project. The section is modified in its entirety for the preferred TI alternatives outlined within this DCR Update.
5.1. MAJOR DESIGN FEATURES OF THE PRINCESS DRIVE RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE
5.1.1. Design Controls

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.1, except that the design year has been updated to 2040 .
5.1.2. Roadway Configuration

Improvements at the Princess Drive TDl include triple left-turn lanes extended approximately $500^{\prime}$ feet to the east along Princess Drive to add additional storage/capacity. This alternative will require the existing center median island to be reduced on the east side of $\operatorname{SR}$ 101L and widened on the west side of SR 101L as presented in Appendix C. The existing roadway width already accounts for this third lane and is currently not in use. With this configuration the median west of the TI requires minor modification, and the median east is reconstructed to add additional storage for all three left turn lanes and restriping as required to tie to existing conditions.
5.1.3. Horizontal and Vertical Alignments

The Princess Drive horizontal and vertical alignments and approach lanes would be retained in their current diamond configuration.
5.1.4. Access Control

Commercial development surrounds the Princess Drive TI. Full access control is provided east of SR 101L and west of the Princess Drive SB entrance ramp. Driveways are located $520^{\prime}$ west of Princess Drive SB exit ramp, which does not meet current access control guidelines. Existing access control will be maintained in accordance with ADOT and FHWA Access Control Policy requirements along Princess Drive.
5.1.5. Right -Of-Way

No new right-of-way is anticipated with the implementation of this alternative
5.1.6. Structures

The widening of the Princess Drive TI Overpass does not impact this TI alternative. No additional structures are anticipated with this alternative.
5.1.7. Retaining Walls, Noise Walls, and Box Culverts

No additional walls, noise walls, or box culverts are anticipated to be impacted with this alternative.
5.1.8. Drainage

No drainage facilities are impacted by this alternative.

### 5.1.9. Traffic Design

5.1.9.1. $\quad$ Signing and Pavement Marking

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.10.1
5.1.9.2. Traffic Signals

Traffic signal heads may require modification of location or additional heads added for the triple left-turn lanes and shifted through lanes. This may be needed on both sides of SR 101L.

### 5.1.9.3. Lighting

No changes to the existing lighting layout are anticipated with the proposed changes.

### 5.1.10. Utility Coordination

The extension of the WB left turn bay may require median reconstruction under the adjacent SRP overhead power lines from Station $23+00$ to Station $26+00$. During final design the plans should be submitted to SRP to verify overhead clearances are maintained and a Consent To Use Agreement issued prior to construction.

At Station $30+66.62$, there is a City of Scottsdale sewer manhole within the existing median on the right. The proposed improvements will reduce the median width at this location and result in the manhole being located at the stripe line. The manhole rim and lid will need to be lowered to grade.
5.2. MAJOR DESIGN FEATURES OF THE FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD TI RECOMMENDED alternative
5.2.1. Design Controls

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.1
5.2.2. Roadway Configuration

The existing TI at Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard would be reconstructed to a TDI while meeting current AASHTO and Roadway Design Guidelines and standards.
5.2.3. Horizontal and Vertical Alignments

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard horizontal and vertical alignments would be retained in their current configuration. Existing pavement will be used, and new pavement added to achieve the SPUI to TDI conversion. The left-turn lane extended storage and the tie-ins to the existing condition would require reconstruction and right-of-way near neighboring development as depicted on Figure 3.2 A and B .

Preliminary plans are provided in Appendix C for the recommended alternative which include the horizontal geometry for the existing Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard and interchange ramps.
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5.2.4. Access Control

Commercial development surrounds the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI. Driveways are located $185^{\prime}$ west and $280^{\prime}$ east of SR 101L, which does not meet current access control guidelines. Existing access control will be maintained in accordance with ADOT and FHWA Access Control Policy requirements along Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard
5.2.5. Right-of-Way

The locations and areas of anticipated right-of-way and TCE acquisition are shown in Table 5.1
Table 5.1 - Anticipated Frank Lloyd Wright TI R/W and TCEs

| Parcel | Ownership | Parcel Total <br> Area (Ac) | Acquisition <br> Area (Ac) | TCE Area (Ac) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $215-51-001 R$ | Vans Golf Properties LLC | 1.18 | 0.080 | 0.000 |
| $215-51-022$ | FLW and Pima Plaza LLC | 3.10 | 0.290 | 0.097 |
| $217-13-037 \mathrm{H}$ | FLW 101 LLC | 4.26 | 0.071 | 0.157 |

### 5.2.6. Structures

The widening of the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI Overpass (Structure No's. 2505 and 2512) will not conflict with the TDI as shown on Figure 3.1
5.2.7. Retaining Walls, Noise Walls, and Box Culverts

To reduce the impacts to neighboring development, the NB off-ramp is shifted to the west near the existing retaining wall. An additional To reduce the impacts to neighboring development, the NB off-ramp is shifted to the west near the existing retaining wall. An additional walls, or box culverts would be anticipated with this alternative.

### 5.2.8. Drainage

### 5.2.8.1. Off-Site Systems

This alternative does not include any off-site drainage analysis or modifications to existing drainage patterns.

### 5.2.8.2. On-Site System

Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard will retain the existing longitudinal slope and cross slope. The reconfiguration would have major Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard will retain the existing longitudinal slope and cross slope. The reconfiguration would have major
impacts to existing drainage systems due to the conversion to a TDI. Catch basins within the median islands would need to be relocated or removed. Impacts to storm drain are also along the north side of the roadway as the roadway would be widened. Reconnection of these storm drain systems is required.

### 5.2.9. Traffic Design

### 5.2.9.1. $\quad$ Signing and Pavement Marking

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.10.1

### 5.2.9.2. Traffic Signals

Widening of the bridge on SR 101L over Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard and the realignment of the off-ramps and porkchop islands would necessitate new traffic signal poles for the NB and SB off-ramps along with new signal heads mounted on the bridge fascia. The existing controller and meter pedestal can be reused with new conduit, pull boxes, and conductors.

### 5.2.9.3. Lighting

Existing jurisdictional lighting would be relocated for the arterial conversion to a TDI.
5.2.10. Construction Phasing and Traffic Control

Construction of the bridge widening on SR 101L at Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard will impact the traffic signal heads mounted to the existing bridge fascia. Temporary traffic signals will be necessary for the east and west cross street approaches, along with the NB and SB SR 101L off-ramp approaches. Temporary signal poles can be placed in the portion of the porkchop medians that separate the through and left-turn movements at the frontage road intersections with Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard.

It is anticipated that this construction will be considered a significant project and that a TMP will need to be developed. The TMP will include a temporary traffic control plan that is compliant with the 2009 MUTCD and the Arizona Supplement to the MUTCD, a traffic operations component that identifies strategies to mitigate impacts of the work zone on the operation and management of the transportation system, and a public information component that includes strategies to inform affected road users, the general public, area residences and businesses, and appropriate public entities about the project, the expected work zone impacts, and the changin details, and commuter alternatives. See also ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.11.
5.2.11. Utility coordination

The proposed Tight Diamond TI improvements at Frank Lloyd Wright will require utility relocations and adjustments as described in the table below.

Table 5.2 - Anticipated Frank Lloyd Wright Utility Conflicts

| Owner | Description | Quadrant/Location | Sta/Offset | Conflict/Mitigation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADOT | Storm Drain Manhole | NW in existing median porkchop | $\begin{aligned} & 21+19.58 / \\ & 75.97 \text { ' } \mathrm{Rt} \end{aligned}$ | In conflict with future sidewalk. <br> Adjust to grade. |
| City of Scottdale | Water Manhole and air release pipe. | NW Behind Sidewalk | $\begin{aligned} & 23+04.65 / \\ & 67.48^{\prime} \mathrm{Rt} \end{aligned}$ | In conflict with future curb and gutter. Relocate. |
| City of Scottsdale | Fire Hydrant | NW - Behind Curb Ramp | $\begin{aligned} & 22+42.33 / \\ & 93.00^{\prime} \mathrm{Rt} \end{aligned}$ | In conflict with future curb ramp. Relocate. |
| APS \& CenturyLink | APS <br> Transformer \& CenturyLink | NW - Near Van's Golf Shops | $\begin{aligned} & 27+50.00 / \\ & 75.00^{\prime} \mathrm{Rt} \end{aligned}$ | In conflict with future sidewalk. Relocate. |
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| Owner | Description | Quadrant/Location | Sta/Offset | Conflict/Mitigation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Scottsdale | Sewer Manhole | NW - Behind curb ramp at FLW/Hayden NE Corner | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 28+08.21 / \\ & 97.74^{\prime} \mathrm{Rt} ; \\ & 28+37.97 / \\ & 85.03^{\prime} \mathrm{Rt} \end{aligned}$ | In conflict with future pavement. <br> Adjust to grade. |
| City of Scottsdale | Water Valve \& Fire Hydrant | NW - In sidewalk ramp. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22+35.31/ } \\ & 89.59 ' \mathrm{Rt} \end{aligned}$ | In conflict with future pavement. <br> Adjust to grade/relocate. |
| City of Scottsdale | Water Valves | NW - East of DW No. 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 24+82.28 / \\ & 78.08 \text { ' } \mathrm{Rt} \end{aligned}$ | In conflict with future pavement. |
| City of Scottsdale | Water Valves | SE - In sidewalk | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 16+06.77 \\ & 59.15 \text { ' Lt; } \\ & 16+07.00 \\ & 52.54^{\prime} \mathrm{Lt} \end{aligned}$ | In conflict with future sidewalk. <br> Adjust to grade. |
| City of Scottsdale | Water Vault | SE - In sidewalk | $\begin{aligned} & 16+26.95 / \\ & 55.87 \text { ' Lt; } \\ & 16+31.88 / \\ & 56.96 \prime \mathrm{Lt} \end{aligned}$ | In conflict with future sidewalk. <br> Adjust to grade. |
| APS | Electrical Manhole | SE <br> In sidewalk | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 16+93.81 / \\ & 58.36 \text { Lt } \end{aligned}$ | In conflict with future sidewalk. <br> Adjust to grade. |
| City of Scottsdale/ APS/Zayo | Various cabinets /pedestals/boxes | SE <br> Behind sidewalk ramp | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 17+50.00 / \\ & 80^{\prime} \mathrm{Lt} \end{aligned}$ | Conflict with future sidewalk and grading. |
| City of Scottsdale | Sewer Manhole | NE <br> West of DW No. 2 behind sidewalk | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 10+84.43 / \\ & 60.67 \prime \mathrm{Rt} \end{aligned}$ | Conflict with sidewalk removal/grading. <br> Adjust to grade. |
| City of Scottsdale | Backflow Preventors | NE <br> Adjacent to overhead sign pole. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 16+02.12 \\ & 100.49 \\ & \mathrm{Rt} \end{aligned}$ | Conflict with future sidewalk and grading. <br> Relocate/Adjust to grade. |
| Southwest Gas | Valves | NE <br> Adjacent to driveways. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 11+92.89 / \\ & 44.59^{\prime} \mathrm{Rt} ; \\ & 11+92.87 / \\ & 52.94^{\prime} \mathrm{Rt} \end{aligned}$ | In conflict with future pavement. |
| City of Scottsdale | Water Manhole | Located at existing bridge abutment | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20+77.66/ } \\ & 98.98 ' \mathrm{Lt} \end{aligned}$ | Potential conflict with future bridge widening. |

5.2.12. Scottsdale Airport Coordination

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.14
5.3. MAJOR DESIGN FEATURES OF THE RAINTREE DRIVE TI RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE
5.3.1. Design Controls

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.1
5.3.2. Roadway Configuration

The updated capacity analysis within Section 2 of this report confirmed minor improvements are required in to increase the capacity at the Raintree Drive SPUI.

The alternative recommends the addition of three right-turn lanes:
SB to WB on the SB exit ramp
NB to EB on the NB exit ramp

- WB to NB on Raintree Drive

These are shown on the preliminary plans in Appendix C.
5.3.3. Horizontal and Vertical Alignments

The Raintree Drive horizontal and vertical alignments would be retained in their current configuration. Preliminary plans are provided in Appendix C for the recommended alternative, which includes the horizontal geometry for the existing Raintree Drive and interchange ramps.
5.3.4. Access Control

Commercial development surrounds the Raintree Drive TI. The full access control requirement is provided east of the Raintree Drive NB entrance ramp. Driveways are located 475' east of Raintree Drive NB exit ramp and 200' west of SR 101L, which does not meet current access control guidelines. Existing access control will be maintained in accordance with ADOT and FHWA Access Control Policy requirements along Raintree Drive.
5.3.5. Right-of-Way

The addition of a right turn lane would require new TCE. The locations and area of the anticipated TCE acquisition is shown in Table 5.2
Table 5.3 - Raintree Drive TI Anticipated TCEs

| Parcel | Ownership | Parcel Total <br> Area (Ac) | Acquisition Area <br> (Ac) | TCE Area (Ac) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $215-53-039 C$ | Bank of America NA | 1.54 | 0.000 | 0.026 |

5.3.6. Structures

The widening of the Freeway and improvements along Raintree Drive will not impact the existing Raintree Drive TI Underpass structure. No additional structures are anticipated with this alternative.
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5.3.7. Retaining Walls, Noise Walls, and Box Culverts

No additional walls, noise walls, or box culverts would be anticipated with this alternative.

### 5.3.8. Drainage

### 5.3.8.1. Off-Site Systems

This alternative does not include any off-site drainage analysis or modifications to existing drainage patterns.

### 5.3.8.2. On-Site Systems

Raintree Drive will retain the existing longitudinal slope and cross slope. The addition of the right-turn lanes impacts catch basins within the median islands that would require relocation. Catch basins within the right-turn lane widening will also be reconfigured and reconnection of these storm drain systems is required.

### 5.3.9. Traffic Design

### 5.3.9.1. Traffic Signals

The improvements at Raintree Drive will require that the pedestrian signal in the southeast corner of the NB off-ramp be relocated. Work in this area will need to be performed to avoid impacting the traffic signal controller or meter pedestal.

### 5.3.9.2. Lighting

Existing jurisdictional lighting will be relocated for the arterial widening on the preferred TI alternatives.
5.3.10. Construction Phasing and Traffic Control

Traffic will be managed by detailed traffic control plans and by procedures and guidelines specified in Part VI of the current version of the MUTCD and by the Arizona Supplement to the MUTCD.

Construction of the ramp modifications at Raintree Drive can be accomplished utilizing single-lane closures with the exception of the widening of the channelized right-turn for WB traffic entering the NB on-ramp. This channelized right will need to be closed during construction. Temporary concrete barrier will be placed along the saw-cut lines on the ramps and traffic will utilize the existing striping where feasible. Some modification to pavement marking symbols and overhead lane use signing will be required while ramp lanes are closed.

It is anticipated that this construction will be considered a significant project and that a TMP will need to be developed. The TMP will include a temporary traffic control plan that is compliant with the 2009 MUTCD and the Arizon Supplement to the MUTCD, a traffic include a temporary traffic control plan that is compliant with the 2009 MUTCD and the Arizona Supplement to the MUTCD, a traffic
operations component that identifies strategies to mitigate impacts of the work zone on the operation and management of the operations component that identifies strategies to mitigate impacts of the work zone on the operation and management of the
transportation system, and a public information component that includes strategies to inform affected road users, the general public, transportation system, and a public information component that includes strategies to inform affected road users, the general public,
area residences and businesses, and appropriate public entities about the project, the expected work zone impacts, and the changing conditions of the project. The selected communications method(s) should include project characteristics, expected impacts, closure details, and commuter alternatives.
5.3.11. Utility Coordination

At the northwest quadrant, the modifications to the SB exit ramp will result in two sewer lines, owned by City of Scottsdale, to be under the ramp concrete pavement for approximately 300 -feet approaching the intersection. These sewer lines are already under the
intersection concrete pavement. Survey of the existing sewer inverts and storm drain profiles will be needed during final design to determine if there are any conflicts with storm drain extensions and the existing sewer lines.

Century Link has an existing duct that run parallel in close proximity to the new curb line for the ramp. Utility designation to a quality level B and potholes will be required during final design to determine conflicts.

At the northeast quadrant, for the westbound right turn lane onto the NB SR 101L, the existing APS underground conduit may have to be relocated during construction. Utility designation to a quality level B and potholes will be required during final design to confirm conflicts.

There are existing communication lines along the existing curb return on the southeast quadrant of the intersection. These lines will need to be potholed during final design to determine if the construction of the widening will impact the lines.
Utility adjustments for the Raintree Modified SPUI are summarized in the table below:
Table 5.4 - Anticipated Raintree Drive Utility Conflicts

| Owner | Description | Quadrant/Location | Sta/Offset | Conflict/Mitigation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| City of Scottdale | Sewer Manhole | NW - West side of SR <br> 101 SB offramp | $134+61.37 /$ <br> $34.02^{\prime}$ Rt | In conflict with proposed right <br> turn lane. Adjust to grade. |
| City of <br> Scottsdale/APS | Various <br> Cabinets/Pedestals/ <br> Boxes | SE - Behind sidewalk <br> ramp | $17+50 /$ <br> $65.00^{\prime}$ Lt | In conflict with proposed <br> sidewalk and grading. <br> Relocate. |

5.4. MAJOR DESIGN FEATURES OF THE SHEA BOULEVARD TI RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE
5.4.1. Design Controls

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.1
5.4.2. SR 101L Widening Roadway Configuration

The updated capacity analysis within Section 2 of this report confirmed minor improvements are required in to increase the capacity at the existing Shea Boulevard SPUI.

The alternative recommends the addition a right-turn lane for WB to NB traffic that heads north on SR 101L.
5.4.3. Horizontal and Vertical Alignments

The Shea Boulevard horizontal and vertical alignments would be retained in their current configuration. Preliminary plans are provided in Appendix C for the recommended alternative which includes the horizontal geometry for the existing Shea Boulevard and interchange ramps.
5.4.4. Access Control

Commercial development surrounds the Shea Boulevard TI. The full access control requirement is provided west of the Shea Boulevard SB entrance ramp. Driveways are located $300^{\prime}$ west of Shea Boulevard SB exit ramp and $130^{\prime}$ east of SR 101 , which does not meet
current access control guidelines. Existing access control will be maintained in accordance with ADOT and FHWA Access Control Policy requirements along Shea Boulevard.
5.4.5. Right-of-Way

The right-turn lane extended storage would require new TCEs. The locations and areas of anticipated right-of-way and TCE acquisition are shown in Table 5.3

Table 5.5 - Shea Boulevard Anticipated TCEs

| Parcel | Ownership | Parcel Total Area <br> (Ac) | Acquisition <br> Area (Ac) | TCE Area (Ac) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $217-25-989 \mathrm{D}$ | Wildwood Mobile Villa INC | 1.20 | 0.000 | 0.013 |
| $217-25-989 \mathrm{E}$ | BRE LQ Properties LLC | 3.38 | 0.000 | 0.018 |

5.4.6. Structures

No additional structures are anticipated with this alternative.
5.4.7. Retaining Walls, Noise Walls, and Box Culverts

No additional walls, noise walls, or box culverts would be anticipated with this alternative.
5.4.8. Drainage

No drainage facilities are impacted by this alternative.

### 5.4.9. Traffic Design

### 5.4.9.1. $\quad$ Signing and Pavement Marking

See ADOT 2010 DCR Section 4.10.1
5.4.9.2. Traffic Signals

The improvements at Shea Boulevard would not require changes to the existing traffic signal, signal controller, or meter pedestal.

### 5.4.9.3. Lighting

The preferred alternative would require existing jurisdictional lighting to be relocated for the arterial right-turn lane extension. 5.4.10. Construction Phasing and Traffic Control

Traffic will be managed by detailed traffic control plans and by procedures and guidelines specified in Part VI of the current version of MUTCD and by the Arizona Supplement to the MUTCD.

Construction of the ramp modifications at Shea Boulevard can be accomplished utilizing single-lane closures with the exception of the widening of the channelized right turn for WB traffic entering the NB on-ramp. This channelized right will need to be closed during construction. Temporary concrete barrier will be placed along the saw-cut lines on the ramps and traffic will utilize the existing striping
wher
close
5.4.11. Utility Coordination

There are existing underground fiber and communications utilities that run parallel to the right turn lane and a cox Communication fiber line that crosses perpendicular to the turn lane. No conflicts are anticipated, but utility designation to a quality level B and potholes will be required during final design to confirm.

Water valves, manholes and communication pedestals will have to be adjusted to grade to accommodate the roadway widening and realigned sidewalk.

Utility adjustments for Shea Boulevard are summarized in the table below:
Table 5.6 - Anticipated Shea Boulevard Utility Conflicts

| Owner | Description | Quadrant/Location | Sta/Offset | Conflict/Mitigation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CenturyLink | Communications <br> pedestal | West of DW No. 1 <br> behind sidewalk | $16+12.15 / 58.44^{\prime}$ <br> Rt | Future pavement. Relocate. |
| CenturyLink | Communications <br> pedestal | West of DWW No. 1 <br> behind sidewalk | $15+82.27 / 57.97^{\prime}$ <br> Rt | Pedestal appears to be damaged. In <br> conflict w/future pavement. <br> Relocate. |
| AT\&T | Communication <br> Manhole | In sidewalk | $12+69.17 / 52.00^{\prime}$ <br> Rt | In conflict w/future pavement. and <br> future right turn bay pavement (at <br> taper). Adjust to grade. |
| City of <br> Scottsdale | Water Valve | West of DW No. 2 <br> behind sidewalk | $11+95.21 / 63.02^{\prime}$ <br> Rt | Re-align new sidewalk to avoid valve <br> in sidewalk. Adjust to grade. |

## 6. ITEMIZED ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE COSTS

6.1. Cost Estimate of Recommended Alternative

The total estimated cost for the Recommended Alternative is $\$ 121,435,000$ which includes $\$ 114,285,000$ for construction, $\$ 650,000$ for right-of-way acquisitions, and $\$ 6,500,000$ for design as shown in Table 6.1. The current programmed amount for SR 101L construction from Princess to Shea Boulevard is $\$ 88,179,293$, which is $\$ 81,154,243$ for construction, $\$ 525,050$ for right-of-way acquisitions and utility relocations, and $\$ 6,500,000$ for design

The estimated unit costs are based on the unit prices obtained from recent ADOT bid results.
The following is a list of assumptions that are reflected in the cost estimates for the Recommended Alternative:

1. Costs for landscaping includes the restoration of disturbed areas as well as the cost to maintain existing landscape features.
2. FMS, lighting, and drainage improvements are included in the cost estimates.
3. Pavement structural sections were assumed based on similar projects and will require evaluation during final design process.
4. The earthwork factor applied to the project excavation is estimated to be $15 \%$ shrink. No additional earthwork quantities were included in anticipation of hazardous materials or unsuitable material sites.
5. Environmental mitigation costs are not included in this cost estimate.

Table 6.1 - Order of Magnitude Construction Cost Estimate

| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020021 | REMOVAL OF CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER | L.FT. | 74,437 | \$5.00 | \$372,185 |
| 2020027 | removal of concrete barrier | L.fT. | 13,101 | \$20.00 | \$262,020 |
| 2020029 | removal of ASPhaltic concrete pavement | sa.vo. | 187 | \$5.00 | \$935 |
| 2020031 | removal of portland cement concrete pavement | sa.y. | 62,031 | \$25.00 | \$1,550,775 |
| 2020033 | Remove (STRUCTURAL Concrete) | sQ.YD. | 35,445 | \$40.00 | \$1,417,800 |
| 2020041 | removal of pipe | L.FT. | 8,464 | \$30.00 | \$253,920 |
| 2020047 | Removal of Signs | EACH | 2 | \$250.00 | \$500 |
| 2020053 | Remove (CATCH BASINS) | EACH | 165 | \$1,000.00 | \$165,000 |
| 2020054 | remove (manholes) | EACH | 28 | \$2,500.00 | \$70,000 |
| 2020071 | remove guard rail | L.FT. | 439 | \$6.00 | \$2,634 |
| 2020081 | Remove bituminous pavement (miluing (1") | sa.vo. | 392,866 | \$2.00 | \$785,732 |
| 2020115 | Remove (sign bridges) | EACH | 5 | \$10,000.00 | \$50,000 |
| 2020116 | REMOVE (SCUPPER) | EACH | 5 | \$1,000.00 | \$5,000 |
| 2020155 | Remove (PULL BoX) | EACH | 50 | \$300.00 | \$15,000 |
| 2020162 | REmOVE (CONCRETE) | sQ.yD. | 5,539 | \$4.00 | \$22,156 |
| 2020173 | remove (ATtenuators) | EACH | 2 | \$1,500.00 | \$3,000 |
| 2020175 | removal of light poles and bases | EACH | 50 | \$900.00 | \$45,000 |
| 2030301 | roadway excavation | cu.y. | 89,006 | \$10.00 | \$890,060 |
| 2030900 | Borrow (IN PLACE) | cu.y. | 77,720 | \$12.00 | \$932,640 |
| 3030022 | AGGregate base, Class 2 | cu.y. | 89 | \$50.00 | \$4,450 |
| 4010016 | Portland cement concrete pavement (13" PCCP over 4" AB) | sa.y. | 17,367 | \$66.00 | \$1,146,222 |
| 4010019 | Portland cement concrete pavement (13" PCCP over 4" AC) | sa.vo. | 55,106 | \$81.00 | \$4,463,586 |
| 4010020 | portland cement concrete pavement (11" PCCP over 4" Ab) | sa.y. | 42,940 | \$60.00 | \$2,576,400 |
| 4060009 | asphaltic concrete (miscellaneous Paving) | Ton | 26 | \$500.00 | \$13,000 |
| 5012524 | storm drain Pipe, 24 " | L.fT. | 9,358 | \$100.00 | \$935,800 |
| 5012530 | Storm drain Plipe, 30" | L.fT. | 16 | \$150.00 | \$2,400 |
| 5012536 | Storm drain PIPE, 36" | L.fT. | 239 | \$155.00 | \$37,045 |
| 5012548 | Storm drain PIPE, 48" | L.fT. | 99 | \$185.00 | \$18,315 |
| 5012554 | Storm drain PIPE, 54" | L.FT. | 160 | \$200.00 | \$32,000 |


| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5012566 | STORM DRAIN PIPE, 66" | L.FT. | 175 | \$350.00 | \$61,250 |
| 5012572 | Storm drain PIPE, 72" | L.FT. | 336 | \$550.00 | \$184,800 |
| 5030142 | CONCRETE CATCH BASIN (MEDIAN) ( $\mathrm{C}-15.80$ ) | EACH | 7 | \$5,000.00 | \$35,000 |
| 5030604 | CONCRETE CATCH BASIN (C-15.91) | EACH | 126 | \$5,000.00 | \$630,000 |
| 5030605 | CONCRETE CATCH BASIN (C-15.92) | EACH | 18 | \$6,000.00 | \$108,000 |
| 5030606 | Concrete catch basin (DEtall) | EACH | 36 | \$6,000.00 | \$216,000 |
| 5050013 | Manhole (C 18.10) (NEW) | EACH | 6 | \$6,000.00 | \$36,000 |
| 6060073 | bridge sign structure (tapered tube, single beam) | EACH | 2 | \$45,000.00 | \$90,000 |
| 6060074 | Foundation for bridge sign structure (tapered tube) | EACH | 6 | \$6,000.00 | \$36,000 |
| 6060079 | FOUNDATION FOR BRIDGE SIGN STRUCTURE (SD9.20, TYPE 4F) | EACH | 4 | \$14,000.00 | \$56,000 |
| 6060133 | CANTLEVER SIGN STRUCTURE (SD9.10, TYPE 3C) | EACH | 22 | \$45,000.00 | \$990,000 |
| 6060151 | SIGN STRUCTURE (DMS BUTTERFLY Structure) | EACH | 3 | \$60,000.00 | \$180,000 |
| 6060152 | SIGN STRUCTURE (FOUNDATION FOR DMS BUTTERFLY STRUCTURE) | EACH | 3 | \$12,000.00 | \$36,000 |
| 6060256 | Foundation for cantilever sign structure (Sd9.10, type 3c) | EACH | 22 | \$12,000.00 | \$264,000 |
| 6070002 | BREAKAWAY SIGN POST S4X7.7 | L.FT. | 440 | \$35.00 | \$15,400 |
| 6070022 | FOUNDATION FOR BREAKAWAY SIGN POST S4X7. 7 | EACH | 43 | \$600.00 | \$25,800 |
| 6070038 | SLIP BASE (2 1/2s) | EACH | 75 | \$250.00 | \$18,750 |
| 6070055 | SIGN POST (PERFORATED) (2 1/2 S) | L.FT. | 576 | \$15.00 | \$8,640 |
| 6070060 | Foundation for sign post (CONCRETE) | EACH | 56 | \$300.00 | \$16,800 |
| 6080005 | regulatory, warning, or marker sign panel | sQ.fT. | 1,293 | \$20.00 | \$25,860 |
| 6080018 | extruded aluminum sign panel with type vil/ix/X Sheet | SQ.fT. | 5,047 | \$25.00 | \$126,175 |
| 6110201 | METAL HANDRAIL | L.FT. | 2,300 | \$65.00 | \$149,500 |
| 7020007 | Impact attenuation device (CRASH CUSHION) | EACH | 3 | \$20,000.00 | \$60,000 |
| 7030095 | MILEPOST MARKER (S-10) | EACH | 8 | \$400.00 | \$3,200 |
| 7040005 | PAVEMENT MARKING (WHITE EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (0.090") | L.FT. | 313,732 | \$0.60 | \$188,239 |
| 7040006 | PAVEMENT MARKING (YELLOW EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (0.090") | L.fT. | 100,620 | \$0.60 | \$60,372 |
| 7040072 | PAVEMENT MARKING (TRANSVERSE) (THERMOPLASTIC) (ALKYD) (0.090") | L.FT. | 1,455 | \$0.75 | \$1,091 |
| 7040074 | PAVEMENT SYMBOL (EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (ALKYD) (0.090") | EACH | 87 | \$125.00 | \$10,875 |
| 7060013 | PAVEMENT MARKER, RAISED, TYPe C | EACH | 7,266 | \$5.00 | \$36,330 |
| 7060017 | pavement marker, ralsed, type e | EACH | 1,206 | \$3.00 | \$3,618 |
| 7080201 | WATERBORNE-TYPE I PAVEMENT MARKING (PAINTED) (White) | L.FT. | 315,187 | \$0.10 | \$31,519 |
| 7080202 | Waterborne-type i pavement marking (Painted) (Yellow) | L.FT. | 95,260 | \$0.10 | \$9,526 |
| 7080204 | Waterborne-type i pavement marking (painted symbol) | EACH | 87 | \$100.00 | \$8,700 |
| 7310010 | POLE (TYPE A) | EACH | 5 | \$1,500.00 | \$7,500 |
| 7310092 | POLE (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | 26 | \$2,000.00 | \$52,000 |
| 7310140 | POLE (TYPE R) | EACH | 4 | \$9,000.00 | \$36,000 |
| 7310162 | POLE (TYPE T) (50 FT.) | EACH | 24 | \$3,000.00 | \$72,000 |
| 7310191 | POLE ( 54 FT CCTV POLE W/ LOWERING DEVICE) | EACH | 6 | \$18,000.00 | \$108,000 |
| 7310195 | POST (PEDESTRIAN PUSH BUTTON) | EACH | 47 | \$700.00 | \$32,900 |
| 7310197 | breakaway base for lighting pole or signal flasher | EACH | 50 | \$600.00 | \$30,000 |
| 7310200 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE A) | EACH | 9 | \$1,200.00 | \$10,800 |
| 7310276 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | 26 | \$800.00 | \$20,800 |
| 7310320 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE R) | EACH | 8 | \$4,000.00 | \$32,000 |
| 7310341 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE T) (40 FT. THRU 55 FT .) | EACH | 24 | \$1,500.00 | \$36,000 |
| 7310372 | POLE FOUNDATION ( 54 FT CCTV POLE W/ LOWERING DEVICE) | EACH | 6 | \$6,000.00 | \$36,000 |
| 7310551 | MAST ARM (20 FT.) (TAPERED) | EACH | 6 | \$1,300.00 | \$7,800 |
| 7310554 | MAST ARM (20 FT.) (SPECIAL) | EACH | 26 | \$2,000.00 | \$52,000 |
| 7320040 | Electrical Conduit (11/2") (PVC) | L.FT. | 6,836 | \$12.00 | \$82,032 |
| 7320050 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (2") (PVC) | L.fT. | 22,500 | \$10.00 | \$225,000 |
| 7320072 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (3-3") (PVC) | L.FT. | 41,450 | \$20.00 | \$829,000 |
| 7320270 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (3") | L.FT. | 560 | \$15.00 | \$8,400 |
| 7320410 | pull box (no. 5) | EACH | 20 | \$500.00 | \$10,000 |
| 7320421 | PULL Box (NO. 7) (With extension) | EACH | 108 | \$1,000.00 | \$108,000 |
| 7320450 | PULL BOX ( $\mathrm{NO.7}$ 7) (FM-2.06) | EACH | 98 | \$1,000.00 | \$98,000 |
| 7320455 | pull box (no. 9) | EACH | 30 | \$5,000.00 | \$150,000 |
| 7320456 | PULL BOX (4B) | EACH | 50 | \$1,000.00 | \$50,000 |
| 7320461 | PULL BOX (6B) | EACH | , | \$2,000.00 | \$8,000 |
| 7320500 | CONDUCTOR (NO. 12) | L.FT. | 7,500 | \$0.80 | \$6,000 |
| 7320520 | CONDUCTOR (NO. 8) | L.fT. | 98,000 | \$0.95 | \$93,100 |

AロロT

| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7320585 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 12) | L.FT. | 7,750 | \$1.00 | \$7,750 |
| 7320595 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 8) | L.fT. | 22,500 | \$2.00 | \$45,000 |
| 7320654 | CONDUCTORS ( NO .8 8) | L.fT. | 28,378 | \$1.00 | \$28,378 |
| 7320740 | removal of existing conductors | L.FT. | 110,728 | \$0.50 | \$55,364 |
| 7320787 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS)(ADOT) | L.fT. | 60,850 | \$3.00 | \$182,550 |
| 7320788 | SINGLE MOD FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS)(SCOTTSDALE) | L.fT. | 60,850 | \$3.00 | \$182,550 |
| 7320789 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CAbLE (12 FIBERS) | L.FT. | 5,750 | \$2.00 | \$11,500 |
| 7320794 | Fiber optic Splice closure (FMS) | EACH | 24 | \$1,500.00 | \$36,000 |
| 7320809 | Cable innerduct (1") | L.FT. | 41,300 | \$1.25 | \$51,625 |
| 7330060 | traffic signal face (tYpe f) | EACH | 23 | \$500.00 | \$11,500 |
| 7330620 | relocate traffic signals | L.SUM | 1 | \$15,000.00 | \$15,000 |
| 7340103 | CONTROL CAbInet (CCTV Pole) | EACH | 6 | \$5,000.00 | \$30,000 |
| 7340105 | control cabinet foundation | Each | 13 | \$1,200.00 | \$15,600 |
| 7340120 | meter pedestal cabinet | EACH | 4 | \$4,000.00 | \$16,000 |
| 7340252 | Controller (INTELIGHt 2070LC) | EACH | 10 | \$7,500.00 | \$75,000 |
| 7340306 | meter Pedestal foundation | EACH | 4 | \$1,200.00 | \$4,800 |
| 7350030 | LOOP DETECTOR FOR TRAFFIC SURVEILLANCE (6'X6') | EACH | 122 | \$1,000.00 | \$122,000 |
| 7350051 | detector card | EACH | 58 | \$200.00 | \$11,600 |
| 7350165 | loop detector leadin cable | L.FT. | 50,000 | \$1.00 | \$50,000 |
| 7360030 | LUMINAIRE (HORIZONTAL MOUNT) (HPS 250 WATT) | EACH | 6 | \$600.00 | \$3,600 |
| 7360070 | LUMINAIRE (VERTICAL MOUNT) (400 WATT) | EACH | 14 | \$650.00 | \$9,100 |
| 7360080 | LUMINAIRE (HIGH MAST) (HPS 400 WATT) | EACH | 198 | \$750.00 | \$148,500 |
| 7360104 | luminaire (triple luminaire bracket) | EACH | 66 | \$800.00 | \$52,800 |
| 7360111 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (HORIZONTAL MOUNT) (TYPE 40L) | EACH | 69 | \$900.00 | \$62,100 |
| 7360112 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (HIGH MAST) (TYPE 40L) | EACH | 112 | \$1,000.00 | \$112,000 |
| 7360113 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (UNDERDECK 15L) | EACH | 24 | \$1,000.00 | \$24,000 |
| 7360114 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (VERTICAL MOUNT) (TYPE 40L) | EACH | 49 | \$900.00 | \$44,100 |
| 7360160 | Power supply (BATTERY BACKUP) | EACH | 1 | \$5,000.00 | \$5,000 |
| 7360420 | remove and salvage existing sign lighting | L.SUM | 1 | \$15,000.00 | \$15,000 |
| 7370450 | miscellaneous electrical (FURNISH AND Install dms) | L.SUM | 1 | \$360,000.00 | \$360,000 |
| 7370452 | miscellaneous electrical (relocate cctv) | L.SUM | 1 | \$19,200.00 | \$19,200 |
| 7370455 | miscellaneous electrical (relocate dms) | L.SUM | 1 | \$48,000.00 | \$48,000 |
| 7370654 | Fiber optic equipment (fiber termination panel) | EACH | 24 | \$750.00 | \$18,000 |
| 7370705 | CCTV FIELD EQUIPMENT | EACH | 6 | \$9,000.00 | \$54,000 |
| 8080043 | backflow prevention assembly relocation | EACH | 2 | \$6,000.00 | \$12,000 |
| 8080551 | PIPE (DUCTILE IRON, 8", CLASS 53) | L.FT. | 320 | \$200.00 | \$64,000 |
| 8080646 | Reset frame and cover for valve box | EACH | 6 | \$700.00 | \$4,200 |
| 8080655 | relocate fire hydrant | Each | 4 | \$5,000.00 | \$20,000 |
| 8080695 | concrete plpe plug | EACH | 1 | \$1,000.00 | \$1,000 |
| 8082845 | manhole (reset frame and cover) | EACH | 10 | \$1,500.00 | \$15,000 |
| 9050025 | GUARD RAIL TERMINAL (MASH) | EACH | 16 | \$5,000.00 | \$80,000 |
| 9050401 | gUard rail transition, w-beam to concrete barrier | EACH | 16 | \$3,000.00 | \$48,000 |
| 9080084 | concrete curb and gutter (All types) | L.FT. | 25,697 | \$20.00 | \$513,940 |
| 9080201 | CONCRETE SIDEWALK (C-05.20) | SQ.fT. | 23,925 | \$6.00 | \$143,550 |
| 9080296 | concrete sidewalk ramp (all types) | EACH | 54 | \$2,500.00 | \$135,000 |
| 9080303 | concrete driveway | sQ.fT. | 400 | \$20.00 | \$8,000 |
| 9080511 | SCUPPER (MAG DET. 203) | EACH | 5 | \$5,000.00 | \$25,000 |
| 9100000 | CONCRETE BARRIER (SINGLE FACE WITH GUTTER) | L.FT. | 16,032 | \$80.00 | \$1,282,560 |
| 9100008 | CONCRETE BARRIER (SPECIAL HALF) (32") | L.fT. | 6,381 | \$120.00 | \$765,720 |
| 9100009 | concrete barrier (ADJacent to retaining wall) | L.fT. | 10,957 | \$140.00 | \$1,533,980 |
| 9100012 | CONCRETE BARIIER (SPECIAL HALF) (42") | L.fet. | 14,239 | \$180.00 | \$2,563,020 |
| 9140153 | retaining wall (regular) | SQ.fT. | 46,131 | \$70.00 | \$3,229,170 |
| 9140155 | Retaining wall (SPECIALTY) | sQ.fT. | 57,565 | \$175.00 | \$10,073,875 |
| 9210021 | median paving (CONCRETE PAVERS) | so.yd. | 3,849 | \$60.00 | \$230,940 |
| 9240051 | miscellaneous work (swallow mitigation) | L.SUM | , | \$40,000.00 | \$40,000 |
| 9240052 | miscellaneous work (LANDSCAPE \& EROSION Control) | L.SUM | 1 | \$2,646,500.00 | \$2,646,500 |
| 9240055 | miscellaneous work (Structures) | L.SUM | 1 | \$15,000.00 | \$15,000 |
| 9240056 | miscellaneous work (thermal camera detection system princess) | L.SUM | 1 | \$30,000.00 | \$30,000 |



Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd
Final DCR Update

| SUMMARY |  |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | ITEM TOTAL |
|  | PROECT WIDE |
|  | OTHER COST TOTAL |
|  | SUBTOTAL PROJECT COST |
|  | INDIRECT COST ALLOCATION (9.90\%) |
|  | DESIGN |
|  | TOTAL PROJECT COST |


6.1.1. Detailed Cost Estimates of Preferred Alternatives

The estimates for the preferred alternatives are provided in this section. These estimates are incorporated within the overall preferred alternative estimate as contained in section 6.1.

- SR 101L Mainline Widening Alternatives, Table 6.2
- Princess Drive TDI: convert to dual lefts and extend storage. Table 6.3
- Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TDI, Table 6.4
- Raintree Drive Improved SPUI, Table 6.5
- Shea Boulevard SPUI: extend right-turn lane, Table 6.6

Table 6.2 -SR 101L Mainline Widening

| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020021 | REMOVAL Of CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER | L.FT. | 61,685 | \$5.00 | \$308,425 |
| 2020033 | REMOVE (STRUCTURAL CONCRETE) | sa.yd. | 35,445 | \$40.00 | \$1,417,800 |
| 2020027 | removal of concrete barrier | L.fT. | 13,101 | \$20.00 | \$262,020 |
| 2020031 | removal of portland cement concrete pavement | sQ.yd. | 57,563 | \$25.00 | \$1,439,075 |
| 2020041 | REMOVAL OF PIPE | L.FT. | 8,464 | \$30.00 | \$253,920 |
| 2020047 | removal of Signs | EACH | 2 | \$250.00 | \$500 |
| 2020053 | Remove (CATCH BASINS) | EACH | 155 | \$1,000.00 | \$155,000 |
| 2020054 | Remove (MANHOLES) | EACH | 28 | \$2,500.00 | \$70,000 |
| 2020071 | remove guard rail | L.fT. | 439 | \$6.00 | \$2,634 |
| 2020081 | REMOVE BITUMINOUS PAVEMENT (MILLING) (1") | SQ.YD. | 392,866 | \$2.00 | \$785,732 |
| 2020115 | Remove (SIGN bridges) | EACH | 5 | \$10,000.00 | \$50,000 |
| 2020155 | Remove (PULL BOX) | EACH | 46 | \$300.00 | \$13,800 |
| 2020173 | Remove (ATtenuators) | EACH | 1 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500 |
| 2020175 | removal of light poles and bases | EACH | 46 | \$900.00 | \$41,400 |
| 2030301 | Roadway excavation | cu.y. | 85,764 | \$10.00 | \$857,640 |
| 2030900 | Borrow (IN PLACE) | cu.y. | 77,720 | \$12.00 | \$932,640 |
| 4010016 | Portland Cement Concrete pavement (13" PCCP over 4" Ab) | sa.y. | 17,367 | \$66.00 | \$1,146,222 |
| 4010019 | PortiAnd Cement concrete pavement (13" PCCP over 4" AC) | sa.yD. | 55,106 | \$81.00 | \$4,463,586 |
| 4010020 | Portland Cement concrete pavement (11" PCCP over 4" Ab) | sa.yd. | 37,893 | \$60.00 | \$2,273,580 |
| 5012524 | Storm drain PIPE, 24" | L.fT. | 9,143 | \$100.00 | \$914,300 |
| 5012530 | STORM DRAIN PIPE, 30" | L.fT. | 16 | \$150.00 | \$2,400 |


| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5012536 | STORM DRAIN PIPE, 36" | L.FT. | 239 | \$155.00 | \$37,045 |
| 5012548 | storm drain PIPE, 48" | L.fT. | 99 | \$185.00 | \$18,315 |
| 5012554 | Storm drain PIPE, 54" | L.fT. | 160 | \$200.00 | \$32,000 |
| 5012566 | Storm drain PIPE, 66" | L.fT. | 175 | \$350.00 | \$61,250 |
| 5012572 | storm drain Plpe, 72" | L.FT. | 336 | \$550.00 | \$184,800 |
| 5030142 | CONCRETE CATCH BASIN (MEDIAN) (C-15.80) | EACH | 6 | \$5,000.00 | \$30,000 |
| 5030604 | concrete catch basin (c-15.91) | EACH | 117 | \$5,000.00 | \$585,000 |
| 5030605 | CONCRETE CATCH BASIN (C-15.92) | EACH | 18 | \$6,000.00 | \$108,000 |
| 5030606 | concrete catch basin (detall) | EACH | 36 | \$6,000.00 | \$216,000 |
| 5050013 | manhole (C 18.10) (NeW) | EACH | 6 | \$6,000.00 | \$36,000 |
| 6060073 | BRIDGE SIGN STRUCTURE (TAPERED TUBE, SINGLE BEAM) | EACH | 2 | \$45,000.00 | \$90,000 |
| 6060074 | Foundation for bridge sign structure (tapered tube) | EACH | 6 | \$6,000.00 | \$36,000 |
| 6060079 | Foundation for bridge sign structure (SD9.20, TYPE 4F) | EACH | 4 | \$14,000.00 | \$56,000 |
| 6060133 | CANTILEVER SIGN STRUCTURE (SD9.10, TYPE 3C) | EACH | 22 | \$45,000.00 | \$990,000 |
| 6060151 | SIGN StRUCTURE (DMS BUTTERFLY STRUCTURE) | EACH | 3 | \$60,000.00 | \$180,000 |
| 6060152 | SIGN STRUCTURE (FOUNDATION FOR DMS BUTTERFLY STRUCTURE) | EACH | 3 | \$12,000.00 | \$36,000 |
| 6060256 | FOUNDATION FOR CANTILEVER SIGN STRUCTURE (SD9.10, TYPE 3C) | EACH | 22 | \$12,000.00 | \$264,000 |
| 6070002 | breakaway SIGN Post S4x7. 7 | L.f. | 224 | \$35.00 | \$7,840 |
| 6070022 | foundation for breakaway sign post sax 7 | EACH | 16 | \$600.00 | \$9,600 |
| 6070038 | SLIP BASE (2 1/2S) | EACH | 48 | \$250.00 | \$12,000 |
| 6070055 | SIGN POST (PERFORATED) (2 1/2 S) | L.fT. | 576 | \$15.00 | \$8,640 |
| 6070060 | FOUNDATION FOR SIGN POST (CONCRETE) | EACH | 56 | \$300.00 | \$16,800 |
| 6080005 | regulatory, warning, or marker sign panel | SQ.fT. | 977 | \$20.00 | \$19,540 |
| 6080018 | extruded aluminum sign panel with type vil/I/X Sheet | SQ.fT. | 5,047 | \$25.00 | \$126,175 |
| 6110201 | metal handrail | L.FT. | 2,300 | \$65.00 | \$149,500 |
| 7020007 | IMPACT ATTENUATION DEVIIE (CRASH CUSHION) | EACH | 3 | \$20,000.00 | \$60,000 |
| 7030095 | MILEPOST MARKER ( S -10) | EACH | 8 | \$400.00 | \$3,200 |
| 7040005 | PAVEMENT MARKING (White extruded thermoplastic) (0.090") | L.FT. | 298,305 | \$0.60 | \$178,983 |
| 7040006 | PAVEMENT MARKING (YELLOW EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (0.090") | L.FT. | 99,600 | \$0.60 | \$59,760 |
| 7040072 | PAVEMENT MARKING (TRANSVERSE) (THERMOPLASTIC) (ALKYD) (0.090") | L.FT. | 630 | \$0.75 | \$473 |
| 7040074 | PAVEMENT SYMBOL (EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (ALKYD) (0.090") | EACH | 53 | \$125.00 | \$6,625 |
| 7060013 | pavement marker, raised, type C | EACH | 6,880 | \$5.00 | \$34,400 |
| 7060017 | Pavement marker, ralsed, type e | EACH | 1,180 | \$3.00 | \$3,540 |
| 7080201 | WATERBORNE-TYPE I PAVEMENT MARKING (Palinted) (white) | L.fT. | 298,935 | \$0.10 | \$29,894 |
| 7080202 | Waterborne-type i pavement marking (Painted) (Yellow) | L.FT. | 94,240 | \$0.10 | \$9,424 |
| 7080204 | Waterborne-type i pavement marking (painted symbol) | EACH | 53 | \$100.00 | \$5,300 |
| 7310092 | POLE (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | 22 | \$2,000.00 | \$44,000 |
| 7310162 | POLE (TYPE T) ( 50 FT .) | EACH | 24 | \$3,000.00 | \$72,000 |
| 7310191 | POLE ( 54 FT CCTV POLE W/ LOWERING DEVICE) | EACH | 6 | \$18,000.00 | \$128,000 |
| 7310195 | POST (PEDESTRIAN PUSH BUTTON) | EACH | 47 | \$700.00 | \$32,900 |
| 7310197 | BREAKAWAY BASE FOR LIGHTING POLE OR SIGNAL FLASHER | EACH | 46 | \$600.00 | \$27,600 |
| 7310200 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE A) | EACH | 4 | \$1,200.00 | \$4,800 |
| 7310276 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | 22 | \$800.00 | \$17,600 |
| 7310320 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE R) | EACH | 4 | \$4,000.00 | \$16,000 |
| 7310341 | PoLe foundation (tYPE T) ( 40 FT . THRU 55 FT .) | EACH | 24 | \$1,500.00 | \$36,000 |
| 7310372 | POLE FOUNDATION ( 54 FT CCTV POLE W/ LOWERING DEVICE) | EACH | 6 | \$6,000.00 | \$36,000 |
| 7310551 | MAST ARM ( 20 FT.) (TAPERED) | EACH | 6 | \$1,300.00 | \$7,800 |
| 7310554 | MAST ARM (20 FT.) (SPECIAL) | EACH | 22 | \$2,000.00 | \$44,000 |
| 7320040 | Electrical conduit (11/2") (PVC) | L.fT. | 4,000 | \$12.00 | \$48,000 |
| 7320050 | Electrical Conduit (2") (3VC) | L.FT. | 20,500 | \$10.00 | \$205,000 |
| 7320072 | ElECTRICAL CONDUIT (3-3") (PVC) | L.fT. | 38,950 | \$20.00 | \$779,000 |
| 7320270 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (3") | L.FT. | 560 | \$15.00 | \$8,400 |
| 7320410 | pull box (no. 5) | EACH | 20 | \$500.00 | \$10,000 |
| 7320421 | pull box (no.7) (with extension) | EACH | 94 | \$1,000.00 | \$94,000 |
| 7320450 | PULL BOX (NO. 7) (FM-2.06) | EACH | 94 | \$1,000.00 | \$94,000 |
| 7320455 | pull box (no.9) | EACH | 26 | \$5,000.00 | \$130,000 |
| 7320456 | PULL Box (4B) | EACH | 46 | \$1,000.00 | \$46,000 |
| 7320461 | PULL BOX (6B) | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320500 | CONDUCTOR (NO. 12) | L.fT. | 6,900 | \$0.80 | \$5,520 |


| ITEM No | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7320520 | CONDUCTOR (NO. 8) | L.FT. | 90,000 | \$0.95 | \$85,500 |
| 7320585 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 12) | L.fT. | 7,450 | \$1.00 | \$7,450 |
| 7320595 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BoND) (NO. 8) | L.fT. | 20,500 | \$2.00 | \$41,000 |
| 7320654 | CONDUCTORS ( NO .8$)$ | L.fT. | 19,370 | \$1.00 | \$19,370 |
| 7320740 | removal of existing conductors | L.fT. | 98,220 | \$0.50 | \$49,110 |
| 7320787 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS)(ADOT) | L.FT. | 58,350 | \$3.00 | \$175,050 |
| 7320788 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS)(SCOTTSDALE) | L.fT. | 58,350 | \$3.00 | \$175,050 |
| 7320789 | SIngle mode fiber optic Cable (12 Fibers) | L.FT. | 4,750 | \$2.00 | \$9,500 |
| 7320794 | FIBER OPTIC SPLICE Closure (FMS) | EACH | 20 | \$1,500.00 | \$30,000 |
| 7320809 | CAble innerduct (1") | L.FT. | 38,800 | \$1.25 | \$48,500 |
| 7330620 | relocate traffic signals | L.SUM | 1 | \$15,000.00 | \$15,000 |
| 7340103 | Control cabinet (CCTV Pole) | EACH | 6 | \$5,000.00 | \$30,000 |
| 7340105 | control cabinet foundation | EACH | 13 | \$1,200.00 | \$15,600 |
| 7340120 | meter pedestal cabinet | EACH | 1 | \$4,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| 7340252 | CONTROLLER (2070) | EACH | 10 | \$7,500.00 | \$75,000 |
| 7340306 | meter pedestal foundation | EACH | 1 | \$1,200.00 | \$1,200 |
| 7350030 | LOOP detector for traffic survelilance (6'X6') | EACH | 116 | \$1,000.00 | \$116,000 |
| 7350051 | detector card | EACH | 58 | \$200.00 | \$11,600 |
| 7350165 | Loop detector lead-in cable | L.FT. | 50,000 | \$1.00 | \$50,000 |
| 7360030 | LUMINAIRE (HORIZONTAL MOUNT) (HPS 250 WATT) | EACH | 6 | \$600.00 | \$3,600 |
| 7360070 | LUMINAIRE (VERTICAL MOUNT) (400 WATT) | EACH | 14 | \$650.00 | \$9,100 |
| 7360080 | LUMINAIRE (HIGH MAST) (HPS 400 WATT) | EACH | 198 | \$750.00 | \$148,500 |
| 736004 | LUminaire (TRIPLE LUMINAIRE BRACKET) | EACH | 66 | \$800.00 | \$52,800 |
| 7360111 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (HORIZONTAL MOUNT) (TYPE 40L) | EACH | 65 | \$900.00 | \$58,500 |
| 7360112 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (HIGH MAST) (TYPE 40L) | EACH | 112 | \$1,000.00 | \$112,000 |
| 7360113 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (UNDERDECK 15L) | EACH | 6 | \$1,000.00 | \$6,000 |
| 7360114 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (VERTICAL MOUNT) (TYPE 40L) | EACH | 49 | \$900.00 | \$44,100 |
| 7360160 | POWER SUPPLY (BATTERY BACKUP) | EACH | 1 | \$5,000.00 | \$5,000 |
| 7360420 | remove and salvage existing sign lighting | L.SUM | 1 | \$15,000.00 | \$15,000 |
| 7370450 | miscellaneous electrical (furnish and install dms) | L.SUM | 1 | \$360,000.00 | \$360,000 |
| 7370452 | miscellaneous electrical (relocate cctv) | L.SUM | 1 | \$19,200.00 | \$19,200 |
| 7370455 | MIISELLANEOUS ELECTRICAL (RELOCATE DMS) | L.SUM | 1 | \$48,000.00 | \$48,000 |
| 7370654 | Fiber optic equipment (fiber termination panel) | EACH | 24 | \$750.00 | \$18,000 |
| 7370705 | CCTV FIELD EQUIPMENT | EACH | 6 | \$9,000.00 | \$54,000 |
| 8080043 | backflow prevention assembly relocation | EACH | 1 | \$6,000.00 | \$6,000 |
| 8080646 | Reset frame and cover for valve box | EACH | 3 | \$700.00 | \$2,100 |
| 8080655 | relocate fire hydrant | EACH | 2 | \$5,000.00 | \$10,000 |
| 8082845 | manhole (reset frame and cover) | EACH | 5 | \$1,500.00 | \$7,500 |
| 8080695 | concrete plpe plug | EACH | 1 | \$1,000.00 | \$1,000 |
| 8080551 | PIPE (DUCTILE IRON, 8", CLASS 53) | L.FT. | 320 | \$200.00 | \$64,000 |
| 9050025 | GUARD RAIL TERMINAL (MASH) | EACH | 16 | \$5,000.00 | \$80,000 |
| 9050401 | GUARD Rall transition, w-beam to concrete barrier | EACH | 16 | \$3,000.00 | \$48,000 |
| 9080084 | CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER (ALL TYPES) | L.fT. | 15,607 | \$20.00 | \$312,140 |
| 9080296 | concrete sidewalk ramp (all types) | EACH | 26 | \$2,500.00 | \$65,000 |
| 9080303 | concrete driveway | sQ.fT. | 400 | \$20.00 | \$8,000 |
| 9100000 | concrete barrier (single face with gutter) | L.fT. | 16,032 | \$80.00 | \$1,282,560 |
| 9100008 | CONCRETE BARRIER (SPECIAL HALF) (32") | L.fT. | 6,381 | \$120.00 | \$765,720 |
| 9100009 | concrete barrier (ADJacent to retaining wall) | L.fT. | 10,957 | \$140.00 | \$1,533,980 |
| 9100012 | CONCRETE BARRIER (SPECIAL HALF) (42") | L.fT. | 14,239 | \$180.00 | \$2,563,020 |
| 9140153 | retaining wall (regular) | sQ.fT. | 46,131 | \$70.00 | \$3,229,170 |
| 9140155 | ReTAINING WALL (SPECIALTY) | sQ.fT. | 57,565 | \$175.00 | \$10,073,875 |
| 9240051 | miscellaneous work (swallow mitigation) | L.SUM | 1 | \$40,000.00 | \$40,000 |
| 9240052 | miscellaneous work (LANDSCAPE \& EROSIon control) | L.SUM | 1 | \$2,530,500.00 | \$2,530,500 |
| 9240055 | miscellaneous work (STRUCTURES) | L.SUM | 1 | \$15,000.00 | \$15,000 |
| 9240056 | miscellaneous work (thermal camera detection system princess) | L.SUM | 1 | \$30,000.00 | \$30,000 |
| 9240057 | miscellaneous work (thermal camera detection system frank LLOYD WRIGHT) | L.SUM | 1 | \$30,000.00 | \$30,000 |
| 9240058 | miscellaneous work (thermal camera detection system raintree) | L.SUM | 1 | \$30,000.00 | \$30,000 |
| 9240059 | miscellaneous work (thermal camera detection system cactus) | L.SUM | 1 | \$30,000.00 | \$30,000 |



Table 6.3 - Princess Drive Tight Diamond Interchange


Table 6.4 - Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard Tight Diamond Interchange

| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020021 | REMOVAL OF CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER | L.FT. | 9,483 | \$5.00 | \$47,415 |
| 2020029 | removal of ASPhaltic concrete pavement | sQ.yD. | 187 | \$5.00 | \$935 |
| 2020031 | removal of portland cement concrete pavement | so.yb. | 3,301 | \$25.00 | \$82,525 |
| 2020053 | Remove (CATCH BASIINS) | EACH | 7 | \$1,000.00 | \$7,000 |
| 2020116 | REMOVE (SCUPPER) | EACH | 5 | \$1,000.00 | \$5,000 |
| 2020155 | REMOVE (PULL BOX) | EACH | 1 | \$300.00 | \$300 |
| 2020162 | Remove (CONCRETE) | SQ.YD. | 4,558 | \$4.00 | \$18,232 |
| 2020173 | remove (attenuators) | Each | 1 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500 |
| 2020175 | REMOVAL OF LIGHT POLES AND BASES | EACH | 1 | \$900.00 | \$900 |


| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2030301 | ROADWAY EXCAVATION | CU.YD. | 2,005 | \$10.00 | \$20,050 |
| 3030022 | agGregate base, class 2 | cu.y. | 89 | \$50.00 | \$4,450 |
| 4010020 | portland cement concrete pavement (11" PCCP over 4" ab) | sQ.y. | 2,773 | \$60.00 | \$166,380 |
| 4060009 | ASPHALTIC CONCRETE (MISCELLANEOUS PAVING) | ton | 15 | \$500.00 | \$7,500 |
| 5012524 | Storm drain PIPE, 24" | L.FT. | 188 | \$100.00 | \$18,800 |
| 5030142 | CONCRETE CATCH BASIN (MEDIAN) (15.80) | EACH | 1 | \$5,000.00 | \$5,000 |
| 5030604 | CONCRETE CATCH BASIN (15.19) | EACH | 6 | \$5,000.00 | \$30,000 |
| 6070002 | breakaway SIGN Post S4x7. 7 | L.fet. | 192 | \$35.00 | \$6,720 |
| 6070022 | FOUNDATION FOR BREAKAWAY SIGN POST S4x7.7 | Each | 24 | \$600.00 | \$14,400 |
| 6070038 | SLIP BASE | EACH | 24 | \$250.00 | \$6,000 |
| 6080005 | regulatory, warning, or marker sign panel | sQ.fT. | 216 | \$20.00 | \$4,320 |
| 7040005 | Pavement marking (White extruded thermoplastic) (0.090") | L.fT. | 14,189 | \$0.60 | \$8,513 |
| 7040006 | PAVEMENT MARKING (YELLOW EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (0.090") | L.FT. | 1,020 | \$0.60 | \$612 |
| 7040072 | PAVEMENT MARKING (TRANSVERSE) (THERMOPLASTIC) (ALKYD) (0.090") | L.FT. | 825 | \$0.75 | \$619 |
| 7040074 | PAVEMENT SYMBOL (EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (ALKYD) (0.090") | EACH | 29 | \$125.00 | \$3,625 |
| 7060013 | PAVEMENT MARKER, RAISED, TYPE C | EACH | 355 | \$5.00 | \$1,775 |
| 7060017 | pavement Marker, raised, type e | EACH | 26 | \$3.00 | \$78 |
| 7080201 | WATERBORNE-TYPE I PAVEMENT MARKING (PAINTED) (White) | L.FT. | 15,014 | \$0.10 | \$1,501 |
| 7080202 | Waterborne-type i pavement marking (painted) (Yellow) | L.FT. | 1,020 | \$0.10 | \$102 |
| 7080204 | WAterborne-type i pavement marking (Painted symbol) | EACH | 29 | \$100.00 | \$2,900 |
| 7310010 | POLE (TYPEA) | EACH | 4 | \$1,500.00 | \$6,000 |
| 7310092 | POLE (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7310140 | POLE (TYPE R) | EACH | 4 | \$9,000.00 | \$36,000 |
| 7310197 | BREAKAWAY BASE FOR LIGHTING POLE OR SIGNAL FLASHER | EACH | 1 | \$600.00 | \$600 |
| 7310200 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE A) | EACH | 4 | \$1,200.00 | \$4,800 |
| 7310276 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | 1 | \$800.00 | \$800 |
| 7310320 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE R) | Each | 4 | \$4,000.00 | \$16,000 |
| 7310554 | MAST ARM (20 FT.) (SPECIAL) | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320040 | ElECTRICAL CONDUIT (11/2") (PVC) | L.fT. | 2,336 | \$12.00 | \$28,032 |
| 7320050 | Electrical Conduit (2") (PVC) | L.fT. | 500 | \$10.00 | \$5,000 |
| 7320072 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (3-3") (PVC) | L.FT. | 1,000 | \$20.00 | \$20,000 |
| 7320421 | pull box (no.7) (With extension) | EACH | 14 | \$1,000.00 | \$14,000 |
| 7320450 | PULL Box (NO.7) (FM-2.06) | Each | 2 | \$1,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320455 | Pull box ( NO . 9) | EACH | 2 | \$5,000.00 | \$10,000 |
| 7320456 | PULL BOX (4B) | EACH | 1 | \$1,000.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320461 | PULL Box (6B) | Each | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320500 | CONDUCTOR (NO. 12) | L.fT. | 150 | \$0.80 | \$120 |
| 7320520 | CONDUCTOR (NO. 8) | L.FT. | 2,000 | \$0.95 | \$1,900 |
| 7320585 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 12) | L.fT. | 75 | \$1.00 | \$75 |
| 7320595 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 8) | L.FT. | 500 | \$2.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320654 | CONDUCTORS ( NO .8 ) | L.FT. | 7,508 | \$1.00 | \$7,508 |
| 7320740 | removal of existing conductors | L.fT. | 9,008 | \$0.50 | \$4,504 |
| 7320787 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS)(ADOT) | L.fT. | 1,000 | \$3.00 | \$3,000 |
| 7320788 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS)(SCOTTSDALE) | L.FT. | 1,000 | \$3.00 | \$3,000 |
| 7320789 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CAbLE (12 FIBERS) | L.FT. | 500 | \$2.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320794 | FIBER OPTIC SPLICE Closure (ITS) | EACH | 2 | \$1,500.00 | \$3,000 |
| 7320809 | CABLE INNERDUCT (1") | L.FT. | 1,000 | \$1.25 | \$1,250 |
| 7330060 | TRAFFIC SIGNAL FACE (TYPE F) | EACH | 23 | \$500.00 | \$11,500 |
| 7340120 | meter pedestal cabinet | EACH | 1 | \$4,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| 7340306 | METER PEDESTAL FOUNDATION | EACH | 1 | \$1,200.00 | \$1,200 |
| 7350030 | LOOP DETECTOR FOR TRAFFIC SURVEILLANCE (6'X6') | EACH |  | \$1,000.00 | \$6,000 |
| 7360111 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (HORIZONTAL MOUNT) (TYPE 40L) | EACH | 1 | \$900.00 | \$900 |
| 7360113 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (UNDERDECK 15L) | EACH | 6 | \$1,000.00 | \$6,000 |
| 8080043 | backflow prevention assembly relocation | EACH | 1 | \$6,000.00 | \$6,000 |
| 8082845 | MANHOLE (RESET FRAME AND COVER) | EACH |  | \$1,500.00 | \$4,500 |
| 8080646 | RESET FRAME AND COVER FOR VALVE BOX | EACH | 1 | \$700.00 | \$700 |
| 8080655 | RELOCATE FIRE HYDRANT | EACH | 2 | \$5,000.00 | \$10,000 |
| 9080084 | CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER (ALL TYPES) | L.FT. | 8,435 | \$20.00 | \$168,70 |
| 9080201 | CONCRETE SIDEWALK (C-05.20) | SQ.FT. | 18,909 | \$6.00 | \$113,45 |

Aロロт


Table 6.5 - Raintree Drive Improved Single-Point Urban Interchange

| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020021 | REMOVAL OF CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER | L.FT. | 1,234 | \$5.00 | \$6,170 |
| 2020053 | remove (Catch basins) | EACH | 3 | \$1,000.00 | \$3,000 |
| 2020155 | Remove (PULL BOX) | EACH | 1 | \$300.00 | \$300 |
| 2020162 | Remove (CONCRETE) | sQ.yD. | 316 | \$4.00 | \$1,264 |
| 2020175 | removal of light poles and bases | Each | 1 | \$900.00 | \$900 |
| 2030301 | roadway excavation | cu.YD. | 906 | \$10.00 | \$9,060 |
| 4010020 | Portland cement concrete pavement (11" PCCP over 4" Ab) | so.yD. | 1,107 | \$60.00 | \$66,420 |
| 5012524 | Storm drain PIPE, 24" | L.fT. | 27 | \$100.00 | \$2,700 |
| 5030604 | concrete catch basin (c-15.91) | EACH | 3 | \$5,000.00 | \$15,000 |
| 6070002 | BREAKAWAY SIGN POST S4X7.7 | L.FT. | 24 | \$35.00 | \$840 |
| 6070022 | Foundation for breakaway sign post saxi. 7 | EACH | 3 | \$600.00 | \$1,800 |


| ITEM NO ITEM DESCRIPTION |  | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6070038 SLIP BASE ( $21 / 2$ S) |  | EACH | 3 | \$250.00 | \$750 |
| 6080005 ReGulatory, warning, or marker sign panel |  | sQ.fT. | 100 | \$20.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7040005 PAVEMENT MARKING (WHITE EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (0.090") |  | L.FT. | 1,238 | \$0.60 | \$743 |
| 7040074 PAVEMENT SYMBOL (EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (ALKYD) (0.090") |  | EACH | 5 | \$125.00 | \$625 |
| 7060013 PAVEMENT MARKER, RAISED, TYPE C |  | EACH | 31 | \$5.00 | \$155 |
| 7080201 WATERBORNE-TYPE I PAVEMENT MARKING (PAINTED) (White) |  | L.FT. | 1,238 | \$0.10 | \$124 |
| 7080204 WATERBORNE-TYPE I Pavement marking (Painted symbol) |  | Each | 5 | \$100.00 | \$500 |
| 7310010 POLE (TYPEA) |  | EACH | 1 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500 |
| 7310092 POLE (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) |  | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7310197 BREAKAWAY BASE FOR LIGHTING POLE OR SIGNAL FLASHER |  | EACH | 1 | \$600.00 | \$600 |
| 7310200 PoLe foundation (tYPE A) |  | EACH | 1 | \$1,200.00 | \$1,200 |
| 7310276 POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) |  | EACH | 1 | \$800.00 | \$800 |
| 7310554 MAST ARM (20 FT.) (SPECIAL) |  | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320040 ELECTRICAL CONDUIT ( $11 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ ) (PVC) |  | L.FT. | 500 | \$12.00 | \$6,000 |
| 7320050 ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (2") (PVC) |  | L.FT. | 500 | \$10.00 | \$5,000 |
| 7320072 Electrical Conduit (3-3") (PVC) |  | L.FT. | 1,500 | \$20.00 | \$30,000 |
| 7320450 PULL BOX (NO. 7) (FM-2.06) |  | EACH | 2 | \$1,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320455 PULL box (NO.9) |  | EACH | 2 | \$5,000.00 | \$10,000 |
| 7320456 Pull box (4B) |  | EACH | 1 | \$1,000.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320461 PULL Box (6B) |  | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320500 CONDUCTOR (NO. 12) |  | L.fT. | 150 | \$0.80 | \$120 |
| 7320520 CONDUCTOR (NO. 8) |  | L.FT. | 2,000 | \$0.95 | \$1,900 |
| 7320585 CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 12) |  | L.fT. | 75 | \$1.00 | \$75 |
| 7320595 CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 8) |  | L.FT. | 500 | \$2.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320654 CONDUCTORS (NO. 8) |  | L.FT. | 1,500 | \$1.00 | \$1,500 |
| 7320740 removal of existing conductors |  | L.f. | 2,500 | \$0.50 | \$1,250 |
| 7320787 SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS)(ADOT) |  | L.fT. | 1,500 | \$3.00 | \$4,500 |
| 7320788 SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS)(SCOTTSDALE) |  | L.f. | 1,500 | \$3.00 | \$4,500 |
| 7320789 SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (12 FIBERS) |  | L.f. | 500 | \$2.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320794 FIBER OPTIC SPLICE CLOSURE (ITS) |  | EACH | 2 | \$1,500.00 | \$3,000 |
| 7320809 CABLE INNERDUCT (1") |  | L.FT. | 1,500 | \$1.25 | \$1,875 |
| 7340120 meter pedestal cabinet |  | Each | 1 | \$4,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| 7340306 meter pedestal foundation |  | EACH | 1 | \$1,200.00 | \$1,200 |
| 7360111 LUMINAIRE (LED) (HORIZONTAL MOUNT) (TYPE 40L) |  | EACH | 1 | \$900.00 | \$900 |
| 7360113 LUMINAIRE (LED) (UNDERDECK 15L) |  | EACH | 8 | \$1,000.00 | \$8,000 |
| 8082845 MANHOLE (RESET FRAME AND COVER) |  | EACH | 1 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500 |
| 9080084 CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER (ALL TYPES) |  | L.FT. | 1,201 | \$20.00 | \$24,020 |
| 9080201 CONCRETE SIDEWALK (C-05.20) |  | SQ.FT. | 2,387 | \$6.00 | \$14,322 |
| 9080296 CONCRETE SIDEWALK RAMP (ALL TYPES) |  | EACH | 8 | \$2,500.00 | \$20,000 |
| 9240052 MISCELLANEOUS WORK (LANDSCAPE \& EROSION CONTROL) |  | L.SUM | 1 | \$12,000.00 | \$12,000 |
| 9240131 misceldaneous work (GigE SWITCH) |  | EACH | 2 | \$2,500.00 | \$5,000 |
|  |  |  |  | item total | \$288,113 |
| PROJECT WIDE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mobilization (10\%) | cost |  |  |  | \$28,812 |
| Dust and Water Palliative (1\%) | COST |  |  |  | \$2,882 |
| Quality Control (2\%) | cost |  |  |  | \$5,763 |
| Construction Surveying ( $2 \%$ ) | COST |  |  |  | \$5,763 |
| Maintenance and Protection of Traffic (10\%) | cost |  |  |  | \$28,812 |
|  |  | PRoject wide subtotal |  |  | \$72,032 |
| Unidentified Item Allowance (20\%) | cost |  |  |  | \$72,029 |
|  |  | PROJECT WIDE TOTAL |  |  | \$144,061 |
| OTHER COST |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Engineering (9\%) | cost |  |  |  | \$38,896 |

Aロロт


Table 6.6 - Shea Boulevard Single-Point Urban Interchange: Extend Right Turn Lane

| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020021 | Removal of Concrete curb and gutter | L.FT. | 470 | \$5.00 | \$2,350 |
| 2020155 | Remove (PULL BOX) | EACH | 2 | \$300.00 | \$600 |
| 2020162 | Remove (CONCRETE) | sQ.yD. | 342 | \$4.00 | \$1,368 |
| 2020175 | removal of light poles and bases | EACH | 2 | \$900.00 | \$1,800 |
| 2030301 | Roadway excavation | cu.yd. | 331 | \$10.00 | \$3,310 |
| 4060009 | ASPhaltic Concrete (miscellaneous paving) | ton | 11 | \$500.00 | \$5,500 |
| 7310092 | POLE (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | , | \$2,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| 7310197 | BREAKAWAY BASE FOR LIGHTING POLE OR SIGNAL FLASHER | EACH | 2 | \$600.00 | \$1,200 |
| 7310276 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | 2 | \$800.00 | \$1,600 |
| 7310554 | MAST ARM ( 20 FT .) ( (SPECIAL) | EACH | 2 | \$2,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| 7320050 | ElECTRICAL CONDUIT (2") (PVC) | L.FT. | 1,000 | \$10.00 | \$10,000 |
| 7320456 | pull box (4B) | EACH | , | \$1,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320461 | PuLL box (6B) | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320500 | CONDUCTOR (NO. 12) | L.FT. | 300 | \$0.80 | \$240 |
| 7320520 | CONDUCTOR (No. 8) | L.fT. | 4,000 | \$0.95 | \$3,800 |
| 7320585 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 12) | L.FT. | 150 | \$1.00 | \$150 |
| 7320595 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 8) | L.FT. | 1,000 | \$2.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320740 | removal of existing conductors | L.FT. | 1,000 | \$0.50 | \$500 |
| 7340120 | meter Pedestal cabinet | EACH | 1 | \$4,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| 7340306 | METER PEDESTAL FOUNDATION | EACH | 1 | \$1,200.00 | \$1,200 |
| 7360111 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (HORIZONTAL MOUNT) (TYPE 40L) | EACH | 2 | \$900.00 | \$1,800 |
| 7360113 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (UNDERDECK 15L) | EACH | 4 | \$1,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| 8080646 | RESET frame and cover for valve box | EACH | 2 | \$700.00 | \$1,400 |
| 8082845 | manhole (RESET Frame and cover) | EACH | 1 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500 |
| 9080084 | CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER (ALL TYPES) | L.FT. | 454 | \$20.00 | \$9,080 |
| 9080201 | CONCRETE SIDEWALK ( C -05.20) | sQ.fT. | 2,629 | \$6.00 | \$15,774 |
| 9080296 | CONCRETE SIDEWALK RAMP (ALL TYPES) | EACH | 4 | \$2,500.00 | \$10,000 |
| 9240120 | MIICELLANEOUS WORK (RELOCATED COMMUNICATIONS PEDESTAL) | EACH | 2 | \$1,000.00 | \$2,000 |
|  |  |  |  | ITEM TOTAL | \$97,172 |
| PROJECT WIDE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mobilization (10\%)Dust and Water Palliative (1\%) |  | cost |  |  | \$9,718 |
|  |  | COST |  |  | \$972 |
| Dust and Water Palliative (1\%) Quality Control (2\%) |  | COST |  |  | \$1,932 |
| Construction Surveying (2\%) |  | COST |  |  | \$1,944 |


6.2. Estimate of Future Maintenance Costs

An estimate of the additional future maintenance costs that would be the result of the additional roadway lane miles added to the freeway system was evaluated for the SR 101L Widening Preferred alternative. The additional maintenance costs are estimated to be approximately $\$ 283,795$ as shown in Table 6.7 below.

Table 6.7 - Estimate of Future Maintenance Costs

| Annual Maintenance Cost Per Lane Mile Using Latest FY Data ${ }^{\mathbf{1}}$ |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| MCL=Maintenance Cost per Lane Mile |  |
| Annual Maintenance Cost of Project at PD/DCR Phase | Metropolitan Phoenix $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{6}}$ |
| PW = Total Pavement Width | 12 |
| NL = Number of Lane Miles | 1 |
| LP = Length of Project in Miles | 9.6 |
| PMC = Current Project Maintenance Costs | $\$ 214,080$, |
| Annual Maintenance Cost of Project a Beginning of Maintenance | Metropolitan Phoenix ${ }^{\mathbf{6}}$ |
| Phase | 1.058 |
| IF = Inflation Factor | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| N = Number of Years to Maintenance Phase | $\$ 283,795$ |
| PMCI = Project Maintenance cost Including Inflation |  |

1. MAG Study - Estimated Maintenance Costs (5-year estimates in 2019 dollars) for ADOT assets in Maricopa County.
2. Miscellaneous maintenance include building and yard maintenance, work for other decisions, training, material ha
3. Mised maintenance include buiding and yard maintenance, work for other decisions, training, material handling, vegetation control and contract administration for categories not considered in the
4. For Other Speciailty tems, contact Central Maintenance
5. Total pavement width includes the main line, ramps, and shoulders.
6. Based on increase in maintenance costs of $76 \%$ over the last 10 years
7. Numbers for maintenance costs at PCA/DCR Phase and Beginning of Maintenance Phase represent an Example Project, 24 feet wide, 2 miles long
going into the maintenance phase 3 years later.
NL=PW $/ 12$
$P M C-M C L \times N L \times L P$
$P M C I=P M C \times(I F F N)$
6.3. Detailed Cost Estimates of Other Alternatives Considered

Refer to Appendix D for detailed cost estimates of the following other alternatives considered:

- Frank Lloyd Wright Improved SPUI
- Raintree Drive TDI
- Raintree DRI

7. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The current approved RTPFP programmed amount for SR 101L construction from Princess to Shea Boulevard is $\$ 88,179,293$, which is $\$ 81,154,243$ for construction, $\$ 525,050$ for right-of-way acquisitions and utility relocations, and $\$ 6,500,000$ for design.

The total estimated cost for the Recommended Alternative is $\$ 121,435,000$ which includes $\$ 114,285,000$ for construction, $\$ 650,000$ for ight-of-way acquisitions, and $\$ 6,500,000$ for design.

## 8. AASHTO Controlling Design Criteria

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Controlling Design Criteria have been reviewed for the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Controlling Design Criteria have been reviewed for the
existing roadways that will remain as a part of the proposed improvements. Existing and proposed features for each of the alternatives that do not meet current AASHTO ( 2018 Green Book) recommended guidelines are indicated below.

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Design Criteria has also been reviewed for the existing roadways which will remain as a part of the proposed improvements. Existing and proposed features for each alternative that do not meet current ADOT Roadway Design Guidelines are also indicated below.
A complete listing of the existing SR 101L features and evaluation results are presented within the Initial AASHTO Controling Criteria Report, dated December 2020. This report is included in Appendix A.
8.1. AASHTO Non-Conforming Geometric Design Elements

Non-conforming AASHTO design elements that would not be upgraded as part of this project include the following:

## SR 101L Mainline (NB and SB)

The existing median shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Princess Drive TIOP Bridge Pier (MP 36.53 to MP 36.64): $2.0^{\prime}$ less than recommended
b. Bell Road OP Bridge Pier (MP 37.03 to MP 37.17): $2.1^{\prime}$ less than recommended
b. Bell Road OP Bridge Pier (MP 37.03 to MP 37.17): $2.1^{\prime}$ ' less than recommended
c. SR 101L Southbound Overhead Sign Support (MP 37.26 to MP 37.27 ): $2.0^{\prime}$ less than recommended
c. SR $\begin{aligned} & \text { d. CAP Canal OP Bridge Pier (MP } 37.65 \text { to MP 37.71): } 0.3^{\prime} \text { less than recommended }\end{aligned}$
d. CAP Canal OP Bridge Pier (MP 37.65 to MP 37.71): 0.3' less than recommended
e. Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI OP Bridge Pier (MP 37.76 to MP 37.81): $0.3^{\prime}$ less than recommended
e. Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard Ti SP Bridge Pier (MP 37.76 to MP 37.81): $0.3^{\prime}$ less than recommended
f. SR 101L Southbound Overhead Sign Support (MP 38.27 to MP 38.28): $2.0^{\prime}$ less than recommended
g. Raintree Drive TI UP Bridge Pier (MP 38.56 to MP 38.59): $1.9^{\prime}$ less than recommended
g. Raintree Drive TouP Bridge Pier (MP 38.56 to MP 38.59): 1.9 ' less than recommended
h. SR 101L Northbound Overhead Sign Support (MP 38.98 to MP 38.99): $2.0^{\prime}$ less than recommended
h. SR 101L Northbound Overhead Sign Support (MP 38.98 to MP 38.99): $2.00^{\prime}$ less than rec
i. Thunderbird Road UP Bridge Pier (MP 39.03 to MP 39.05): $1.9^{\prime}$ less than recommended
j. Sweetwater Avenue Pedestrian UP Bridge Pier (MP 39.54 to MP 39.55 ): $1.9^{\prime}$ less than recommended k. Cactus Road TI UP Bridge Pier (MP 40.06 to MP 40.09): $1.9^{\prime}$ less than recommended
I. SR 101L Northbound Overhead Sign Support (MP 40.12 to MP 40.14): $2.0^{\prime}$ less than recommended
m. SR 101L Southbound Overhead Sign Support (MP 40.93 to MP 40.94): $2.0^{\prime}$ less than recommended
n. Shea Boulevard TI UP Bridge Pier (MP 41.04 to MP 41.08): $1.9^{\prime}$ less than recommended

The proposed outside shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. MP 40.57 to MP 40.65 (SR 101L SB): $0.0^{\prime}$ to $9.0^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing superelevation is less than the AASHTO recommended at the following locations:
a. MP 36.54 to MP 37.21 (SR 101L SB): $0.001 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ less than $0.030 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}^{* *}$
b. MP 36.54 to MP 37.04 (SR 101L NB): $0.001 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ less than $0.030 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft} * *$
c. MP 37.04 to MP 37.16 (SR 101L NB): $0.001 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ less than $0.036 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft**}$

## Princess Drive ramp C:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $27^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $2+48$ to Station $6+85$ : $3^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended 27 ' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $16+85$ to Station $29+17$ : $3^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $2+48$ to Station $6+85: 6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 10 ' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $16+85$ to Station $24+32: 5^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Princess Drive ramp D:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $25^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+00$ to Station $4+25$ : $1^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $25^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $14+25$ to Station $31+33$ : $1^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 6 ' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+00$ to Station $4+25: 4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $6^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $14+25$ to Station $31+33$ : $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 10 ' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $3+53$ to Station $4+25$ : $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 10 ' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $14+25$ to Station $24+89: 4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard Ramp A:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $26^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $23+00$ to Station $27+49: 2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $26^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $20+17$ to Station $33+00: 2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $6^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $23+00$ to Station $27+49$ : $4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 6 ' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $20+17$ to Station $33+00: 4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $23+00$ to Station $23+48: 6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $25+68$ to Station $33+00$ : $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard Ramp B:

The proposed ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended 18 ' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $9+35$ to Station $27+09$ : $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station 17+09 to Station 17+98: $1^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $14+32$ to Station $27+09$ : $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard Ramp D:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $26^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+00$ to Station 4+59: $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $28^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $14+59$ to Station $30+70$ : $4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 6 ' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+00$ to Station 4+59: $4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $6^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $14+59$ to Station $30+70$ : $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations: a. Station $14+59$ to Station $24+33$ : $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Raintree Drive Ramp A-1:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $32^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+95$ to Station $2+05$ : $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing inside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $2^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+00$ to Station 2+56: $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $2^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+95$ to Station 2+05: $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Raintree Drive Ramp B-1:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended 32' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+64$ to Station 2+04: $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing inside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $2^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+00$ to Station 2+61: $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 2 ' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+64$ to Station 2+04: $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Raintree Drive Ramp C-1:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $32^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $3+14$ to Station $4+28$ : $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 2 ' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $3+14$ to Station 4+28: $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Raintree Drive Ramp D-1:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended 32' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $2+35$ to Station $3+75$ : $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing inside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $2^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $1+82$ to Station 4+73: $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $2^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $2+35$ to Station 3+75: $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Raintree Drive Ramp A:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended 27' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $16+30$ to Station $18+59$ : $3^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $25^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $8+67$ to Station $26+30$ : $1^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $6^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $16+30$ to Station $18+59$ : $4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $6^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $8+67$ to Station $26+30$ : $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $14+18$ to Station $26+30$ : $4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Raintree Drive Ramp D:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $26^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+00$ to Station $5+67$ : $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $26^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $15+67$ to Station $32+30$ : $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 6 ' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+00$ to Station 5+67: $4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $6^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $15+67$ to Station $32+30$ : $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $4+01$ to Station $5+67$ : $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $15+67$ to Station $25+79$ : $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Cactus Road SPUI Ramp A:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $32^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $14+87$ to Station $16+14: 6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing inside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $2^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $13+79$ to Station $16+70$ : $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Cactus Road SPUI Ramp B:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $32^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $14+51$ to Station $16+21: 8^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Cactus Road SPUI Ramp C:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $32^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $3+15$ to Station $4+84: 6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Cactus Road SPUI Ramp D:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended 32' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $2+38$ to Station 3+70: $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing inside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $2^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $1+84$ to Station 4+76: $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Cactus Road Ramp A:

The proposed ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $26^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations: a. Station $9+30$ to Station 20+70: $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 6 ' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $10+70$ to Station $13+79: 4^{\prime}$ less than recommended ${ }^{* *}$

The proposed outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $6^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $9+30$ to Station 20+70: $4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $10+70$ to Station $13+79$ : $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 10' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $14+20$ to Station 20+70: $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Cactus Road Ramp C:

The proposed combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $17+67$ to Station $25+04$ : $\mathbf{2}^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Cactus Road Ramp D:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $26^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $4+75$ to Station 7+82: $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $26^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations: a. Station $17+81$ to Station $29+25: 2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 6 ' minimum at the following locations: a. Station $4+75$ to Station $7+82$ : $4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $6^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations: a. Station $17+82$ to Station $29+25: 2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $4+75$ to Station $7+82$ : $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $17+81$ to Station $24+35$ : $4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

Shea Boulevard Ramp A-1:
The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $32^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+67$ to Station $1+35$ : 7 l less than recommended**

## Shea Boulevard Ramp B-1:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $32^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $0+56$ to Station $1+61$ : $8^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Shea Boulevard Ramp A:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $27^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations: a. Station $10+80$ to Station $14+35$ : $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $26^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations: a. Station $8+76$ to Station 20+80: $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 6 ' minimum at the following locations: a. Station $10+80$ to Station $14+35$ : $4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed outside ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended 6 ' minimum at the following locations: a. Station $8+76$ to Station $20+80$ : $2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations: a. Station $10+80$ to Station $14+35$ : $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations: a. Station $14+41$ to Station 20+80: $4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Shea Boulevard Ramp B:

The existing ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $28^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $17+43$ to Station $17+44: 4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed ramp traveled way width is less than the AASHTO recommended $26^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $10+00$ to Station $22+85: 2^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The existing combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $17+43$ to Station $17+44$ : $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed combined ramp shoulder width is less than the AASHTO recommended $10^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations: a. Station $14+65$ to Station $22+85: 5^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## 101 Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd <br> Final DCR Update

8.2. Request for AASHTO Design Exceptions

ADOT 2010 DCR requested design exceptions for the non-conforming design elements listed in Section 8.1 of this report. Design exceptions marked with ${ }^{* *}$ will be requested for the non-conforming design elements.
8.3. ADOT Non-Conforming Geometric Design Elements

Non-conforming ADOT design elements that would not be upgraded as part of this project include the following:

## Princess Drive Ramp C

The existing outside shoulder width is less than the ADOT recommended $8^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $2+48$ to Station $6+85$ : $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed outside shoulder width is less than the ADOT recommended $8^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $16+85$ to Station 29+17: $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## rank Lloyd Wright Boulevard Ramp B

The proposed outside shoulder width is less than the ADOT recommended $8^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $9+35$ to Station $27+09$ : $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

## Cactus Road Ramp C :

The proposed outside shoulder width is less than the ADOT recommended $8^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $17+67$ to Station $31+16$ : $4^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

Shea Boulevard Ramp B:
The existing outside shoulder width is less than the ADOT recommended $8^{\prime}$ minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $17+43$ to Station $17+44$ : $6^{\prime}$ less than recommended**

The proposed outside shoulder width is less than the ADOT recommended 8 ' minimum at the following locations:
a. Station $10+00$ to Station $22+85$ : $7^{\prime}$ less than recommended**
8.4. REQUEST FOR ADOT DESIGN DEVIATIONS

Design deviations will be requested for the non-conforming design elements from the ADOT DCR 2010 and marked with ** listed in Section 8.3 of this report.

101 Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd
9. SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

See ADOT 2010 DCR 2010 Section 9.0. NEPA will be updated during Design.
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## LIST OF EXISTING FEATURES REQUIRING DESIGN EXCEPTIONS

The following is a list of the existing design features requiring design exceptions based upon A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets 2018 edition.

## SR 101L MAINLINE (DIVIDED)

The existing shoulder width is less than the recommended 10' (median) as follows:

1. *MP 36.53 to MP 36.64 (Princess Drive TI OP Bridge Pier) - 2.0' less than recommended.
2. *MP 37.03 to MP 37.17 (Bell Road TI OP Bridge Pier) - 2.1' less than recommended.
3. *MP 37.26 to MP 37.27 (SB Overhead Sign Support) - 2.0' less than recommended.
4. *MP 37.65 to MP 37.71 (CAP Canal OP Bridge Pier) - 0.3 ' less than recommended.
5. *MP 37.76 to MP 37.81 (Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI OP Bridge Pier) - 0.3' less than recommended.
6. *MP 38.27 to MP 38.28 (SB Overhead Sign Support) - 2.0' less than recommended.
7. *MP 38.56 to MP 38.59 (Raintree Drive TI UP Bridge Pier) - 1.9' less than recommended.
8. *MP 38.98 to MP 38.99 (NB Overhead Sign Support) - 2.0' less than recommended.
9. *MP 39.03 to MP 39.05 (Thunderbird Road TI UP Bridge Pier) - 1.9' less than recommended.
10. *MP 39.54 to MP 39.55 (Sweetwater Avenue Pedestrian UP Bridge Pier) - 1.9' less than recommended.
11. *MP 40.06 to MP 40.09 (Cactus Road TI UP Bridge Pier) - 1.9' less than recommended.
12. *MP 40.12 to MP 40.14 (NB Overhead Sign Support) - 2.0 ' less than recommended.
13. *MP 40.93 to MP 40.94 (SB Overhead Sign Support) - 2.0' less than recommended.
14. *MP 41.04 to MP 41.08 (Shea Boulevard TI UP Bridge Pier) - 1.9' less than recommended.
*For information only, Design Exceptions were approved from project 101L MA 36 H6874 01L
The superelevation rate is less than the recommended minimum on the following horizontal curves:
15. Beginning MP 36.54 (SR 101L HPI Station 1964+83.90) - $0.001 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.
16. Beginning MP 36.54 (SR 101L NB HPI Station 1962+46.41) - $0.001 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.
17. Beginning MP 37.04 (SR 101L NB HPI Station 2110+23.08) - $0.001 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.

## SOUTHBOUND FRONTAGE ROAD

No design exceptions.

## NORTHBOUND FRONTAGE ROAD

No design exceptions.

## PRINCESS DRIVE TI

The existing traveled way width is less than the recommended minimum as follows:

1. Ramp C - Station $10+07.00$ to Station $20+13.10-2 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 15 ft recommended minimum.
2. Ramp C - Station $2+48.93$ to Station $10+07.00-3 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 27 ft recommended minimum.
3. Ramp D - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $21+71.69-1 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 25 ' recommended minimum.

The existing outside shoulder width is less than the recommended 6' as follows:

1. Ramp C - Station $2+48.93$ to Station $10+07.00-4 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.
2. Ramp D - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $21+71.69-4 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.

The existing combined shoulder width is less than the recommended 10 ' as follows:

1. Ramp C - Station $2+48.93$ to Station $10+07.00-6 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.
2. Ramp D - Station $3+53.93$ to Station $14+87.13-4 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.

## FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD TI

The existing traveled way width is less than the recommended minimum as follows:

1. Ramp A - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $27+48.67-2 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 26 ft recommended minimum.
2. Ramp D - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $20+16.89-2 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 26 ft recommended minimum.

The existing outside shoulder width is less than the recommended 6' as follows:

1. Ramp A - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $27+48.67-4$ ft less than the minimum.
2. Ramp D - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $20+16.89-4 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.

The existing combined shoulder width is less than the recommended 10 ' as follows:

1. Ramp A - Station $14+71.48$ to Station $23+48.28-6$ ft less than the minimum.
2. Ramp B - Station $4+63.20$ to Station $17+98.30-1 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.
3. Ramp D - Station $4+59.17$ to Station $14+22.31-6$ ft less than the minimum.

## RAINTREE DRIVE TI

The existing traveled way width is less than the recommended minimum as follows:

1. Ramp A - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $18+58.57-3 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 27 ft recommended minimum.
2. Ramp A-1 - Station $0+95.61$ to Station $2+04.89-2 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 32 ft recommended minimum.
3. Ramp B-1 - Station $0+64.91$ to Station $2+03.66-2 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 32 ' recommended minimum.
4. Ramp C-1 - Station $3+14.77$ to Station $4+27.53-6$ ft less than the 32 ft recommended minimum.
5. Ramp D - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $29+32.44-2 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 26 ft recommended minimum.
6. Ramp D-1 - Station $2+35.53$ to Station $3+75.33-2$ ft less than the 32 ' recommended minimum.

The existing inside shoulder width is less than the recommended 2 ' as follows:

1. Ramp A-1 - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $2+56.20-2 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.
2. Ramp B-1 - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $2+60.82-2 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.
3. Ramp D-1 - Station $1+82.84$ to Station $4+73.25-2$ ft less than the minimum.

The existing outside shoulder width is less than the recommended 6' as follows:

1. Ramp A - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $18+58.57-4 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.
2. Ramp D - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $29+32.44-4 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.

The existing outside shoulder width is less than the recommended 2' as follows:

1. Ramp A-1 - Station $0+95.61$ to Station $2+04.89-2 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.
2. Ramp B-1 - Station $0+64.91$ to Station $2+03.66-2 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.
3. Ramp C-1 - Station $3+14.77$ to Station $4+27.53-2$ ft less than the minimum.
4. Ramp D-1 - Station $2+35.53$ to Station $3+75.33-2$ ft less than the minimum.

The existing combined shoulder width is less than the recommended 10 ' as follows:

1. Ramp A - Station $4+21.26$ to Station $12+61.44-6 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.
2. Ramp D - Station $4+01.00$ to Station $14+13.39-6$ ft less than the minimum.

## CACTUS ROAD TI

The existing traveled way width is less than the recommended minimum as follows:

1. SPUI Ramp A - Station $14+87.56$ to Station $16+14.44-6 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 32 ft recommended minimum.
2. SPUI Ramp B - Station $14+51.26$ to Station $16+20.80-8 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 32 ft recommended minimum.
3. SPUI Ramp C - Station $3+15.41$ to Station $4+83.42-6 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 32 ft recommended minimum.
4. Ramp D - Station $4+75.46$ to Station $18+61.60-2$ ft less than the 26 ft recommended minimum.
5. SPUI Ramp D - Station $2+38.88$ to Station $3+69.38-6 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 32 ft recommended minimum.

The existing inside shoulder width is less than the recommended 2' as follows:

1. SPUI Ramp A - Station $13+79.33$ to Station $16+69.87-2 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.
2. SPUI Ramp D - Station $1+84.88$ to Station $4+75.46-2 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.

The existing outside shoulder width is less than the recommended 6' as follows:

1. Ramp A - Station $5+29.26$ to Station $13+79.33-4$ ft less than the minimum.
2. Ramp D - Station $4+75.46$ to Station $18+61.60-4 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.

The existing combined shoulder width is less than the recommended 10 ' as follows:

1. Ramp A - Station $4+41.85$ to Station 13+79.33-6 ft less than the minimum.
2. Ramp D - Station $4+75.46$ to Station $14+37.20-6$ ft less than the minimum.

## SHEA BOULEVARD TI

The existing traveled way width is less than the recommended minimum as follows:

1. Ramp A - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $14+35.26-2 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 27 ft recommended minimum.
2. Ramp A-1 - Station $0+67.04$ to Station $1+35.04-7 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 32 ft recommended minimum.
3. Ramp B - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $17+44.41-4 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 28 recommended minimum.
4. Ramp B-1 - Station $0+56.98$ to Station $1+60.68-8 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the 32 ft recommended minimum.

The existing outside shoulder width is less than the recommended 6' as follows:

1. Ramp A - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $14+35.26-4$ ft less than the minimum.
2. Ramp B - Station $0+00.00$ to Station $17+44.41-4 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.

The existing combined shoulder width is less than the recommended 10 ' as follows:

1. Ramp A - Station $4+99.39$ to Station $14+35.26-6$ ft less than the minimum.
2. Ramp B - Station $6+75.36$ to Station $17+44.41-4 \mathrm{ft}$ less than the minimum.

## THUNDERBIRD ROAD

No design exceptions.

## PRINCESS DRIVE

No design exceptions.

## BELL ROAD

No design exceptions.

## FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD

No design exceptions.

## RAINTREE DRIVE

No design exceptions.

## CACTUS ROAD

No design exceptions.
SHEA BOULEVARD
No design exceptions.

## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

SR 101L MAINLINE SUMMARY (DIVIDED)


REMARKS:
*DESIGN EXCEPTION REQUIRED

## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

SR 101L MAINLINE SUMMARY (DIVIDED)
(CONTINUED)
SUPERELEVATION:


## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

 SOUTHBOUND FRONTAGE ROAD

## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

 SOUTHBOUND FRONTAGE ROAD(CONTINUED)
 REMARKS:

## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

 NORTHBOUND FRONTAGE ROAD

## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

NORTHBOUND FRONTAGE ROAD
(CONTINUED)
SUPERELEVATION:
NORTHBOUND FRONTAGE ROAD EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE IS: 0.023 FT/FT
AASHTO MAXIMUM RATE IS: 0.060 FT/FT
AASHTO MINIMUM RATE IS: SEE ATTACHMENT \#1


REMARKS:

## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

 PRINCESS DRIVE TI RAMPS

DESIGN SPEED:
THE AASHTO RECOMMENDED MINIMUM DESIGN SPEED OF THE HIGHWAY IS: RAMP TERMINUS = 35 MPH ; RAMP MAIN BODY = 50 MPH ; RAMP GORE AREA = 60 MPH (FOR EXIT RAMPS) RAMP TERMINUS = 35 MPH ; RAMP MAIN BODY = 50 MPH ; RAMP GORE AREA = 55 MPH (ENTRANCE RAMPS)

| THE POSTED SPEED LIMIT IS: N/A A |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LANE WIDTH: | TRAVELED WAY |  | LANES |  |
|  | EXISTING | AASHTO | EXISTING | AASHTO |
| RAMP C (Case 2,C): | *13' | $15^{\prime}$ | 13 ' | 12' |
| RAMP C (Case 3,C): | *24' | 27 ' | $12^{\prime}$ | $12^{\prime}$ |
| RAMP D (Case 3,C): | *24' | $25^{\prime}$ | $12^{\prime}$ | 12' |

REMARKS:
*DESIGN EXCEPTION REQUIRED

## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

PRINCESS DRIVE TI RAMPS
(CONTINUED)


SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA
PRINCESS DRIVE TI RAMPS
(CONTINUED)
STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE:

| VPI StAtion | $\begin{gathered} \text { MIL } \\ \text { BEGIN } \end{gathered}$ | END | APPROACH GRADE (\%) | EPARTURE GRADE <br> (\%) | LENGTH OF CURVE (FT) | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE  <br> EXISTING REQUIRED <br> (FT) (FT) |  | EXISting SPEED (MPH) | Posted SPEED (MPH) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEE ATTACHMENT \#2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAXIMUM GR |  |  |  |  | DESCENDIN |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RAMP C EXISTING MAXIMUM GRADE: RAMP D EXISTING MAXIMUM GRADE: |  |  | 1.5201\% | -1.7692\% | ( 50 MPH ) | AASHTO MAXIMUM GRADE FOR 35 MPH IS: AASHTO MAXIMUM GRADE FOR $45+$ MPH IS: |  |  | 6.0000\% |
|  |  |  |  | 2.4661\% | -1.0739\% | ( 50 MPH ) |  |  |  | 5.0000\% |
| CROSS SLOPE: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ALL RAMPS EXISTING CROSS SLOPE IS: |  |  | 2.0\% |  |  |  | AASHTO ALLOWAbLE RANGE IS: |  | 1.5-2.0\% |
| StRUCTURE |  | MILEPOST |  | VERTICAL clearance NB/EB |  | VERTICAL clearance SB/WB |  | MINIMUM CLEARANCE |  |  |
| NO STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DESIGN LOADING STRUCTURAL CAPACITY: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROUTE No. | MILEPOST | STR. NO. AND NAME | BRIDGE LENGTH | BRIDGE ROADWAY WIDTH | BRIDGE RAIL BARRIER | AC OVERLAY | VERTICAL CLEARANCE (MINIMUM) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BRIDGE } \\ & \text { LOAD } \\ & \text { RATING } \end{aligned}$ | BRIDGE SUFFICIENCY RATING |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | No STRUCTU |  |  |  |  |

REMARKS:

## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD TI RAMPS

PROJECT NUMBER:
PROJECT LOCATION:
HIGHWAY SECTION:
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
101L MA 036 F0123D
Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Pima Freeway (SR101L)

## ROUTE: SR 101 <br> BEGINNING MP: $\quad 37.21$

ENDING MP: $\quad 38.63$

TRAFFIC VOLUMES AND FACTORS:

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD TI RAMPS
RAMP A (WESTBOUND ON-RAMP)
RAMP B (EASTBOUND OFF-RAMP)
RAMP C (WESTBOUND OFF-RAMP)
RAMP D (EASTBOUND ON-RAMP)

2019 AADT
12,300
10,500
13,700
14,300

DESIGN
2040 AADT
13,600
11,600
15,100
15,800

TRAFFIC FACTORS

| D= | T= |
| :---: | :---: |
| $100 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| $100 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| $100 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| $100 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

DESIGN SPEED:
THE AASHTO RECOMMENDED MINIMUM DESIGN SPEED OF THE HIGHWAY IS: RAMP TERMINUS = 35 MPH ; RAMP MAIN BODY $=50 \mathrm{MPH}$; RAMP GORE AREA $=60 \mathrm{MPH}$ (FOR EXIT RAMPS) RAMP TERMINUS $=35 \mathrm{MPH}$; RAMP MAIN BODY $=50 \mathrm{MPH}$; RAMP GORE AREA $=55 \mathrm{MPH}$ (ENTRANCE RAMPS)

| THE | Posted SP | D LIMIT IS | N/A |  | RAGE ELEVATION IS: | $1,510 \mathrm{FT}$ |  | TERRAIN IS: | LEVEL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LANE WIDTH: <br> (Case, Traffic Condition) | TRAVELED WAY |  | LANES |  |  | TRAVELED WAY |  | LANES |  |
|  | EXISTING | AASHTO | EXISTING | AASHTO |  | EXISting | AASHTO | EXISTING | AASHTO |
| RAMP A (Case 3,C): | *24' | $26^{\prime}$ | 12' | 12' | RAMP C (Case 2,C): | 12' | 12' | 12' | 12' |
| RAMP A-1 (Case 3,C): | (1) **29' | 32 | 12'-16' | $12^{\prime}$ | RAMP C-1 (Case 3,C): | (1) **28' | 32 | 12'-14' | $12^{\prime}$ |
| RAMP B (Case 2,C): | $14^{\prime}$ | $12^{\prime}$ | 14' | 12' | RAMP D (Case 3,C): | *24' | $26^{\prime}$ | 12' | 12' |
| RAMP B-1 (Case 3,C): | ${ }^{(1)}$ **30' | 32' | 12'-14' | 12' | RAMP D-1 (Case 3,C): | ${ }^{(1)}$ **30' | 32 | 12'-14' | $12^{\prime}$ |

${ }^{(1)}$ TWO LANE SPUI RAMP
*DESIGN EXCEPTION REQUIRED
*DESIGN EXCEPTION WILL NOT BE REQUESTED SINCE THIS TI WILL BE RECONSTRUCTED AS A TIGHT DIAMOND

| SHOULDER WIDTH: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | INSIDE SHOULDER |  | OUTSIDE SHOULDER |  | UNIFORM SHOULDER WIDTH |  |  | COMBINED SHOULDER WIDTH |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Existing | AASHTO | EXISting | AASHTO |  |  |  |  | $\underset{* 4^{\prime}}{\text { EXISTING }}$ | AASHTO |  |
|  |  | RAMP A: | $2 '$ | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ | *2' | $6^{\prime}$ - 10' |  | YES |  |  |  | 10' - 14' |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP A-1: | **0' | $2^{\prime}$ - ${ }^{\prime}$ | 2 ' | 2' - $\mathbf{'}^{\prime}$ |  | YES |  |  | $2 '$ | N/A |  |
|  |  | RAMP B: | $2 '$ | 2' - 4' | $7{ }^{\prime}$ | $6^{\prime}$ - 10' |  | YES |  |  | *9' | 10' - 14' |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP B-1: | **0' | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ | **0' | 2' - $\mathbf{'}^{\prime}$ |  | YES |  |  | $0{ }^{\prime}$ | N/A |  |
|  |  | RAMP C: | $2 '$ | 2' - $\mathbf{'}^{\prime}$ | $8{ }^{\prime}$ | $6^{\prime}$ - 10 |  | YES |  |  | 10' | 10' - 14' |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP C-1: | **0' | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ | $2 '$ | 2' - 4' |  | YES |  |  | $2 '$ | N/A |  |
|  |  | RAMP D: | $2 '$ | 2' - $\mathbf{'}^{\prime}$ | *2' | $6^{\prime}-10^{\prime}$ |  | YES |  |  | *4' | 10' - 14' |  |
|  |  | (1)RAMP D-1: | **0' | 2' - 4' | **0' | 2' - 4' |  | YES |  |  | $0^{\prime}$ | N/A |  |
| HORIZONTAL CURVE RADIUS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | SUPERELEVATION |  |  | EXISTING DEGREE OF CURVE | AASHTO MAX | METHOD 2 | POSTED | EXISTING | EXISTING | HORIZON | TAL SSD |
|  | MIL | OST | EXISting | AASHTO MIN | RDG MAX |  | DEGREE OF | SPEED | SPEED | HSO | GRADE | EXISTING | REQUIRED |
| HPI STATION | BEGIN | END | (FT/FT) | (FT/FT) | (FT/FT) |  | CURVE | (MPH) | (MPH) | (FT) | (\%) | (FT) | (FT) |
| SEE ATTACHMENT \#1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SUPERELEVATION:
RAMP A EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.020 FT/FT
AASHTO MAXIMUM RATE IS: 0.060 FT/FT
${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP A-1 EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: N/A
RAMP B EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.024 FT/FT
${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP B-1 EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: N/A
RAMP C EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.023 FT/FT
${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP C-1 EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: N/A
RAMP D EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.020 FT/FT
${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP D-1 EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: N/A

REMARKS:

[^5]
## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD TI RAMPS
(CONTINUED)


REMARKS:
${ }^{(1)}$ TWO LANE SPUI RAMP

SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA
RAINTREE DRIVE TI RAMPS

PROJECT NUMBER:
HIGHWAY SECTION
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

101L MA 036 F0123D
Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Pima Freeway (SR101L)
Freeway Ramps \& Turning Roadways

ROUTE: SR 101L
BEGINNING MP: 37.69
ENDING MP: 39.08

| TRAFFIC VOLUMES AND FACTORS: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EXISTING | design |  | ACTOR |  |
| RAINTREE DRIVE TI RAMPS | 2019 AADT | 2040 AADT | $\mathrm{K}=$ | D= | $\mathrm{T}=$ |
| RAMP A (WESTBOUND ON-RAMP) | 7,400 | 8,200 | 11\% | 100\% | 4\% |
| RAMP B (EASTBOUND OFF-RAMP) | 9,300 | 10,300 | 11\% | 100\% | 4\% |
| RAMP C (WESTBOUND OFF-RAMP) | 15,600 | 17,200 | 9\% | 100\% | 4\% |
| RAMP D (EASTBOUND ON-RAMP) | 14,200 | 15,700 | 11\% | 100\% | 4\% |

## DESIGN SPEED:

THE AASHTO RECOMMENDED MINIMUM DESIGN SPEED OF THE HIGHWAY IS: RAMP TERMINUS $=35 \mathrm{MPH}$; RAMP MAIN BODY $=50 \mathrm{MPH}$; RAMP GORE AREA $=60 \mathrm{MPH}$ (FOR EXIT RAMPS) RAMP TERMINUS = $35 \mathrm{MPH} ;$ RAMP MAIN BODY $=50 \mathrm{MPH} ;$ RAMP GORE AREA $=55 \mathrm{MPH}$ (ENTRANCE RAMPS)

| THE POSTED SPEED LIMIT IS: N/A |  |  |  |  | AVERAGE ELEVATION IS: $1,450 \mathrm{FT}$ |  |  | TERRAIN IS: LEVEL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LANE WIDTH: | TRAVELED WAY |  | LANES |  |  | TRAVELED WAY |  | LANES |  |
|  | EXISting | AASHTO | EXISting | AASHTO |  | EXISting | AASHTO | Existing | AASHTO |
| RAMP A (Case 3,C): | *24' | 27 ' | 12' | 12' | RAMP C (Case 2,C): | 12'-53' | $12^{\prime}$ | $12^{\prime}$ | 12' |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP A-1 (Case 3,C): | *30' | $32^{\prime}$ | 14'-16' | $12^{\prime}$ | ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP C-1 (Case 3,C): | *26' | $32^{\prime}$ | 12'-15' | $12^{\prime}$ |
| RAMP B (Case 2,C): | $12^{\prime}$ | 12 | $12^{\prime}$ | 12 | RAMP D (Case 3,C): | *24' | $26^{\prime}$ | 12' | 12 |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP B-1 (Case 3,C): | *30' | 32 | 14'-16' | 12' | ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP D-1 (Case 3,C): | *30' | $32 '$ | 14'-16' | 12' |

REMARKS:

[^6]
## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

RAINTREE DRIVE TI RAMPS
(CONTINUED)

## SHOULDER WIDTH:

|  | INSIDE SHOULDER |  | OUTSIDE SHOULDER |  | UNIFORM SHOULDER WIDTH | COMBINED SHOULDER WIDTH |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EXISTING | AASHTO | EXISTING | AASHTO |  | EXISTING | AASHTO |
| RAMP A: | $2 '$ | 2' - 4' | *2' | 6' - 10' | YES | *4' | 10' - 14' |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP A-1: | *0' | 2' - 4' | ${ }^{*} 0^{\prime}$ | 2' - $\mathbf{'}^{\prime}$ | YES | $0^{\prime}$ | N/A |
| RAMP B: | $2 '$ | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ | $8{ }^{\prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-10$ | YES | 10' | 10' - 14' |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP B-1: | *0' | 2' - 4' | *0' | 2' - 4' | YES | 0' | N/A |
| RAMP C: | $2 '$ | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ | 8' | $6^{\prime}$ - 10' | YES | $10^{\prime}$ | 10' - 14' |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP C-1: | $4 '$ | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ | *0' | 2' - 4' | YES | $4{ }^{\prime}$ | N/A |
| RAMP D: | $2 '$ | 2' $\mathbf{4}^{\prime}$ | *2' | $6^{\prime}$ - 10' | YES | *4' | 10' - 14' |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP D-1: | *0' | $2^{\prime}$ - ${ }^{\prime}$ | *0' | 2' - 4' | YES | $0^{\prime}$ | N/A |


| HORIZONTAL CURVE RADIUS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | SUPERELEVATION |  |  | EXISTING DEGREE OF CURVE | AASHTO MAX DEGREE OF CURVE | METHOD 2 <br> SPEED <br> (MPH) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { EXISTING } \\ \text { HSO } \\ \text { (FT) } \end{gathered}$ | EXISTING GRADE (\%) | HORIZONTAL SSD |  |
|  | miLEPOST |  | EXISting | AASHTO MIN | RDG MAX |  |  |  |  |  |  | EXISting | REQUIRED |
| HPI STATION | BEGIN | END | (FT/FT) | (FT/FT) | (FT/FT) |  |  |  |  |  |  | (FT) | (FT) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ATTACHMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## SUPERELEVATION:

AASHTO MAXIMUM RATE IS: 0.060 FT/FT
${ }^{1}$ RAMP A-1 EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: N/A
RAMP B EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.020
${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP B-1 EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: N/A
RAMP C EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.020 FT/FT
${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP C-1 EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: N/A
RAMP D EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.020 FT/FT
${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP D-1 EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: N/A

REMARKS:

[^7]
# SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA 

RAINTREE DRIVE TI RAMPS
(CONTINUED)


[^8]
# SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA 

CACTUS ROAD TI RAMPS

| PROJECT NUMBER: | 101L MA 036 F0123D |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT LOCATION: | Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard |
| HIGHWAY SECTION: | Pima Freeway (SR101L) |

HIGHWAY SECTION:
Pima Freeway (SR101L)
ROUTE: SR 101L
BEGINNING MP: 39.72
ENDING MP: 40.43
Freeway Ramps \& Turning Roadways

TRAFFIC VOLUMES AND FACTORS:
CACTUS ROAD TI RAMPS
RAMP A (WESTBOUND ON-RAMP)
RAMP B (EASTBOUND OFF-RAMP)
RAMP C (WESTBOUND OFF-RAMP)

| EXISTING | DESIGN |  | TRAFFIC FACTORS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 AADT | 2040 AADT | K= | D= | T= |
| 6,000 | 6,600 | $8 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| 7,400 | 8,200 | $12 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| 12,600 | 13,900 | $10 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| 8,700 | 9,600 | $9 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

DESIGN SPEED:
THE AASHTO RECOMMENDED MINIMUM DESIGN SPEED OF THE HIGHWAY IS: RAMP TERMINUS $=35 \mathrm{MPH}$; RAMP MAIN BODY $=50$ MPH; RAMP GORE AREA $=60$ MPH (FOR EXIT RAMPS) RAMP TERMINUS = $35 \mathrm{MPH} ;$ RAMP MAIN BODY $=50 \mathrm{MPH} ;$ RAMP GORE AREA $=55 \mathrm{MPH}$ (ENTRANCE RAMPS)

| THE | POSTED SP | ED LIMIT IS | N/A |  | ERAGE ELEVATION IS: | 1,400 FT |  | TERRAIN IS | LEVEL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LANE WIDTH: <br> (Case, Traffic Condition) | TRAVELED WAY |  | LANES |  |  | TRAVELED WAY |  | LANES |  |
|  | Existing | AASHTO | Existing | AASHTO |  | EXISting | AASHTO | EXISting | AASHTO |
| RAMP A (Case 3,C): | 26 | 26 ' | 12' | 12' | RAMP C (Case 3,C): | 12 | 12 | $12 '$ | 12' |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP A (Case 3,C): | *26' | 32 | 12'-13' | $12^{\prime}$ | ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP C (Case 3,C): | *26' | $32 '$ | 12'-13' | $12^{\prime}$ |
| RAMP B (Case 2,C): | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | RAMP D (Case 3,C): | *24' | $26^{\prime}$ | 12 | 12 |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP B (Case 3,C): | *24' | 32 | $12^{\prime}$ | $12^{\prime}$ | ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP D (Case 3,C): | *26' | $32^{\prime}$ | 12'-14' | $12^{\prime}$ |

REMARKS:

[^9]
## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

CACTUS ROAD TI RAMPS
(CONTINUED)
SHOULDER WIDTH:

|  | INSIDE SHOULDER |  | OUTSIDE SHOULDER |  | UNIFORM SHOULDER WIDTH |  |  | COMBINED SHOULDER WIDTH |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing | AASHTO | Existing | AASHTO |  |  |  |  | Existing | AASHTO |  |
| RAMP A: | $2^{\prime}$ | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ | *2' | $6^{\prime}$ - $10{ }^{\prime}$ |  | YES |  |  | *4' | 10' - 14' |  |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP A: | *0' | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ | 4'-6' | 2' - $\mathbf{'}^{\prime}$ |  | NO |  |  | 4'-6' | N/A |  |
| RAMP B: | $2^{\prime}$ | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ | $8^{\prime}$ | $6^{\prime}-10$ |  | YES |  |  | $10^{\prime}$ | 10' - 14' |  |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP B: | 3 ' | $2^{\prime}-4$ | $4 '$ | $2^{\prime}$ - $\mathbf{l}^{\prime}$ |  | YES |  |  | $7{ }^{\prime}$ | N/A |  |
| RAMP C: | $2 '$ | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ | $8{ }^{\prime}$ | 6' - 10' |  | YES |  |  | $10^{\prime}$ | 10' - 14' |  |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP C: | 4'-6' | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ | $2 '$ | 2' - $\mathbf{'}^{\prime}$ |  | NO |  |  | 6'-8' | N/A |  |
| RAMP D: | $2 '$ | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ | *2' | $6^{\prime}-10^{\prime}$ |  | YES |  |  | *4' | 10' - 14' |  |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP D: | *0' | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ | $3 '$ | 2' - ${ }^{\prime}$ |  | YES |  |  | $3^{\prime}$ | N/A |  |
| RADIUS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | SUPERELEVATION |  |  | Existing | AASHTO MAX | METHOD 2 | POSTED | Existing | Existing | HORIZON | TAL SSD |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { IILEPOST } \\ & \mathrm{N} \text { END } \end{aligned}$ | EXISTING <br> (FT/FT) | AASHTO MIN (FT/FT) | RDG MAX <br> (FT/FT) | DEGREE OF CURVE | DEGREE OF CURVE | SPEED <br> (MPH) | SPEED <br> (MPH) | HSO <br> (FT) | GRADE (\%) | EXISTING <br> (FT) | REQUIRED <br> (FT) |
| SEE ATTACHMENT \#1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SUPERELEVATION:
RAMP A EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.023 FT/FT
RAMP B EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.023 FT/FT RAMP C EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.023 FT/FT RAMP D EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.023 FT/FT
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# SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA 

CACTUS ROAD TI RAMPS
(CONTINUED)


SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA SHEA BOULEVARD TI RAMPS

PROJECT NUMBER:
PROJECT LOCATION:
HIGHWAY SECTION:
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION:

101L MA 036 F0123D
Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Pima Freeway (SR101L)
Freeway Ramps \& Turning Roadways

ROUTE: SR 101L
BEGINNING MP: 40.64
ENDING MP: 41.49

TRAFFIC VOLUMES AND FACTORS:
SHEA BOULEVARD TI RAMPS
RAMP A (WESTBOUND ON-RAMP)
RAMP B (EASTBOUND OFF-RAMP)

| EXISTING | DESIGN |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2019 AADT | 2040 AADT |
| 19,900 | 22,000 |
| 17,500 | 19,300 |


| TRAFFIC FACTORS |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| D= | $\mathbf{T}=$ |
| $100 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| $100 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

DESIGN SPEED:
THE AASHTO RECOMMENDED MINIMUM DESIGN SPEED OF THE HIGHWAY IS: RAMP TERMINUS = $35 \mathrm{MPH} ;$ RAMP MAIN BODY = 50 MPH ; RAMP GORE AREA = 60 MPH (FOR EXIT RAMPS RAMP TERMINUS = 35 MPH ; RAMP MAIN BODY $=50 \mathrm{MPH}$; RAMP GORE AREA $=55 \mathrm{MPH}$ (ENTRANCE RAMPS)

| THE POSTED SPEED LIMIT IS: N/A |  |  |  |  | AVERAGE ELEVATION IS: | 1,365 FT |  | TERRAIN IS: | LEVEL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LANE WIDTH: | TRAVELED WAY |  | LANES |  |  | TRAVELED WAY |  | LANES |  |
|  | EXISTING | AASHTO | EXISting | AASHTO |  | EXISting | AASHTO | EXISting | AASHTO |
| RAMP A (Case 3,C): | *25' | 27' | 12'-13' | 12' | RAMP B (Case 3,C): | *24' | 28' | 12' | 12' |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP A-1 (Case 3,C): | ${ }^{(1)} * 25^{\prime}$ | 32' | 12'-13' | 12 | ${ }^{(1)}$ RAMP B-1 (Case 3,C): | ${ }^{(1)} * 24$ | $32 '$ | $12 '$ | $12 '$ |
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## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

SHEA BOULEVARD TI RAMPS
(CONTINUED)
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# SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA 

 SHEA BOULEVARD TI RAMPS(CONTINUED)


## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

 THUNDERBIRD ROAD CROSSROAD
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# SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA 

THUNDERBIRD ROAD CROSSROAD
(CONTINUED)
SUPERELEVATION:

| STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VPI STATION | $\begin{array}{r} \text { M } \\ \text { BEGIN } \end{array}$ | END | APPROACH GRADE (\%) | DEPARTURE GRADE (\%) | LENGTH OF CURVE (FT) | STOPPING S EXISTING (FT) | HT DISTANCE REQUIRED (FT) | EXISTING <br> SPEED <br> (MPH) | POSTED SPEED (MPH) |  |
| SEE ATTACHMENT \#2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAXIMUM GRADE: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| THUNDERBIRD RD EXISTING MAXIMUM GRADE: |  |  |  |  | 0.5390\% |  |  | AASHTO MAXIMUM GRADE IS: |  | 8.0000\% |
| CROSS SLOPE: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| THUNDERBIRD RD EXISTING CROSS SLOPE IS: |  |  |  | 2.0\% |  |  |  | AASHTO ALLOWABLE RANGE IS: $1.5 \%-3.0 \%$ |  |  |
| STRUCTURE |  | MILEPOST |  |  | ICAL <br> RANCE <br> /EB | VERTICAL |  | MINIMUM |  |  |
| NO STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DESIGN LOADING STRUCTURAL CAPACITY: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ROUTE NO. | MILEPOST | STR. NO. <br> AND <br> NAME | BRIDGE <br> LENGTH | BRIDGE <br> ROADWAY <br> WIDTH | BRIDGE RAIL/ <br> BARRIER | AC OVERLAY | VERTICAL CLEARANCE (MINIMUM) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BRIDGE } \\ & \text { SUFFICIENCY } \\ & \text { RATING } \end{aligned}$ |
| NO STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

REMARKS:

## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

## PRINCESS DR, BELL RD, FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BLVD, RAINTREE DR, \& CACTUS RD CROSSROADS



| LANE WIDTH: |  | LANES |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | EXISTING |  |
|  |  | AASHTO |  |
|  | PRINCESS DR: | $10.5^{\prime}-12^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ |
| BRELL RD: | $12^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ |  |
| FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BLVD: | $12^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ |  |
| RAINTREE DR: | $12^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ |  |
| CACTUS RD: | $12^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ |  |

[^14]
## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

PRINCESS DR, BELL RD, FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BLVD, RAINTREE DR, \& CACTUS RD CROSSROADS (CONTINUED)

| SHOULDER WIDTH: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INSIDE SHOULDER |  | OUTSIDE SHOULDER |  |
|  | EXISTING | AASHTO | EXISTING | AASHTO |
| PRINCESS DR: | $0^{\prime}$ | N/A | ${ }^{(1)} 5{ }^{\prime}$ | N/A |
| BELL RD: | $0^{\prime}$ | N/A | ${ }^{(2)} 6{ }^{\prime}$ | N/A |
| FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BLVD: | $0^{\prime}$ | N/A | $6{ }^{\prime}$ | N/A |
| RAINTREE DR: | $0^{\prime}$ | N/A | ${ }^{(2)} 6^{\prime}$ | N/A |
| CACTUS RD: | $0^{\prime}$ | N/A | ${ }^{(2)} 6$ ' | N/A |


| HORIZONTAL CURVE RADIUS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MILEPOST |  | SUPERELEVATION |  |  | DEGREE OF CURVE | AASHTO MAX DEGREE OF CURVE | METHOD 2 SPEED (MPH) | POSTED <br> SPEED <br> (MPH) | $\begin{gathered} \text { EXISTING } \\ \text { HSO } \\ \text { (FT) } \end{gathered}$ | EXISTING GRADE (\%) | HORIZONTAL SSD |  |
|  |  |  | EXISTING <br> (FT/FT) | AASHTO MIN (FT/FT) | RDG MAX <br> (FT/FT) |  |  |  |  |  |  | EXISTING | REQUIRED |
| HPI STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (FT) | (FT) |
| SEE ATTACHMENT \#1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SUPERELEVATION:
PRINCESS DR EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.020 FT/FT BELL RD EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.020 FT/FT FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BLVD EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.020 FT/FT RAINTREE DR EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.020 FT/FT CACTUS RD EXISTING MAXIMUM RATE: 0.020 FT/FT

| AASHTO MAXIMUM RATE IS: | N/A |
| :--- | :--- |
| AASHTO MAXIMUM RATE IS: | N/A |
| AASHTO MAXIMUM RATE IS: | N/A |
| AASHTO MAXIMUM RATE IS: | N/A |
| AASHTO MAXIMUM RATE IS: | N/A |

REMARKS:
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## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

PRINCESS DR, BELL RD, FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BLVD, RAINTREE DR, \& CACTUS RD CROSSROADS (CONTINUED)

## STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE:

| VPI STATION | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { MILEPOST } \\ \text { BEGIN } & \\ \text { END } \end{array}$ | APPROACH GRADE (\%) | DEPARTURE GRADE (\%) | LENGTH OF CURVE (FT) | STOPPING EXISTING (FT) | HT DISTANCE REQUIRED (FT) | existing SPEED (MPH) | POSTED SPEED (MPH) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEE ATTACHMENT \#2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAXIMUM GRADE: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PRINCESS | EXISTING MA | YIMUM GRADE: | 1.7576\% |  |  | AASHTO M | M GRADE IS: | 6.0000\% |
|  | BELL | EXISTING MA | IIMUM GRADE: | 0.4000\% |  |  | AASHTO M | M GRADE IS: | 6.0000\% |
|  | FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT B | Existing ma | IIMUM GRADE: | 1.2482\% |  |  | AASHTO M | M GRADE IS: | 6.0000\% |
|  | RAINTREE | EXISTING MA | IIMUM GRADE: | 1.2940\% |  |  | AASHTO M | M GRADE IS: | 6.0000\% |
|  | CACTUS | EXISTING MA | IIMUM GRADE: | 0.6833\% |  |  | AASHTO M | M GRADE IS: | 6.0000\% |
| CROSS SLOPE: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PRINCES | Existing CR | OSS SLOPE IS: | 2.0\% |  |  | AASHTO ALLO | E RANGE IS: | 1.5\%-3.0\% |
|  | BEL | Existing CR | OSS SLOPE IS: | 2.0\% |  |  | AASHTO ALLO | RANGE IS: | 1.5\% - $3.0 \%$ |
|  | FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT | Existing CR | OSS SLOPE IS: | 2.0\% |  |  | AASHTO ALLO | E RANGE IS: | 1.5\% - $3.0 \%$ |
|  | RAINTRE | Existing CR | OSS SLOPE IS: | 2.0\% |  |  | AASHTO ALLO | E RANGE IS: | 1.5\%-3.0\% |
|  | CACTU | Existing CR | OSS SLOPE IS: | 2.0\% |  |  | AASHTO ALLO | ERANGE IS: | 1.5\% - $3.0 \%$ |

REMARKS:

## SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA

PRINCESS DR, BELL RD, FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BLVD, RAINTREE DR, \& CACTUS RD CROSSROADS (CONTINUED)


SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA
SHEA BOULEVARD CROSSROAD


REMARKS:

SUMMARY OF AASHTO CONTROLLING DESIGN CRITERIA
SHEA BOULEVARD CROSSROAD
(CONTINUED)


REMARKS:

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> SR 101L MAINLINE (DIVIDED)

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade(\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 1964+83.90 | 35.71 | 37.21 | *0.029 | 0.030 | 0.06 | $1^{\circ}$-00'-00" | $3^{\circ}-27{ }^{\prime}$ | 89 | 65 | 14.84 | -2.0302 | 825 | 669 |
| 2161+56.43 | 37.97 | 38.18 | 0.020 | 0.016 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-29 '-56 "$ | $3^{\circ}-27^{\prime}$ | >100 | 65 | 16.45 | -2.584 | 1229 | 676 |
| 2188+11.92 | 38.47 | 38.69 | 0.020 | 0.016 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-29 '-56 "$ | $3^{\circ}-27^{\prime}$ | >100 | 65 | 16.86 | -2.584 | 1245 | 676 |
| 2309+75.98 | 40.77 | 40.99 | 0.025 | 0.024 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-45^{\prime}-33 "$ | $3^{\circ}-27^{\prime}$ | 94 | 65 | 16.11 | -1.2604 | 986 | 659 |
| 2329+69.02 | 41.19 | 41.33 | 0.042 | 0.040 | 0.06 | $1^{\circ}-27^{\prime}-19{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $3^{\circ}-27^{\prime}$ | 83 | 65 | 19.26 | -1.2604 | 779 | 659 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Meaning Of Symbols:
Requires a design exception
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> SR 101L NORTHBOUND MAINLINE (DIVIDED)

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade <br> (\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 1962+46.41 | 33.68 | 37.04 | *0.029 | 0.030 | 0.06 | 0-59'-29" | $3^{\circ}-27^{\prime}$ | 89 | 65 | 17 | 1.1250 | 887 | 631 |
| 2110+23.08 | 37.04 | 37.16 | *0.035 | 0.036 | 0.06 | $1^{\circ}-16{ }^{\prime}-51{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $3^{\circ}-27^{\prime}$ | 84 | 65 | 14.5 | 1.125 | 721 | 631 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Meaning Of Symbols:
Requires a design exception
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both - \& + grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> SOUTHBOUND FRONTAGE ROAD

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO | Grade <br> (\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (t) | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted | (ft) |  | Existing | Required |
| 51+00.71 | 36.63 | 37.22 | 0.020 | 0.019 | 0.06 | 0-58'-13" | $6^{\circ}-53 '$ | 87 | 50 | 7.68 | -1.4396 | 602 | 434 |
| 110+59.17 | 37.94 | 38.21 | 0.020 | 0.015 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-26{ }^{\prime}-12{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | >100 | 50 | 7.78 | -2.0000 | 904 | 438 |
| $137+26.14$ | 38.54 | 38.62 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.027 | 0.06 | $1^{\circ}-27^{\prime}-19{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 78 | 50 | 8.63 | -1.0200 | 521 | 431 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(1)

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> NORTHBOUND FRONTAGE ROAD

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade <br> (\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 52+30.14 | 36.77 | 37.09 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.023$ | 0.027 | 0.06 | 1-27'-19" | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 79 | 50 | 7.83 | -2.0063 | 497 | 438 |
| $113+17.63$ | 38.02 | 38.12 | 0.020 | 0.019 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-58{ }^{\prime}-13{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 87 | 50 | 20.47 | -2.0000 | 984 | 438 |
| $138+76.96$ | 38.54 | 38.58 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.027 | 0.06 | $1^{\circ}-27{ }^{\prime}-1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 78 | 50 | 8.22 | -1.0156 | 509 | 431 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Meaning Of Symbols:
Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> PRINCESS DRIVE RAMP C

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade(\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 7+29.71 | 36.70 | 37.08 | 0.027 | 0.027 | 0.06 | 1-27'-19" | $6^{\circ}-53 '$ | 80 | 50 | 8.23 | 1.7692 | 509 | 412 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY PRINCESS DRIVE RAMP D

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

|  | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade <br> (\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (f) | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| $13+23.17$ | 36.69 | 37.02 | 0.027 | 0.027 | 0.06 | $1^{\circ}-27$-19" | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 80 | 50 | 7.93 | 2.4661 | 500 | 407 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD RAMP A

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade(\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 17+95.95 | 37.46 | 37.53 | 0.020 | 0.019 | 0.06 | 0-58'-13" | $6^{\circ}-53 '$ | 87 | 50 | 6.79 | -0.4001 | 566 | 426 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD RAMP A-1

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grade } \\ \hline \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 1+53.58 | 37.74 | 37.78 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.043 | 0.06 | 23º-17'-06" | $70^{\circ}-54^{\prime}$ | 29 | 20 | 9.33 | -0.4001 | 136 | 112 |
| $3+56.66$ | 37.78 | 37.79 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.039 | 0.06 | 17º-27'-50" | $70^{\circ}-54^{\prime}$ | 32 | 20 | 19.63 | -0.4001 | 228 | 112 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD RAMP B

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { HPI Station } \\ \text { (ft) } \end{array}$ | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { HSO } \\ \hline(\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Grade } \\ \hline(\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 8+18.95 | 37.35 | 37.41 | 0.024 | 0.023 | 0.06 | $1^{\circ}-09^{\prime}-51^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 84 | 50 | 5.58 | , 959 | 1184 | 438 |
| 14+22.23 | 37.46 | 37.53 | 0.020 | 0.019 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-58^{\prime}-13^{\prime \prime}$ | -53 | 87 | 50 | 11.28 | -3.6088 | 730 | 451 |
| 19+95.28 | 37.57 | 37.64 | 0.020 | 0.019 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-58^{\prime}-13^{\prime \prime}$ | -53' | 87 | 50 | 7.36 | -0.5001 | 590 | 427 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both - \& + grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD RAMP B-1

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Grade } \\ \hline \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 1+22.76 | 37.74 | 37.78 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.043 | 0.06 | 23 ${ }^{\circ}$-17'-06" | $70^{\circ}-54^{\prime}$ | 29 | 20 | 15.48 | -0.4001 | 175 | 112 |
| $3+73.04$ | 37.78 | 37.79 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.036 | 0.06 | 13-26'-01" | $70^{\circ}-54 '$ | 36 | 20 | 22.07 | -0.4001 | 276 | 112 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD RAMP C

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

|  | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Grade } \\ \hline \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (t) | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | ethod 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 2+57.84 | 38.26 | 39.36 | 0.020 | 0.019 | 0.06 | 0-58'-13" | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 87 | 50 | 7.97 | -4.0000 | 614 | 454 |
| 15+77.71 | 38.47 | 38.66 | 0.023 | 0.019 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-58 '-13 "$ | $6^{\circ}-53 '$ | 88 | 50 | 17.04 | -4.0000 | 897 | 454 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD RAMP C-1

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade(\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 1+48.59 | 37.78 | 37.80 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.036 | 0.06 | 13$-26{ }^{\prime}-01^{\prime \prime}$ | $70^{\circ}-54^{\prime}$ | 36 | 20 | 23.35 | 6.69 | 284 | 106 |
| $3+95.65$ | 37.80 | 37.84 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.043 | 0.06 | 23º-17'-06" | 70-54' | 29 | 20 | 13.72 | -0.4001 | 165 | 112 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD RAMP D-1

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade(\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 0+84.73 | 37.79 | 37.80 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.039 | 0.06 | 17º-27'-50" | $70^{\circ}-54^{\prime}$ | 32 | 20 | 9.93 | -0.4001 | 162 | 112 |
| $3+09.20$ | 37.80 | 37.84 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.043 | 0.06 | 23º-17'-06" | 70-54' | 29 | 20 | 21.58 | -0.4001 | 208 | 112 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> RAINTREE DRIVE RAMP A

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grade } \\ \hline(\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| $1+50.00$ | 37.74 | 37.80 | 0.020 | 0.019 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-58 '-13 "$ | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 87 | 50 | 13.77 | -1.8335 | 807 | 437 |
| $16+72.17$ | 38.02 | 38.09 | 0.020 | 0.019 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-58 '-13 "$ | $6^{\circ}-53 '$ | 87 | 50 | 8.14 | -3.8515 | 620 | 453 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> RAINTREE DRIVE RAMP A-1

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Grade } \\ \hline \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 0+75.32 | 38.53 | 38.55 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.043 | 0.06 | 23º-17'-06" | $70^{\circ}-54 '$ | 29 | 20 | 9.54 | -0.4202 | 137 | 112 |
| $3+04.31$ | 38.55 | 38.58 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.039 | 0.06 | 17º-27'-50" | $70^{\circ}-54^{\prime}$ | 32 | 20 | 9.67 | -0.4202 | 160 | 112 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets therrequirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY RAINTREE DRIVE RAMP B

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade(\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 2+01.70 | 37.75 | 37.82 | 0.020 | 0.019 | 0.06 | 0-58'-13" | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 87 | 50 | 13.88 | -4.0653 | 810 | 455 |
| 19+35.23 | 38.07 | 38.16 | 0.020 | 0.015 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-26$ '-12" | $6^{\circ}-53 '$ | >100 | 50 | 14.18 | -1.0851 | 1220 | 431 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> RAINTREE DRIVE RAMP B-1

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Grade } \\ \hline(\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 1+24.15 | 38.53 | 38.57 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.045 | 0.06 | 24 ${ }^{\circ}-56^{\prime}-54{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $70^{\circ}-54^{\prime}$ | 28 | 20 | 9.71 | -0.4202 | 134 | 112 |
| $3+80.05$ | 38.57 | 38.58 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.036 | 0.06 | 13-26'-01" | $70^{\circ}-54 '$ | 36 | 20 | 10.16 | -0.4202 | 187 | 112 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> RAINTREE DRIVE RAMP C

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grade } \\ \hline(\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 0+86.00 | 38.58 | 38.61 | 0.020 | 0.016 | 0.06 | 1-27'-19" | $16^{\circ}-50$ | 78 | 35 | 19.78 | -1.0155 | 790 | 250 |
| $5+52.41$ | 38.65 | 38.72 | 0.020 | 0.019 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-58 '-13 "$ | $6^{\circ}-53 '$ | 87 | 50 | 9.07 | -3.0600 | 655 | 446 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> RAINTREE DRIVE RAMP C-1

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Grade } \\ \hline(\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 1+55.65 | 38.57 | 38.59 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.036 | 0.06 | 13-26'-01" | $70^{\circ}-54 '$ | 36 | 20 | 9.74 | -0.4202 | 183 | 112 |
| $3+98.41$ | 38.59 | 38.62 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.046 | 0.06 | 26º ${ }^{\circ} 2^{\prime}-02^{\prime \prime}$ | $70^{\circ}-54^{\prime}$ | 27 | 20 | 9.74 | -0.4202 | 129 | 112 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> RAINTREE DRIVE RAMP D

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade(\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| $11+96.82$ | 38.83 | 38.90 | 0.020 | 0.019 | 0.06 | 0-58'-13" | $6^{\circ}-53 '$ | 87 | 50 | 9.71 | -4.0000 | 677 | 454 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> RAINTREE DRIVE RAMP D-1

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade(\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 1+89.82 | 38.58 | 38.61 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.039 | 0.06 | 17º-27'-50" | $70^{\circ}-54^{\prime}$ | 32 | 20 | 9.75 | -0.4202 | 160 | 112 |
| 4+10.23 | 38.61 | 38.63 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.043 | 0.06 | 23º-17'-06" | 70-54' | 29 | 20 | 10.33 | -0.4202 | 143 | 112 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY CACTUS ROAD RAMP A

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO | Grade <br> (\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (t) | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted | (ft) |  | Existing | Required |
| 3+21.94 | 39.76 | 39.98 | 0.023 | 0.019 | 0.06 | 0-58'-13" | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 88 | 50 | 9.62 | -1.2089 | 674 | 432 |
| 15+02.13 | 40.02 | 40.06 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.010$ | 0.043 | 0.06 | 23 ${ }^{\circ}-17^{\prime}-06 "$ | $70^{\circ}-54 '$ | 28 | 20 | 9.41 | 1.1600 | 137 | 111 |
| 17+37.17 | 40.06 | 40.08 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.010$ | 0.039 | 0.06 | 17*$-27^{\prime}-50 "$ | $70^{\circ}-54$ | 32 | 20 | 10.08 | 1.160 | 163 | 111 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY CACTUS ROAD RAMP B

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO | Grade <br> (\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (t) | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted | (ft) |  | Existing | Required |
| 2+96.24 | 39.76 | 39.87 | 0.023 | 0.019 | 0.06 | 0-58'-13" | $6^{\circ}-53 '$ | 88 | 50 | 13.71 | -1.2089 | 805 | 432 |
| 15+00.55 | 40.02 | 40.06 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.010$ | 0.043 | 0.06 | 23 ${ }^{\circ}-17^{\prime}-06 "$ | $70^{\circ}-54{ }^{\prime}$ | 28 | 20 | 9.33 | 1.3401 | 136 | 110 |
| 17+76.73 | 40.06 | 40.08 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.010$ | 0.036 | 0.06 | 13$-26^{\prime}-01^{\prime \prime}$ | $70^{\circ}-54$ | 35 | 20 | 9.88 | 1.3401 | 184 | 110 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Meaning Of Symbols:
Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY CACTUS ROAD RAMP C

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO | Grade(\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted | (ft) |  | Existing | Required |
| 1+74.11 | 40.07 | 40.10 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.010$ | 0.036 | 0.06 | 13-26'-01" | $70^{\circ}-54 '$ | 35 | 20 | 9.79 | -1.1995 | 183 | 113 |
| $4+48.71$ | 40.10 | 40.13 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.010$ | 0.043 | 0.06 | 23 ${ }^{\circ}-17^{\prime}-06{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $70^{\circ}-54$ | 28 | 20 | 9.74 | -2.5753 | 139 | 115 |
| 16+39.87 | 40.28 | 40.40 | 0.023 | 0.019 | 0.06 | 0-58'-13" | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 88 | 50 | 14.35 | -0.2496 | 824 | 425 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY CACTUS ROAD RAMP D

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO | Grade (\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (f) | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted | (ft) |  | Existing | Required |
| 1+30.57 | 40.08 | 40.10 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.010$ | 0.039 | 0.06 | 17º-27'-50" | $70^{\circ}-54{ }^{\prime}$ | 32 | 20 | 10.09 | -1.2598 | 163 | 113 |
| $3+70.79$ | 40.10 | 40.13 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.010$ | 0.043 | 0.06 | 23-17'-06" | $70^{\circ}-54$ | 28 | 20 | 10.35 | -2.4528 | 143 | 115 |
| $15+42.47$ | 40.27 | 40.40 | 0.023 | 0.019 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-58{ }^{\prime}-13^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 88 | 50 | 8.98 | -0.2501 | 651 | 425 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> SHEA BOULEVARD RAMP A

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grade } \\ \hline(\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| $3+84.17$ | 40.74 | 40.89 | 0.028 | 0.023 | 0.06 | $1^{\circ}-09^{\prime}-51^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 85 | 50 | 8.54 | 1.9999 | 580 | 410 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> SHEA BOULEVARD RAMP A-1

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade(\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 1+07.74 | 41.03 | 41.06 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.049 | 0.06 | $31^{\circ}-45^{\prime}-08$ | $70^{\circ}-54 '$ | 26 | 20 | 8.7 | -0.8300 | 113 | 113 |
| $2+68.81$ | 41.06 | 41.06 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.041 | 0.06 | 19²-24'-15' | $70^{\circ}-54 '$ | 31 | 20 | 10 | -0.8300 | 154 | 113 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> SHEA BOULEVARD RAMP B

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade(\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 2+86.42 | 40.55 | 40.66 | 0.020 | 0.015 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-41^{\prime}-55^{\prime \prime}$ | $6^{\circ}-53^{\prime}$ | 94 | 50 | 5.72 | -0.6805 | 613 | 428 |
| $16+43.10$ | 40.74 | 40.98 | 0.020 | 0.020 | 0.06 | $0^{\circ}-59^{\prime}-53 "$ | $6^{\circ}-53 '$ | 87 | 50 | 9.82 | 2.3420 | 672 | 408 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> SHEA BOULEVARD RAMP B-1

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

| HPI Station <br> (ft) | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | Grade(\%) | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 1+03.07 | 41.02 | 41.05 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.046 | 0.06 | 27º-17'-14" | $70^{\circ}-54^{\prime}$ | 27 | 20 | 9.02 | -0.8300 | 124 | 113 |
| $3+12.93$ | 41.05 | 41.07 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.038 | 0.06 | 15º-52'-34" | 70-54' | 33 | 20 | 9.02 | -0.8300 | 162 | 113 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY <br> FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BOULEVARD

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

|  | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Grade } \\ \hline(\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (f) | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| $26+25.44$ | 37.79 | 37.73 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.056 | 0.06 | $3^{\circ}-06^{\prime}-17{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $4^{\circ}-18^{\prime}$ | 62 | 60 | 28 | -1.2482 | 644 | 578 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY CACTUS ROAD

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

|  | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grade } \\ \hline \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(\mathrm{ft}$ | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| 16+04.78 | 40.07 | 40.08 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.048 | 0.06 | $4^{\circ}-21^{\prime}-57^{\prime \prime}$ | $8^{\circ}-55^{\prime}$ | 55 | 45 | 24.63 | -0.4673 | 509 | 362 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13.
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY RAINTREE DRIVE

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

|  | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Grade } \\ \hline(\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (ft) | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| $15+14.71$ | 38.56 | 38.58 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.051 | 0.06 | $3^{\circ}-10^{\prime}-59$ | $5^{\circ}-24^{\prime}$ | 61 | 55 | 19.84 | -0.4202 | 535 | 496 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

## ATTACHMENT 1 - HORIZONTAL CURVE INVENTORY SHEA BOULEVARD

Project Name: SR 101L; Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard Project No: 101L MA 036 F0123D

|  | Milepost |  | Superelevation (ft/ft) |  |  | Degree Of Curve |  | Speed (mph) |  | HSO <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Grade } \\ \hline(\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Horizontal SSD (ft) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (t) | Begin | End | Existing | AASHTO Min | RDG Max | Existing | AASHTO Max | Method 2 | Posted |  |  | Existing | Required |
| $14+52.40$ | 41.07 | 41.06 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.023 | 0.06 | $1^{\circ}-001-00 "$ | $5^{\circ}-24^{\prime}$ | 86 | 55 | 7 | -0.8300 | 566 | 499 |
| $27+26.45$ | 41.06 | 41.05 | ${ }^{(1)} 0.020$ | 0.026 | 0.06 | $1^{\circ}-08^{\prime}-43^{\prime \prime}$ | $5^{\circ}-24^{\prime}$ | 84 | 55 | 13.19 | -0.0900 | 727 | 493 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Meaning Of Symbols:

Existing condition meets the requirements within AASHTO 2018 Section 3.3.6.2 and Table 3-13
Note:
AASHTO Minimum superelevation derived from Method 5 to meet posted speed.
Roadway Engineering Design Guidelines (RDG) Maximum is based on elevation (See RDG Table 202.1A).
Input grade with respect to traffic for inside lane of curve; if both $-\&+$ grades within the curve, choose the negative grade;
if all negative grades, choose the largest negative grade; if all positive grades, choose the smallest positive grade.
(See Help file under Help Topics/Approach Grade)
HSO = Horizontal Sightline Offset

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY - URBAN


## Notes:

Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY - URBAN

| $\begin{gathered} \text { VPI } \\ \text { STATION } \end{gathered}$ | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFICDIRECTION(1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { AASHTO } \\ \text { MINIMUM (ft) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ |
| SB 101L |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1964+00-exst |  |  | 1w | 0.9747 | -1.2288 | 1000 | Crest | 990 | 659 | 83 | 65 |
| 2108+59.58-exst |  |  | 1w | -1.2288 | -2.0298 | 1312.34 | Crest | 2003 | 669 | +100 | 65 |
| 2125+16.40-exst |  |  | 1w | -2.0298 | -0.4001 | 787.4 | Sag | +9999 | 669 | +100 | 65 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NB 101L |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 195445.67-exst |  |  | 1 a | -0.5147 | 1.1254 | 800 | Sag | +9999 | 657 | +100 | 65 |
| 1964+00-exst |  |  | 1a | 1.1254 | -1.2546 | 1100 | Crest | 999 | 657 | 84 | 65 |
| 2109+25.20-exst |  |  | 1 a | -1.2546 | -2.0299 | 984.25 | Crest | 1884 | 630 | +100 | 65 |
| 2125+16.40-exst |  |  | 1a | -2.0298 | -0.4001 | 787.4 | Sag | +9999 | 639 | +100 | 65 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction.

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: COLLECTOR - URBAN


## Notes:

Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: COLLECTOR - URBAN


## Notes:

Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction.

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC DIRECTION (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GRADE } \\ \text { OUT } \\ \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | CURVE LENGTH (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { CURVE } \\ \text { TYPE } \end{gathered}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { AASHTO } \\ \text { MINIMUM (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | AVAILABLE $(\mathrm{mph})$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ \text { (mph) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Princess Ramp C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4+26.51-exst |  |  | 1a | -0.5499 | 1.7692 | 393.7 | Sag | 1154 | 436 | 90 | 50 |
| 10+66.27-exst |  |  | 1 a | 1.7692 | -1.5201 | 853 | Crest | 748 | 436 | 70 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GRADE } \\ \text { OUT } \\ \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | CURVE LENGTH <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { CURVE } \\ \text { TYPE } \end{gathered}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { AASHTO } \\ \text { MINIMUM (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | AVAILABLE $(\mathrm{mph})$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ \text { (mph) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Princess Ramp D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5+90.55-exst |  |  | 1w | -0.6196 | 2.4661 | 393.7 | Sag | 604 | 428 | 62 | 50 |
| 11+81.10-exst |  |  | 1w | 2.4661 | -1.0739 | 590.6 | Crest | 600 | 431 | 62 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L)
Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { GRADE } \\ \text { IN } \\ \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ |
| FLW Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21+32.55-exst |  |  | 1 a | -0.4001 | -3.4637 | 475.7 | Crest | 590 | 421 | 62 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction 1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction 2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L)
Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ |
| FLW Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9+18.64-exst |  |  | 1w | -1.9598 | -3.6088 | 524.9 | Crest | 917 | 451 | 77 | 50 |
| 13+28.74-exst |  |  | 1w | -3.6088 | -0.5001 | 393.7 | Sag | 598 | 451 | 60 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L)
Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC DIRECTION (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE IN (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { CURVE } \\ \text { TYPE } \end{gathered}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) |  | AVAILABLE $(\mathrm{mph})$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ \text { (mph) } \end{gathered}$ |
| FLW Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5+90.55-exst |  |  | 1a | -1.9995 | -4.0000 | 524.9 | Crest | 802 | 410 | 76 | 50 |
| 10+99.08-exst |  |  | 1a | -4.0000 | -1.5184 | 393.7 | Sag | 941 | 413 | 83 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction 1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction 2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L)
Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| FLW Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6+56.17-exst |  |  | 1w | -1.8999 | -4.5821 | 524.9 | Crest | 665 | 460 | 63 | 50 |
| 11+97.51-exst |  |  | 1w | -4.5821 | -1.9997 | 393.7 | Sag | 851 | 460 | 73 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction 1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction 2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Raintree Dr |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7+38.19-exst |  |  | 1 a | -1.8335 | -3.8515 | 492.1 | Crest | 781 | 411 | 75 | 50 |
| 13+94.36-exst |  |  | 1 a | -3.8515 | -1.8819 | 393.7 | Sag | 2676 | 411 | +100 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction 1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction 2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC DIRECTION (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE IN (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { CURVE } \\ \text { TYPE } \end{gathered}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) |  | AVAILABLE $(\mathrm{mph})$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ \text { (mph) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Raintree Dr |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7+21.78-exst |  |  | 1w | -1.9004 | -4.0653 | 590.6 | Crest | 794 | 455 | 70 | 50 |
| 14+59.97-exst |  |  | 1w | -4.0653 | -1.0851 | 393.7 | Sag | 639 | 455 | 62 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L)
Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC DIRECTION (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT (\%) | CURVE LENGTH <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { CURVE } \\ \text { TYPE } \end{gathered}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { AASHTO } \\ \text { MINIMUM (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | AVAILABLE $(\mathrm{mph})$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ \text { (mph) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Raintree Dr |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7+21.78-exst |  |  | 1a | -1.0155 | -3.0600 | 393.7 | Crest | 725 | 417 | 71 | 50 |
| 14+59.97-exst |  |  | 1 a | -3.0600 | -1.7496 | 393.7 | Sag | +9999 | 412 | +100 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction 1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction 2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Raintree Dr |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6+56.17-exst |  |  | 1w | -1.5681 | -4.0000 | 492.1 | Crest | 690 | 454 | 65 | 50 |
| 11+15.49-exst |  |  | 1w | -4.0000 | -1.8202 | 393.7 | Sag | 1464 | 454 | +100 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L)
Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI STATION | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AASHTO } \\ \text { MINIMUM (ft) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Cactus Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7+21.78-exst |  |  | 1 a | -1.2089 | 1.1600 | 393.7 | Sag | 1077 | 432 | 87 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction 1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction 2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L)
Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI STATION | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AASHTO } \\ \text { MINIMUM (ft) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Cactus Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7+71.00-exst |  |  | 1w | -1.4072 | 1.3401 | 393.7 | Sag | 743 | 433 | 70 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction 1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction 2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L)
Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| $\begin{gathered} \text { VPI } \\ \text { STATION } \end{gathered}$ | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AASHTO } \\ \text { MINIMUM (ft) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Cactus Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5+90.55-exst |  |  | 1 a | -1.1995 | -2.5753 | 393.7 | Crest | 981 | 415 | 85 | 50 |
| 12+13.91-exst |  |  | 1a | -2.5753 | -0.2496 | 393.7 | Sag | 1143 | 422 | 92 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L)
Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Cactus Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5+24.93-exst |  |  | 1w | -1.2598 | -2.4528 | 393.7 | Crest | 1101 | 442 | 87 | 50 |
| 11+64.70-exst |  |  | 1w | -2.4528 | -0.2501 | 393.7 | Sag | 1400 | 442 | +100 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L)
Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| $\begin{gathered} \text { VPI } \\ \text { STATION } \end{gathered}$ | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AASHTO } \\ \text { MINIMUM (ft) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Shea Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8+53.02-exst |  |  | 1 a | -1.4287 | 1.9999 | 492.1 | Sag | 622 | 438 | 62 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction 1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction 2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: FREEWAY RAMPS

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Shea Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ramp B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10+82.68-exst |  |  | 1w | -0.6805 | 2.3420 | 459.3 | Sag | 703 | 428 | 68 | 50 |
| 17+71.65-exst |  |  | 1w | 2.3420 | -2.2541 | 918.6 | Crest | 657 | 440 | 64 | 50 |
| 24+27.82-exst |  |  | 1w | -2.2541 | 2.0000 | 262.5 | Sag | 303 | 254 | 39 | 35 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction 1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction 2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: COLLECTOR - URBAN

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE IN (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { CURVE } \\ \text { TYPE } \end{gathered}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) |  | AVAILABLE $(\mathrm{mph})$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ \text { (mph) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Thunderbird Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29+85.56-exst |  |  | 2 | -0.4000 | 0.5390 | 262.5 | Sag | +9999 | 427 | +100 | 50 |
| $33+30.05-\mathrm{exst}$ |  |  | 2 | 0.5390 | -0.3294 | 360.9 | Crest | 1423 | 427 | +100 | 50 |
| 36+08.92-exst |  |  | 2 | -0.3294 | 0.4375 | 196.9 | Sag | +9999 | 426 | +100 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: ARTERIAL - URBAN

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC DIRECTION (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GRADE } \\ \text { OUT } \\ \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | CURVE LENGTH (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { CURVE } \\ \text { TYPE } \end{gathered}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { AASHTO } \\ \text { MINIMUM (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | AVAILABLE $(\mathrm{mph})$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ \text { (mph) } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8+00.00-exst |  |  | 2 | -0.1800 | -1.6000 | 200 | Crest | 860 | 435 | 76 | 50 |
| $14+00.00-$ exst |  |  | 2 | -1.6000 | -1.2000 | 200 | Sag | +9999 | 435 | +100 | 50 |
| 23+30.00-exst |  |  | 2 | -1.2000 | -1.7676 | 200 | Crest | 2001 | 436 | +100 | 50 |
| 27+00.00-exst |  |  | 2 | -1.7676 | -1.5751 | 200 | Sag | +9999 | 436 | +100 | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction 1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction 2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: ARTERIAL - URBAN

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC DIRECTION (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { CURVE } \\ \text { TYPE } \end{gathered}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { AASHTO } \\ \text { MINIMUM (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | AVAILABLE $(\mathrm{mph})$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ \text { (mph) } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29+52.76-exst |  |  | 2 | -0.4202 | 1.2940 | 197 | Sag | +9999 | 503 | +100 | 55 |
| 32+80.84-exst |  |  | 2 | 1.2940 | -0.4843 | 197 | Crest | 705 | 503 | 68 | 55 |
| 37+40.16-exst |  |  | 2 | -0.4843 | -0.6278 | 0 | GB | GB | GB | GB | 55 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: ARTERIAL - URBAN

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC DIRECTION (1w, 1a or 2) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { GRADE } \\ \text { IN } \\ \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) | AASHTO MINIMUM (ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Frank Lloyed Wright |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28+70.73-exst |  |  | 2 | -0.4003 | -1.2482 | 262.5 | Crest | 1404 | 578 | +100 | 60 |
| 31+49.61-exst |  |  | 2 | -1.2482 | 0.8981 | 196.9 | Sag | 1038 | 578 | 85 | 60 |
| 34+94.09-exst |  |  | 2 | 0.8981 | 0.3999 | 196.9 | Crest | 2264 | 575 | +100 | 60 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction 1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction 2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L)
Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: ARTERIAL - URBAN

| $\begin{gathered} \text { VPI } \\ \text { STATION } \end{gathered}$ | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | GRADE <br> IN <br> (\%) | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVELENGTH (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26+41.08-exst |  |  | 2 | -0.2437 | -0.4000 | 0 | GB | GB | GB | GB | 55 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction 1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction 2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: ARTERIAL - URBAN

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC DIRECTION (1w, 1a or 2) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { GRADE } \\ \text { IN } \\ \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Cactus Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29+52.76-exst |  |  | 2 | -0.4673 | 0.5000 | 164 | Sag | +9999 | 362 | +100 | 45 |
| 32+80.84-exst |  |  | 2 | 0.5000 | -0.6833 | 492.1 | Crest | 1158 | 363 | 92 | 45 |
| 36+74.54-exst |  |  | 2 | -0.6833 | -0.4116 | 164 | Sag | +9999 | 363 | +100 | 45 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction
1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction
2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

Project Name: Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard (101L) Project Number: 101L MA 036 F0123D
Roadway Type: ARTERIAL - URBAN

| VPI | MILEPOST |  | TRAFFIC <br> DIRECTION <br> (1w, 1a or 2) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { GRADE } \\ \text { IN } \\ \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | GRADE OUT <br> (\%) | CURVE LENGTH <br> (ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CURVE } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE |  | SPEED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATION | BEGIN | END |  |  |  |  |  | AVAILABLE <br> (ft) |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AVAILABLE } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DESIGN } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Shea Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14+43.57-exst |  |  | 2 | 0.4300 | 0.7400 | 196.9 | Sag | +9999 | 498 | +100 | 55 |
| 16+73.23-exst |  |  | 2 | 0.7400 | -0.8300 | 262.5 | Crest | 819 | 499 | 74 | 55 |
| 19+02.89-exst |  |  | 2 | -0.8300 | 0.0900 | 196.9 | Sag | +9999 | 499 | +100 | 55 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:
Traffic Direction:
1w = One Way Traffic in Station direction 1a = One Way Traffic against Station direction 2 = Two Way Traffic

Grades are with respect to Station direction

* Indicates design exception required.

GB indicates grade break. Stopping Sight Distance and Speed not calculated. Calculations are based on AASHTO 2001 and ADOT 2004 Roadway Design Guidelines formulas with adjustments for effective grade.

# ROADWAY ENGINEERING GROUP <br> ROADWAY PREDESIGN SECTION ATTACHMENT 3 -BRIDGE EVALUATION 

TO: HENRY SUNG
BRIDGE GROUP
BRIDGE MANAGEMENT SECTION, MD 635E

| FROM: | Tafwachi Katapa |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 602.712 .7614 |
|  | tkatapa@azdot.gov |
| ECT: | BRIDGE EVALUA |

DATE:
11/18/2020


Please evaluate the following structures per AASHTO guidelines:

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ROUTE } \\ \text { NO. } \\ \text { N7* } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | MILEPOSTN11 | $\begin{gathered} \text { STR. NO. } \\ \text { AND } \\ \text { NAME } \\ \text { N8 \& A209 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | BRIDGE <br> LENGTH <br> N49 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { BRIDGE } \\ \text { ROADWAY } \\ \text { WIDTH } \\ \text { N51 } \end{array}$ | BRIDGE RAIL / BARRIER |  |  |  |  | AC OVERLAY |  |  | VERTICAL CLEARANCE (MINIMUM) |  | BRIDGE <br> LOAD <br> RATING <br> N66 | BRIDGE SUFFICIENCY <br> RATING <br> SRB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { GEOM. } \\ \text { OK } \end{gathered}$ | STRUC <br> OK | Railings OK | Transitions OK | THICKNESS <br> (EXISTING) | REMOVE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { REPLACE / } \\ & \text { NEW } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | A206A | A206B | A206C | N36A | N36B | A201 | (MINIMUM) | (MAXIMUM) | NB/EB | SB/WB |  |  |
| 101L | 36.59 | 01459Pima Road TI OPEB | 217 | 66 | Concrete Barrier | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 1" | 16.4 | 16.34 | HS 20+ | 99.00 |
|  |  |  | Comments:Existing AC overlay on bridge deck should be removed full depth, bare concrete deck top be inspected, repaired if needed.Then be overlaid with 1 "thick appropriate asphaltic overlay. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101L | 36.59 | 02656Pima Road TI OPWB | 217 | 66 | Concrete Barrier | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 1" | 1 " | 16.24 | 16.23 | HS 20 | 99.00 |
|  |  |  | Comments:Existing AC overlay on bridge deck should be removed full depth, bare concrete deck top be inspected, repaired if needed.Then be overlaid with 1 "thick appropriate asphaltic overlay. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101L | 37.06 | 02510Bell Rd OP NB | 244 | 76.8 | Concrete Barrier | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | $1 "$ | $1 "$ | $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 16.78 | 16.87 | HS 20+ | 94.10 |
|  |  |  | Comments:Existing AC overlay on bridge deck should be removed full depth, bare concrete deck top be inspected, repaired if needed. Then be overlaid with 1 "thick appropriate asphaltic overlay. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101L | 37.06 |  | 244 | 76.8 | Concrete Barrier | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | 1" | 1" | $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 16.46 | 16.46 | HS 20+ | 94.00 |
|  |  |  | Comments:Existing AC overlay on bridge deck should be removed full depth, bare concrete deck top be inspected, repaired if needed .Then be overlaid with 1 "thick appropriate asphaltic overlay. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101L | 37.66 | CAP Canal Bridge | 88 | 35.3 | Concrete Barrier | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | HS 20+ | 100.00 |
|  |  |  | Comments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101L | 37.66 | $02506$ <br> CAP Canal Bridge NB | 275 | 78.4 | Concrete Barrier | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | 2" | 2" | $1 "$ | NA | NA | HS 20+ | 95.00 |
|  |  |  | Comments:Existing AC overlay on bridge deck should be removed full depth, bare concrete deck top be inspected, repaired if needed. Then be overlaid with 1 " thick appropriate asphaltic overlay. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## ROADWAY ENGINEERING GROUP ROADWAY PREDESIGN SECTION ATTACHMENT 3-BRIDGE EVALUATION

(CONTINUED)

| ROUTENO.$\mathrm{N} 7^{*}$ | MILEPOST <br> N11 | $\begin{gathered} \text { STR. NO. } \\ \text { AND } \\ \text { NAME } \\ \text { N8 \& A209 } \end{gathered}$ | BRIDGE <br> LENGTH <br> N49 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { BRIDGE } \\ \text { ROADWAY } \\ \text { WIDTH } \\ \text { N51 } \end{array}$ | BRIDGE RAIL / BARRIER |  |  |  |  | AC OVERLAY |  |  | VERTICAL <br> CLEARANCE <br> (MINIMUM) |  | BRIDGE <br> LOAD <br> RATING <br> N66 | $\begin{gathered} \text { BRIDGE } \\ \text { SUFFICIENCY } \\ \text { RATING } \\ \text { SRB } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | GEOM. <br> OK | STRUC <br> OK | Railings OK | Transitions OK | THICKNESS <br> (EXISTING) | REMOVE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { REPLACE / } \\ & \text { NEW } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | A206A | A206B | A206C | N36A | N36B | A201 | (MINIMUM) | (MAXIMUM) | NB/EB | SB/WB |  |  |
| 101L | 37.66 | 02507CAP Canal BridgeSB | 275 | 78.4 | Concrete Barrier | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | 2" | 2" | $1 "$ | NA | NA | HS 20 | 94.80 |
|  |  |  | Comments:Existing AC overlay on bridge deck should be removed full depth, bare concrete deck top be inspected, repaired if needed.Then be overlaid with 1 "thick appropriate asphaltic overlay. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101L | 37.66 | 02508CAP Canal BridgeWFR | 100 | 39.4 | Concrete Barrier | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | HS 20+ | 81.20 |
|  |  |  | Comments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101L | 37.66 | 02509CAP Canal BridgeEFR | 100 | 51.2 | Concrete Barrier | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | HS 20+ | 80.90 |
|  |  |  | Comments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101L | 37.78 | 02505Frank Lloyd WrightBIvd TI OP | 225 | 157.2 | Concrete Barrier | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $1{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 16.89 | 17.5 | HS 20+ | 100.00 |
|  |  |  | Comments:Existing AC overlay on bridge deck should be removed full depth, bare concrete deck top be inspected, repaired if needed. Then be overlaid with 1 "thick appropriate asphaltic overlay. Structure \#2512 was combined with Structure \#2505 as per inspection note. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101L | 38.59 | 02501 <br> Raintree Drive TI UP | 212 | 109.1 | Concrete Barrier | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | NA | NA | NA | 18.53 | 17.51 | HS 20+ | 97.30 |
|  |  |  | Comments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101L | 39.05 | 02504Thunderbird RdUP | 294 | 78.7 | Concrete Paranet | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | NA | NA | NA | 16.67 | 16.81 | HS 20+ | 94.40 |
|  |  |  | Comments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101L | 39.55 | $\mathbf{0 2 5 0 3}$ <br> Sweetwater Ave <br> Equestrian/Ped UP | 283 | NA | Concrete Barrier \& | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | NA | NA | NA | 18.01 | 18 | NA | NA |
|  |  |  | Comments: Pedestrian Structure. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101L | 40.09 | 02502Cactus Rd TI UP | 183 | 108.8 | Concrete Barrier | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | NA | NA | NA | 17.27 | 16.81 | HS 20+ | 94.30 |
|  |  |  | Comments:There are damaged and deteriorated sections of pourable joint sealant at approach joints. There are some missing sections of the joint sealant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101L | 41.10 | 02480Shea Blvd TI UP | 172 | 102.4 | Concrete Barrier | Yes | Yes | Yes | NA | NA | NA | NA | 17.27 | 16.55 | HS 20+ | 90.90 |
|  |  |  | Comments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Evaluation Completed by: Masudur Rahman
Date:
10/28/2020
Notes: *N numbers are NBI numbers and A numbers are Arizona ltems Number for bridge inventory

101 Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd
Final DCR Uodate
APPENDIX B: Summary of Comments and Responses

AロロT

## Review Comments

| Submittal | DRAFT DCR UPDATE | Project Name | Pima Freeway (SR101L): Princess to Shea Blvd GPLs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Return Date | September 22, 2020 | Project Number | 101-B(210)T |
| Reviewed By | Various | TRACS Number | 101 MA 036 F0123 01D |
| Discipline/Office | Various | Consultant | Kimley»>Horn |
| Phone Number | (602) 712-7614 | ADOT PM | Tafwachi Katapa, P.E. |

Discipline Legend - 1: Roadway 2: Right of Way, U: Utilities 3: Environmental 4: Drainage 5: Traffic 6: Structures 7: Geotechnical/Materials 8: Landscape 9: Estimates

| Discipline | ITEM | DWG/SHT | Comment By | COMMENT | DISPOSITION |  | RESPONSE / COMMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Discipline |  | DWG/SHT | Comment By | COMMENT | INITIAL | FINAL |  |
| 1 | 1 |  | Reed Henry | I assume the Header will be changed to "Final DCR Update" when it's ready for your seal and signature. | A | A | Agree. |
| 1 | 2 | 50 | Reed Henry | Please prepare a Design Exception request for the controlling criteria that will not be met, ASAP. Also please consider as an alternative, where Section 4.2 is considering a 1' outside shoulder, the use of an 8 ' inside shoulder, 11' lanes and an 8 ' outside shoulder. | A | A | Agree - Design Exception submitted. |
| 1 | 3 | 67 | Reed Henry | The AASHTO Report will need to be updated as part of the new Design Exception Request to include all exceptions. | D | D | Section 8 will be updated to include the previous AASHTO Criteria. Appendix A from the previous AASHTO report is still valid and will not be updated as part of the DCR Update since the DCR Update only updates the 3 TIs. |
| 1 | 4 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Plan Sheet } \\ 4 \text { of } 15 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Reed Henry | Verify Build Alternative Plan Sheet 4 of 15 is being designed to meet the 101, I-17 to Pima DB final design configuration. | A | A | Will review to ensure the project tie together correctly. |
| 1 | 5 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Plan Sheet } \\ 10 \text { of } 15 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Reed Henry | Verify Build Alternative Plan Sheet 10 of 15 is correct, it shows a TDI at Raintree. | A | A | Layout is in error, and will be updated to show the improved SPUI configuration. |
| 1 | 6 | Page I | Julia Mendoza | Executive Summary, first paragraph: Please include the limits of this new project. | A | A | Will comply. |
| 1 | 7 | Page 1 | Julia Mendoza | Item 1.1. Second paragraph: Please include "State Route 101L is on the National Highway System (NHS)", as part of this Highway classification. | A | A | Will comply. |
| 1 | 8 | Page 25 | Julia Mendoza | Page 25, Item 2.4.1.1. Second paragraph, fifth sentence: It should be "speeds" instead of "seeds". | D | D | "Seeds" is the correct terminology. "Random seeds" refer to numbers randomly generated as initial values in starting the simulation of traffic modeling such that no two model runs are identical. This helps the models reflect actual conditions, where traffic volumes fluctuate daily. |
| 1 | 9 | Page 27 | Julia Mendoza | Why it is used HCM 2010 to measure the Level of Services on TIs (Table 2.8) and HCM 2016 to measure the Level of Service on Mainlines (Table 2.4)? | A | A | HCM references will be updated to be consistent where applicable. |
| 1 | 10 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pages } 30 \& \\ 31 \end{gathered}$ | Julia Mendoza | Tables 2.13, 2.14, 2.15 \& 2.16: The delay values are very close for TDI and improved SPUI alternatives on Frank Lloyd Wright TI. Average Queues are similar. Why spend more money, almost a million dollars more plus all the inconvenient to change to a TDI and getting similar results of an improved SPUI? | D | D | Section 3.4.2.4 on page 37 explains that the TDI provides the potential for better signal coordination with the ramp/frontage roads and provides an improved environment for pedestrian and bike crossings, which is a high priority for some project stakeholders. Update (10-07-20): Dave Meinhard (COS) explained that the Scottsdale council has presented the interchange options to the commission. The commission voted on the approved TDI recommendation. TDI is more user- and pedestrian-friendly. |
| 1 | 11 | Page 50 | Julia Mendoza | Item 4.1. Design Controls. It is referenced to ADOT 2010 DCR. Tables 21, 22 \& 23 have the Design Year set as 2030. The 2020 DCR Design Year is 2040. Please clarify. | A | A | Text will be modified to indicate the 2010 DCR criteria apply except that the design year is 2040 instead of 2030. |
| 1 | 12 | Page 50 | Julia Mendoza | Item 4.6.2. Will the final 2020 DCR define the alternative to be used on bridges widening within the project limits? This will impact the project cost. Now it is considered as a Lump Sum. | D | D | These will be determined during final design with the bridge selection report |
| 1 | 13 | Page 50 | Julia Mendoza | Item 4.6.2. Will 2020 DCR consider existing bridge deficiencies, based on a new bridge inspection, be fixed as part of this project? | D | D | We have reviewed the current reports. Current inspection reports only mention minor items at the Bell Rd and FLW bridges. The widening of these bridges will address the items mentioned in the repair reports. <br> Update (10-07-20): Previous bridge inspection reports have been reviewed. It was determined that only minor other deficiences will be fixed as part of this project. |
| 1 | 14 | Page 56 | Julia Mendoza | Item 5.3.2. It is recommended just minor improvements for this Raintree Drive SPUI but Plan C2.6 (Appendix B) shows a new TDI. | A | A | Plan sheet C-2.9 will be updated to show a SPUI. |

## Review Comments

| Submittal | DRAFT DCR UPDATE | Project Name | Pima Freeway (SR101L): Princess to Shea Blvd GPLs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Return Date | September 22, 2020 | Project Number | 101-B(210)T |
| Reviewed By | Various | TRACS Number | 101 MA 036 F0123 01D |
| Discipline/Office | Various | Consultant | Kimley»>Horn |
| Phone Number | (602) 712-7614 | ADOT PM | Tafwachi Katapa, P.E. |

Discipline Legend -1: Roadway 2: Right of Way, U: Utilities 3: Environmental 4: Drainage 5: Traffic 6: Structures 7: Geotechnical/Materials 8: Landscape 9: Estimates

| Discipline | ITEM | DWG/SHT | Comment By | COMMENT | DISPOSITION |  | RESPONSE / COMMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Discipline |  | DWGISHT | Comment By | COMMENT | INITIAL | FINAL |  |
| 1 | 15 | Page 57 | Julia Mendoza | Item 5.4.2. Shea Blvd is mentioned as a Diamond TI. It is a SPUI TI. | A | A | Will update reference to SPUI TI. |
| 1 | 16 | Page 58 | Julia Mendoza | Itemized Cost Estimate: Why it is not so detailed on Structures? | D | D | SQ FT cost is typical for DCR's. Detailed estimates will be prepared with the bridge selection reports during final design. |
| 1 | 17 | ADA Report | Julia Mendoza | Does it contain all existing non-compliant features or just those in need of improvements after the TIs reconstruction? | D | D | This includes all ADA features within the project, including all the TIs. |
| 1 | 18 | ADA Report | Julia Mendoza | Introduction. First paragraph: "general purpose...lanes not lands" | A | A | Will update. |
| 1 | 19 | General | Julia Mendoza | What is the purpose of: "See ADOT 2010 DCR" on certain Items of the 2020 DCR. Is it that the referenced piece of information is part of the 2020 DCR and we have to comment on it? Will them be updated and included in the Final 2020 DCR? | D | D | THe project scope is to only provide updates to the 2010 DCR focusing on FLW, Raintree and Shea Blvd Tls. The document has the same layout and headings as the 2010 document, to use them side by side. K-H has reviewed the 2010 DCR and found these sections do not require an update yet will still apply for consideration by the final designer/engineer. Thus a note is placed under that section to refer the final designer to the secton of the older report. Comments are not needed for the 2010 DCR since it is already an approved document. The sections reference from the 2010 DCR will not be included with this DCR Update. |
| 1 | 20 | General | Julia Mendoza | The word "would" is repetitive throughout this 2020 DCR on information copied or referenced to the ADOT 2010 DCR. Shouldn't this give an idea of no certainty on the proposed solutions and/or recommendations? | D | D | This is typical DCR language in providing the final design team flexibility as the recommendations are implemented. |
| 1 | 21 | General | Julia Mendoza | The Design Exceptions Request was not included on this 2020 DCR. | A | A | The Design Exception Request was sent after the DRAFT DCR was submitted. The approved Design Exceptions Request will be included with the Final DCR Update submittal. |
| 1 | 22 | General | David Meinhart | Kiran and I are fine with the draft report. You have already included our comments from the various sections that have now been compiled. Based on last Thursday's Transportation Commission outcome, we are still recommending the TDI concept at Frank Lloyd Wright. | D | D | Thank you for the City of Scottdale's confirmation. |
| 8 | 23 | General | Joe Salazar | Leroy Brady will provide a letter of the finding of public interest for single source granite mulch to be Cheyenne, 1-1/4" minus, from Pioneer. This needs to be included in the DCR and final design special provisions. There is a transition to Coral granite mulch at the south end of the project, but the majority of the corridor will be Cheyenne, by Pioneer. | A | A | This has been sent for signatures. |
| 8 | 24 | General | Joe Salazar | The cross streets (Princess, Bell, FLW), maintained by the City of Scottsdale, are Coral. | A | A | Will note city maintained DG color. |
| 8 | 25 | General | Joe Salazar | Paint colors shall match the control set as provided by ADOT Roadside Development. This is an updated control set from the original project, based on the color selections of the SR 101L GPL Shea to SR 202L project. Sources can be Sherwin Williams, Dunn Edwards, PPG, etc. so long as they match the current control set. | A | A | Will add note on paint color control requirement. |
| 1 | 26 | General | Victor Yang | No comments | D | D |  |

## Review Comments

| Submittal | DRAFT DCR UPDATE | Project Name | Pima Freeway (SR101L): Princess to Shea Blvd GPLs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Return Date | September 22, 2020 | Project Number | 101-B(210)T |
| Reviewed By | Various | TRACS Number | 101 MA 036 F0123 01D |
| Discipline/Office | Various | Consultant | Kimley»)Horn |
| Phone Number | (602) 712-7614 | ADOT PM | Tafwachi Katapa, P.E. |

Discipline Legend - 1: Roadway 2: Right of Way, U: Utilities 3: Environmental 4: Drainage 5: Traffic 6: Structures 7: Geotechnical/Materials 8: Landscape 9: Estimates

| Discipline | ITEM | DWG/SHT | Comment By | COMMENT | DISPOSITION |  | RESPONSE / COMMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | INITIAL | FINAL |  |
| 5 | 27 | Page 51 | Central District | As information in the DCR should include that the NB Frank Lloyd Blvd. Ramp Meter is a wireless type. | B/C | A | Language will be added to the DCR stating that the existing NB FLW ramp meter utilizes a wireless (Sensys) system for detection. All new ramp meter systems for the project will utilize sawcut loop detector technology. |
| 5 | 28 | 59 | Central District | Missing an item for ITS Record Drawings | A | A | Will add item. |
| 5 | 29 | 59,60 | Central District | Will this project need Split \#9 Pull Boxes to keep the fiber communication functional when this project is being constructed? | A | A | We don't anticipate the need for Split \#9 pull boxes. A bid item was added for "Temporary ITS" which we believe can be installed on the median barrier or as a "Phase Zero" to maintain the critical ADOT FMS networks and CCTV/DMS/TS during construction. KHA will elaborate the temp ITS requirements in the DCR. |
| 5 | 30 | 59 | Central District | What are Unidentified Allowances? | D | D | These are items that are not yet discovered in the DCR phase that once final design commences are found to be required. These is usually set at $20 \%$ at this Stage. |
| 5 | 31 | 59 | Central District | If the item 7320421 Pull Box (No. 7) (With Extension) are for FMS change them to No 7 pull boxes Standard FM-2.06 Standard. | A | A | Agree. Will revise Item. |
| 5 | 32 | 61 | Central District | For Item 7340252 in the () edit to read Intelight 2070LC | A | A | Description will be revised per comment. |
| 5 | 33 | 62 | Central District | Missing Item for patch and splice modules | A | A | A fiber optic termination panel bid item will be added. This item was assumed included in the fiber cabling for the submittal. |
| 5 | 34 | 62 | Central District | Is this project is going to need closures for fiber splicing new fiber to existing fiber? | A | A | Its anticipated that no traffic restrictions will be required for splicing of fiber optic cables since the No. 9 pull boxes are located outside of the travel way. KHA will confirm. |
| 1 | 35 | Plan Sheet <br> No.4, 13 | Central District | Plan sheet 4 and 13 are missing freeway beginning and end project limits stations. | A | A | Will add callouts. |
| 1 | 36 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Plan Sheet } \\ & \text { No. } 6 \end{aligned}$ | Central District | The New Conc. Half Barrier Special Detail. Missing the reference Detail | A | D | Will update reference concerning Special details. <br> Update(10/15/2020): The concrete barrier special details will be developed during final design. |
| 5 | 37 | Introduction. $1$ | Central District | Change lands to lanes | A | A | Will update this within the ADA report introduction. |
| 5 | 38 | General | Central District | Will the Ramp Meters in this project be functional during construction of this project? | B/C | D | Lets discuss. The RM will be taken down and offline for construction of on-ramp improvements. At other times during construction the RM can be maintained and operational. Are there specific RM locations ADOT would like maintained during construction? <br> Update (10-07-20): Depending on construction phasing, this will be addressed during final design. |
| U | 39 | pg 52 | Central District | 4.12 "no MH or CB in freeway pavement areas" should also include crossroads/ramps. No MH or CB in any travel lane within ADOT ROW | B/C | A | Will discuss. <br> Update (10-07-20): No "new" MH or CB will be located in the pavement. Standard language from Steve O'Brien will help clarify. |
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| Submittal | DRAFT DCR UPDATE | Project Name | Pima Freeway (SR101L): Princess to Shea Blvd GPLs |
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| Discipline | ITEM | DWG/SHT | Comment By | COMMENT | DISPO | SITION | RESPONSE / COMMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | 40 | pg 52 | Central District | 4.16 change the subtitle from "Landscape Architectural Design" to "Landscape Architectural Design, Construction and Maintenance" | A | . A | Will revise. |
| 8 | 41 | pg 52 | Central District | 4.16 add that the City of Scottsdale is expected to maintain all landscape, equestrian trail and aesthetic features in accordance with the current IGA/JPA 00-207. All improvements, and additions to the freeway aesthetics requested by the City of Scottsdale shall be paid for by the City of Scottsdale at construction, and the maintenance of all aesthetic improvements and additions requested by the City of Scottsdale shall either be paid for, or maintained by the City of Scottsdale. | A | A | Will add. |
| 9 | 42 | pg 58 | Central District | note \#1 states that the landscape cost estimate is based only on disturbed areas. This is not going to be true. The cost of landscape should also include in the estimate a figure of approximately $\$ 31 \mathrm{~K}$ per mile per year for the construction contractor to maintain the existing landscape features which are still part of the project area but not disturbed. This project has a length of approx. 4.8 miles so that would be about $\$ 148 \mathrm{~K}$ per year. This conflicts with paragraph on page 53 which says undisturbed areas will be maintained. | A | A | Will clarify and make sure overall landscape cost estimate includes maintenance of existing landscape. |
| u | 43 | 52 | JR | Section 4.12. Utility Coordination. Please clarify. Are the catch basins being referred to ADOT catch basins, or the City's. Also is it "freeway pavement areas" or "freeway PCCP areas? | B/C | A | Will discuss. <br> Update (10-07-20): Will revise statement to take out catch basins. Catch basins are needed for roadway drainage. |
| U | 44 | 54 | JR | Section 5.1.10. Utility Coordination. Please reference the manhole location by station. | A | A | Will add stations. |
| u | 45 | 55 | JR | Section 5.2.11. Utility Coordination. At the NW quadrant I noticed two waterlines and one sewer line being under the ramp concrete pavement. Please provide offset distances from the frontage road centerline to the facilities being called out. At the SW quadrant I don't see the SB frontage road modifications impacting the two referenced sewer lines. Please call out the plan sheet which is being referenced for this sub-section. | A | A | Will add stations and offsets to help clarify text. |
| u | 46 | 5 (C-2.1a) | JR | There is some median reconstruction work being done under some power lines. If the those lines are SRP transmission lines, at minimum, the work could trigger a "Consent to Use Agreement" to be able to work within their easement. | A | A | Will confirm ownership and existing land rights to confirm if a Consent to Use Agreement is required. |
| 5 | 47 | Page 16 | Beverly Chenausky | "TMCs were collected on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday between 7:00 AM and 9:00 AM and between 4:00 PM and 6:00PM. Newer TMCs were not collected as part of the project effort due to recent drastic changes in travel patterns as a result of COVID-19. The provided TMCs were grown annually by $1.0 \%$ to represent 2020 existing TMCs." - Are there grown estimates for 2040? Are these assumed to be the same for build and no-build? | D | D | Section 2.3.2.1 and Section 2.3.2.2 on page 19 describe the development of the 2040 NoBuild and 2040 Build volumes, respectively. 2040 No-Build mainline volumes are slightly different from 2040 Build mainline volumes. 2040 No-Build intersection peak hour volumes (TMCs) are the same as 2040 Build intersection peak hour volumes (TMCs). The 2040 volumes are displayed in Figures 2.14 through 2.19 on pages 20-24. |
| 5 | 48 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Pages } 17- \\ 18 \end{array}$ | Beverly Chenausky | "Heavy vehicle percentages were assumed to be 7\% (4\% medium and 3\% heavy vehicles) on the freeway mainline and $4 \% ~(3 \%$ <br> medium and $1 \%$ heavy vehicles) on the ramps and TIs based on available ADOT Transportation Data Management System (TDMS) <br> data." - Can you provide some graphic images similar to Figure 2.12 - Existing Freeway Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes and Figure 2.13 - Existing TI Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes that show truck volumes (can be combined medium/heavy). | D | D | Figures showing heavy vehicle percentages have not historically been included in ADOT DCRs. The heavy vehicle volumes can be calculated from any volume shown in the figures using the percentages referenced of $7 \%$ on the mainline and $4 \%$ on the ramps and TIs. Creating figures showing heavy vehicle volumes would be a substantial amount of unanticipated effort. |
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| 5 | 49 | Page 19 | Beverly Chenausky | Similar can these scenarios include information on trucks in Figure 2.14-19 (report notes heavy traffic data available). <br> "For the SR 101L mainline, two alternatives were analyzed as part of the 2040 traffic analysis: <br> - No-Build alternative - where SR 101L remains as it currently exists <br> - Build alternative - where SR 101L is widened by adding one GPL in each direction throughout the project limits <br> For the TIs, four alternatives were analyzed as part of the 2040 traffic analysis: <br> - No-Build alternative - where the TIs remain as existing SPUls with no improvements <br> - Improved SPUI alternative - where the existing SPUIs are improved/expanded at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree <br> Drive, and Shea Boulevard Tls <br> - TDI alternative - where the existing SPUIS are converted to TDIs at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard and Raintree Drive TIs <br> only <br> - DRI alternative - where the existing SPUI is converted to a double-roundabout interchange at the Raintree Drive TI only" | D | D | See response to comment no. 48. |
| 5 | 50 | Page 27 | Beverly Chenausky | "ADOT considers LOS D or better "acceptable" LOS for overall TI and intersection operations in urban conditions. Average vehicle queues in VISSIM that do not exceed available storage or do not block upstream driveways/intersections are generally considered to have acceptable queue lengths. -While LOS D is acceptable be advised that any traffic intersections that impact LOS D or greater or will change intersection LOS D or greater due to traffic volumes attributed to the project are triggers for CO modeling, if the congested intersections "significantly increase truck volumes" then PM10 hot-spot modeling will be needed as well. To "screen" these projects more details are needed on the trucks in the LOS at intersections, for those LOS D greater (congested intersections) some discussions on how the project "improves" congestion or doesn't worsen the condition. From the traffic report it appears most if not all of the intersections improve in the build condition there are a few stragglers, now I am assuming this project won't increase trucks significantly so PM10 modeling likely not needed, may be able to screen out CO modeling based on the overall improvement in congestion/delay but may need some further discussions on this result in Table 2.14.. overall delay is also higher than nobuild? May need a little more explanation on this, can note improvements in AM overall and minimize the impact of the PM increase in overall delay but may not guarantee modeling will not be suggested for CO. The DCR Scope does include an air quality technical report, so keep that in as written, but there is no need for MSAT if this is going to be an ICE clearance. | D | D | The SR 101L/Shea Blvd traffic interchange is the only interchange where the 2040 Build PM condition LOS is D and the average delay per vehicle is higher than the 2040 NoBuild PM condition (40 seconds vs. 38 seconds). This slight 2-second difference is due to variability in the traffic simulation model and does not indicate congestion would be worse with improvements than without as the only improvement at this location is extending the length of the westbound right-turn lane. The traffic model uses "random seed" numbers to initiate the model runs such that no two model runs are exactly the same, similar to how traffic volumes change slightly every day. The values shown in the analysis results tables are the average values of ten model runs. Truck volumes at the traffic interchanges are projected to only grow 10\% between 2020 and 2040 (0.5\% for 20 years). Average delay per vehicle values improve significantly more than this percentage between the 2040 No-Build condition and the 2040 Build condition with the recommended improvements, as indicated by several of the interchanges going from LOS F or LOS E to LOS D or better. Overall, emissions in the 2040 Build condition will be significantly lower than in the 2040 No-Build condition. This can be evaluated further during final design when NEPA clearance is being done. <br> The reference to the MSAT in the Executive Summary is just documenting what environmental reports were included in the 2010 DCR. |
| 5 | 51 | Page 27 | Beverly Chenausky | See image 'Table 2.14' for comment reference | D | D | See response to comment no. 50. |
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| 1 | 52 | Executive <br> Summary | D. Whitaker | Continuing coordination - 2010 FDCR also lists SRPMIC, Tempe, and Mesa. Please confirm | D | D | These three were originally listed in connection with the southern segment 1 of the 2010 DCR that is already constructed. These three are intentionally removed from the DCR update. No changes necessary. |
| 6 | 53 | 59, 61 | I. Racic | The cost of the noise walls in the DCR is at $\$ 25 / \mathrm{sqft}$, which may be a number I would take a look into as the current market figure I believe is above that. 9140133 Noise Barrier Wall (Combination-noise wall portion only) SQ.FT. $25,800 \$ 25.00 \$ 645,000$ ) | A | A | This item has been removed. It is part of Shea BIvd Ramp B which is to remain in-place and not be constructed or modified |
| 1 | 54 | Noise Section | I. Racic | There is a reference to Noise Analysis Technical Report, and the one in the file is from 2008. There will be a need for a new Noise Analysis Technical Report/Re-evaluation form to be completed. | D | D | This will be completed as part of the final design. |
| 1 | 55 | 73/398 | E.Chan | Were the design exceptions listed in 8.1 (without ${ }^{* *}$ - no DE request planned) approved by FHWA previously? A DE request would need to be submitted for pre-existing design exceptions that will be perpetuated. Check if commitments were made in previous Design Exception Approval letters for this cooridor to address exceptions in future widening. | A | A | Yes. Those without ** were approved previously for this project. There were previously approved design exceptions that are still valid for this project since they were approved for this project (same project); the DCR Update project only looked at alternatives for FLW, Raintree and Shea Blvd TIs. The area near Shea Ramp B where the existing combination wall is being avoided will require a new design exception which has been submitted. <br> Update (10-07-20): FHWA previously approved design exceptions for Princess to Red Mountain (SR 202L) project. KHA to check 2010 previous non-conforming design exceptions. |
| 1 | 56 | 73/398 | E.Chan | Superelevation deficiencies. Were they evaluated based on AASHTO Method 2 or Method 5? For reconstruction projects, Method 5 evaluation is required. | A | A | There were 4 locations where superelevation deficiencies were identified in the 2010 DCR: FLW Ramp A, Raintree Drive Ramps A, B and D. These ramps will have to be reconstructed for the addition of the GPL and hence no design exception for superelevation is anticipated. <br> Updated (10/16/2020): Mainline locations listed with superelevations less than recommended minimum have been checked. |
| 1 | 57 | 60/398 | E.Chan | All TI's: Does existing access control meet RDG minimum? If not, can this be addressed with the TI reconfigurations? | B/C | A | Access control could not be updated to current standards without full ROW aquistions on many commecial properties and would be cost prohibitive. <br> Update (10-07-20): Will elaborate the evaluation of access control in the DCR for Princess, FLW, Raintree and Shea. |
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## SR 101LFLW BUILD ALTERNATIVE

| Oiscour | A. Stake | $\frac{\text { DRIE }}{\text { O1/21 }}$ | ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INIERMOOAL TRANSPORTATION DIVIIION ROADWAY DESIGN SERVICES | PRELIMINARY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Doum | I. Bexter |  |  | DCR UPDATE |
|  |  |  | FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT BLVDPLAN SHEET |  |
|  |  |  | NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION OR RECORDING |  |
|  | Princess drive - Shea boulevard |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ow. No. c-2. |
| RACS NO. FO123 OID |  |  |  | 101-B12 | OF |
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## SR 101LFLW BUILD ALTERNATIVE









## SHEA BUILD ALTERNATIVE




101 Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd
101 Final DCR Uodate

APPENDIX D: Detailed Cost Estimates for Other Alternatives

AロロT

# Arizona Department of Transportation <br> Estimated Engineering Construction Cost <br> Itemized Estimate <br> Improved Single-Point Urban Interchange at Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard 

Project Number: 101-B(210)T
Location: SR101L - Princess to Shea DCR
Version: Final Design Concept Report, Stage I (15\%)

| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020021 | REMOVAL OF CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER | L.FT. | 6,423 | \$5.00 | \$32,115 |
| 2020031 | REMOVAL OF PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENT | SQ.YD. | 1,796 | \$25.00 | \$44,900 |
| 2020053 | REMOVE (CATCH BASINS) | EACH | 8 | \$1,000.00 | \$8,000 |
| 2020116 | REMOVE (SCUPPER) | EACH | 3 | \$1,000.00 | \$3,000 |
| 2020155 | REMOVE (PULL BOX) | EACH | 1 | \$300.00 | \$300 |
| 2020162 | REMOVE (CONCRETE) | SQ.YD. | 2,141 | \$4.00 | \$8,564 |
| 2020173 | REMOVE (ATTENUATORS) | EACH | 1 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500 |
| 2020175 | REMOVAL OF LIGHT POLES AND BASES | EACH | 1 | \$900.00 | \$900 |
| 4010020 | PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENT (11" PCCP OVER 4" AB) | SQ.YD. | 3,607 | \$60.00 | \$216,420 |
| 5012524 | STORM DRAIN PIPE, 24" | L.FT. | 115 | \$100.00 | \$11,500 |
| 5030142 | CONCRETE CATCH BASIN (MEDIAN) (C-15.80) | EACH | 3 | \$5,000.00 | \$15,000 |
| 5030604 | CONCRETE CATCH BASIN (C-15.91) | EACH | 7 | \$5,000.00 | \$35,000 |
| 6070002 | BREAKAWAY SIGN POST S4X7.7 | L.FT. | 192 | \$35.00 | \$6,720 |
| 6070022 | FOUNDATION FOR BREAKAWAY SIGN POST S4X7.7 | EACH | 24 | \$600.00 | \$14,400 |
| 6070038 | SLIP BASE | EACH | 24 | \$250.00 | \$6,000 |
| 6080005 | REGULATORY, WARNING, OR MARKER SIGN PANEL | SQ.FT. | 216 | \$20.00 | \$4,320 |
| 7040005 | PAVEMENT MARKING (WHITE EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (0.090") | L.FT. | 14,189 | \$0.60 | \$8,513 |
| 7040006 | PAVEMENT MARKING (YELLOW EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (0.090") | L.FT. | 1,020 | \$0.60 | \$612 |
| 7040072 | PAVEMENT MARKING (TRANSVERSE) (THERMOPLASTIC) (ALKYD) (0.090") | L.FT. | 825 | \$0.75 | \$619 |
| 7040074 | PAVEMENT SYMBOL (EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (ALKYD) (0.090") | EACH | 29 | \$125.00 | \$3,625 |
| 7060013 | PAVEMENT MARKER, RAISED, TYPE C | EACH | 355 | \$5.00 | \$1,775 |
| 7060017 | PAVEMENT MARKER, RAISED, TYPE E | EACH | 26 | \$3.00 | \$78 |
| 7080201 | WATERBORNE-TYPE I PAVEMENT MARKING (PAINTED) (WHITE) | L.FT. | 15,014 | \$0.10 | \$1,501 |
| 7080202 | WATERBORNE-TYPE I PAVEMENT MARKING (PAINTED) (YELLOW) | L.FT. | 1,020 | \$0.10 | \$102 |
| 7080204 | WATERBORNE-TYPE I PAVEMENT MARKING (PAINTED SYMBOL) | EACH | 29 | \$100.00 | \$2,900 |
| 7310010 | POLE (TYPE A) | EACH | 4 | \$1,500.00 | \$6,000 |
| 7310092 | POLE (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7310140 | POLE (TYPE R) | EACH | 4 | \$9,000.00 | \$36,000 |
| 7310197 | BREAKAWAY BASE FOR LIGHTING POLE OR SIGNAL FLASHER | EACH | 1 | \$600.00 | \$600 |
| 7310200 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE A) | EACH | 4 | \$1,200.00 | \$4,800 |
| 7310276 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | 1 | \$800.00 | \$800 |
| 7310320 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE R) | EACH | 4 | \$4,000.00 | \$16,000 |
| 7310554 | MAST ARM (20 FT.) (SPECIAL) | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320040 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT ( $11 / 2$ ") (PVC) | L.FT. | 2,336 | \$12.00 | \$28,032 |
| 7320050 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (2") (PVC) | L.FT. | 500 | \$10.00 | \$5,000 |
| 7320072 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (3-3") (PVC) | L.FT. | 1,000 | \$20.00 | \$20,000 |
| 7320421 | PULL BOX (NO. 7) (WITH EXTENSION) | EACH | 14 | \$1,000.00 | \$14,000 |
| 7320450 | PULL BOX (NO. 7) (FM-2.06) | EACH | 2 | \$1,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320455 | PULL BOX (NO. 9) | EACH | 2 | \$5,000.00 | \$10,000 |
| 7320456 | PULL BOX (4B) | EACH | 1 | \$1,000.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320461 | PULL BOX (6B) | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320500 | CONDUCTOR (NO. 12) | L.FT. | 150 | \$0.80 | \$120 |
| 7320520 | CONDUCTOR (NO. 8) | L.FT. | 2,000 | \$0.95 | \$1,900 |
| 7320585 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 12) | L.FT. | 75 | \$1.00 | \$75 |
| 7320595 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 8) | L.FT. | 500 | \$2.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320654 | CONDUCTORS (NO. 8) | L.FT. | 7,508 | \$1.00 | \$7,508 |
| 7320740 | REMOVAL OF EXISTING CONDUCTORS | L.FT. | 9,008 | \$0.50 | \$4,504 |
| 7320787 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS) | L.FT. | 1,000 | \$3.00 | \$3,000 |

# Arizona Department of Transportation <br> Estimated Engineering Construction Cost <br> Itemized Estimate <br> Improved Single-Point Urban Interchange at Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard 

Project Number: 101-B(210)T
Location: SR101L - Princess to Shea DCR
Version: Final Design Concept Report, Stage I (15\%)

| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7320788 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS) (SCOTTSDALE) | L.FT. | 1,000 | \$3.00 | \$3,000 |
| 7320789 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (12 FIBERS) | L.FT. | 500 | \$2.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320794 | FIBER OPTIC SPLICE CLOSURE (ITS) | EACH | 2 | \$1,500.00 | \$3,000 |
| 7320809 | CABLE INNERDUCT (1") | L.FT. | 1,000 | \$1.25 | \$1,250 |
| 7330060 | TRAFFIC SIGNAL FACE (TYPE F) | EACH | 23 | \$500.00 | \$11,500 |
| 7340120 | METER PEDESTAL CABINET | EACH | 1 | \$4,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| 7340306 | METER PEDESTAL FOUNDATION | EACH | 1 | \$1,200.00 | \$1,200 |
| 7350030 | LOOP DETECTOR FOR TRAFFIC SURVEILLANCE ( $6^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ ) | EACH | 6 | \$1,000.00 | \$6,000 |
| 7360111 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (HORIZONTAL MOUNT) (TYPE 40L) | EACH | 1 | \$900.00 | \$900 |
| 7360113 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (UNDERDECK 15L) | EACH | 6 | \$1,000.00 | \$6,000 |
| 8080043 | BACKFLOW PREVENTION ASSEMBLY RELOCATION | EACH | 1 | \$6,000.00 | \$6,000 |
| 8080646 | RESET FRAME AND COVER FOR VALVE BOX | EACH | 1 | \$700.00 | \$700 |
| 8080655 | RELOCATE FIRE HYDRANT | EACH | 2 | \$5,000.00 | \$10,000 |
| 8082845 | MANHOLE (RESET FRAME AND COVER) | EACH | 3 | \$1,500.00 | \$4,500 |
| 9080084 | CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER (ALL TYPES) | L.FT. | 5,809 | \$20.00 | \$116,180 |
| 9080201 | CONCRETE SIDEWALK (C-05.20) | SQ.FT. | 5,157 | \$6.00 | \$30,942 |
| 9080296 | CONCRETE SIDEWALK RAMP (ALL TYPES) | EACH | 8 | \$2,500.00 | \$20,000 |
| 9080511 | SCUPPER (MAG DET. 203) | EACH | 1 | \$5,000.00 | \$5,000 |
| 9210021 | MEDIAN PAVING (CONCRETE PAVERS) | SQ.YD. | 1,186 | \$60.00 | \$71,160 |
| 9240052 | MISCELLANEOUS WORK (LANDSCAPE \& EROSION CONTROL) | L.SUM | 1 | \$104,000.00 | \$104,000 |
| 9240062 | MISCELLANEOUS WORK (REMOVE AND REPLACE COS ITS INFRASTRUCTURE) | L.SUM | 1 | \$100,000.00 | \$100,000 |
| 9240131 | MISCELLANEOUS WORK (GigE SWITCH) | EACH | 2 | \$2,500.00 | \$5,000 |
|  |  |  |  | ITEM TOTAL | \$1,108,036 |


| PROJECT WIDE |
| :--- |
| Mobilization (10\%) |
| Dust and Water Palliative (1\%) |
| Quality Control (2\%) |
| Construction Surveying (2\%) |
| Maintenance And Protection Of Traffic (10\%) |
|  |
|  |
| Unidentified Item Allowance (20\%) |
|  |
|  |

# Arizona Department of Transportation <br> Estimated Engineering Construction Cost <br> Itemized Estimate <br> Tight Diamond Interchange at Raintree Drive 

Project Number: 101-B(210)T
Location: SR101L - Princess to Shea DCR
Version: Final Design Concept Report, Stage I (15\%)

| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020021 | REMOVAL OF CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER | L.FT. | 6,517 | \$5.00 | \$32,585 |
| 2020029 | REMOVAL OF ASPHALTIC CONCRETE PAVEMENT | SQ.YD. | 565 | \$5.00 | \$2,825 |
| 2020031 | REMOVAL OF PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENT | SQ.YD. | 2,338 | \$25.00 | \$58,450 |
| 2020053 | REMOVE (CATCH BASINS) | EACH | 4 | \$1,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| 2020116 | REMOVE (SCUPPER) | EACH | 5 | \$1,000.00 | \$5,000 |
| 2020155 | REMOVE (PULL BOX) | EACH | 1 | \$300.00 | \$300 |
| 2020162 | REMOVE (CONCRETE) | SQ.YD. | 3,717 | \$4.00 | \$14,868 |
| 2020175 | REMOVAL OF LIGHT POLES AND BASES | EACH | 1 | \$900.00 | \$900 |
| 2030301 | ROADWAY EXCAVATION | CU.YD. | 1,739 | \$10.00 | \$17,390 |
| 3030022 | AGGREGATE BASE, CLASS 2 | CU.YD. | 171 | \$50.00 | \$8,550 |
| 4010020 | PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENT (11" PCCP OVER 4" AB) | SQ.YD. | 2,189 | \$60.00 | \$131,340 |
| 4060009 | ASPHALTIC CONCRETE (MISCELLANEOUS PAVING) | TON | 29 | \$500.00 | \$14,500 |
| 5012524 | STORM DRAIN PIPE, 24" | L.FT. | 113 | \$100.00 | \$11,300 |
| 5030142 | CONCRETE CATCH BASIN (MEDIAN) (C-15.80) | EACH | 1 | \$5,000.00 | \$5,000 |
| 5030604 | CONCRETE CATCH BASIN (C-15.91) | EACH | 3 | \$5,000.00 | \$15,000 |
| 6070002 | BREAKAWAY SIGN POST S4X7.7 | L.FT. | 24 | \$35.00 | \$840 |
| 6070022 | FOUNDATION FOR BREAKAWAY SIGN POST S4X7.7 | EACH | 3 | \$600.00 | \$1,800 |
| 6070038 | SLIP BASE | EACH | 3 | \$250.00 | \$750 |
| 6080005 | REGULATORY, WARNING, OR MARKER SIGN PANEL | SQ.FT. | 100 | \$20.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7040005 | PAVEMENT MARKING (WHITE EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (0.090") | L.FT. | 1,238 | \$0.60 | \$743 |
| 7040074 | PAVEMENT SYMBOL (EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (ALKYD) (0.090") | EACH | 5 | \$125.00 | \$625 |
| 7060013 | PAVEMENT MARKER, RAISED, TYPE C | EACH | 31 | \$5.00 | \$155 |
| 7080201 | WATERBORNE-TYPE I PAVEMENT MARKING (PAINTED) (WHITE) | L.FT. | 1,238 | \$0.10 | \$124 |
| 7080204 | WATERBORNE-TYPE I PAVEMENT MARKING (PAINTED SYMBOL) | EACH | 5 | \$100.00 | \$500 |
| 7310010 | POLE (TYPE A) | EACH | 1 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500 |
| 7310092 | POLE (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7310197 | BREAKAWAY BASE FOR LIGHTING POLE OR SIGNAL FLASHER | EACH | 1 | \$600.00 | \$600 |
| 7310200 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE A) | EACH | 1 | \$1,200.00 | \$1,200 |
| 7310276 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | 1 | \$800.00 | \$800 |
| 7310554 | MAST ARM (20 FT.) (SPECIAL) | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320040 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (1 1/2") (PVC) | L.FT. | 500 | \$12.00 | \$6,000 |
| 7320050 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (2") (PVC) | L.FT. | 500 | \$10.00 | \$5,000 |
| 7320072 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (3-3") (PVC) | L.FT. | 1,500 | \$20.00 | \$30,000 |
| 7320450 | PULL BOX (NO. 7) (FM-2.06) | EACH | 2 | \$1,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320455 | PULL BOX (NO. 9) | EACH | 2 | \$5,000.00 | \$10,000 |
| 7320456 | PULL BOX (4B) | EACH | 1 | \$1,000.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320461 | PULL BOX (6B) | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320500 | CONDUCTOR (NO. 12) | L.FT. | 150 | \$0.80 | \$120 |
| 7320520 | CONDUCTOR (NO. 8) | L.FT. | 2,000 | \$0.95 | \$1,900 |
| 7320585 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 12) | L.FT. | 75 | \$1.00 | \$75 |
| 7320595 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 8) | L.FT. | 500 | \$2.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320654 | CONDUCTORS (NO. 8) | L.FT. | 1,500 | \$1.00 | \$1,500 |
| 7320740 | REMOVAL OF EXISTING CONDUCTORS | L.FT. | 2,500 | \$0.50 | \$1,250 |
| 7320787 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS) | L.FT. | 1,500 | \$3.00 | \$4,500 |
| 7320788 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS) (SCOTTSDALE) | L.FT. | 1,500 | \$3.00 | \$4,500 |
| 7320789 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (12 FIBERS) | L.FT. | 500 | \$2.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320794 | FIBER OPTIC SPLICE CLOSURE (ITS) | EACH | 2 | \$1,500.00 | \$3,000 |
| 7320809 | CABLE INNERDUCT (1") | L.FT. | 1,500 | \$1.25 | \$1,875 |

## Arizona Department of Transportation <br> Estimated Engineering Construction Cost <br> Itemized Estimate <br> Tight Diamond Interchange at Raintree Drive

Project Number: 101-B(210)T
Location: SR101L - Princess to Shea DCR
Version: Final Design Concept Report, Stage I (15\%)

| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT <br> PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7340120 | METER PEDESTAL CABINET | EACH | 1 | \$4,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| 7340306 | METER PEDESTAL FOUNDATION | EACH | 1 | \$1,200.00 | \$1,200 |
| 7360111 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (HORIZONTAL MOUNT) (TYPE 40L) | EACH | 1 | \$900.00 | \$900 |
| 7360113 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (UNDERDECK 15L) | EACH | 8 | \$1,000.00 | \$8,000 |
| 8082845 | MANHOLE (RESET FRAME AND COVER) | EACH | 1 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500 |
| 9080084 | CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER (ALL TYPES) | L.FT. | 6,453 | \$20.00 | \$129,060 |
| 9080201 | CONCRETE SIDEWALK (C-05.20) | SQ.FT. | 13,655 | \$6.00 | \$81,930 |
| 9080296 | CONCRETE SIDEWALK RAMP (ALL TYPES) | EACH | 8 | \$2,500.00 | \$20,000 |
| 9080511 | SCUPPER (MAG DET. 203) | EACH | 5 | \$5,000.00 | \$25,000 |
| 9100009 | CONCRETE BARRIER (ADJACENT TO RETAINING WALL) | L.FT. | 1,349 | \$140.00 | \$188,860 |
| 9210021 | MEDIAN PAVING (CONCRETE PAVERS) | SQ.YD. | 1,803 | \$60.00 | \$108,180 |
| 9240052 | MISCELLANEOUS WORK (LANDSCAPE \& EROSION CONTROL) | L.SUM | 1 | \$12,000.00 | \$12,000 |
| 9240131 | MISCELLANEOUS WORK (GigE SWITCH) | EACH | 2 | \$2,500.00 | \$5,000 |
|  |  |  |  | ITEM TOTAL | \$999,995 |
|  | PROJECT WIDE |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mobilization (10\%) |  |  |  | \$100,000 |
|  | Dust and Water Palliative (1\%) |  |  |  | \$10,000 |
|  | Quality Control (2\%) |  |  |  | \$20,000 |
|  | Construction Surveying (2\%) |  |  |  | \$20,000 |
|  | Maintenance And Protection Of Traffic (10\%) |  |  |  | \$100,000 |
|  |  |  | PROJECT | E SUBTOTAL | \$250,000 |
|  | Unidentified Item Allowance (20\%) |  |  |  | \$249,999 |
|  |  |  | PROJE | WIDE TOTAL | \$499,999 |
|  | OTHER COSTS |  |  |  |  |
|  | Construction Engineering (9\%) |  |  |  | \$121,500 |
|  | Construction Contingencies (5\%) |  |  |  | \$67,500 |
|  | Consultant Services (1\%) |  |  |  | \$13,500 |
|  | PCCP Materials Quality Incentive (\$2 per Sq Yd) |  |  | 2,189 SQ. YD. | \$4,378 |
|  | Right-of-Way (\$30 per Sq Ft) |  |  | 1,555 SQ. YD. | \$46,642 |
|  | Temporary Construction Easement (\$252 per Month) |  |  | 12 Months | \$3,023 |
|  |  |  | OTHE | OSTS TOTAL | \$256,543 |
|  | SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |
|  | ITEM TOTAL |  |  |  | \$999,995 |
|  | PROJECT WIDE |  |  |  | \$499,999 |
|  | OTHER COST TOTAL |  |  |  | \$256,543 |
|  | SUBTOTAL PROJECT COST |  |  |  | \$1,756,537 |
|  | INDIRECT COST ALLOCATION (9.90\%) |  |  |  | \$173,897 |
|  |  |  | TOTAL | OJECT COST | \$1,930,434 |

# Arizona Department of Transportation <br> Estimated Engineering Construction Cost <br> Itemized Estimate <br> Double-Roundabout Interchange at Raintree Drive 

Project Number: 101-B(210)T
Location: SR101L - Princess to Shea DCR
Version: Final Design Concept Report, Stage I (15\%)

| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020021 | REMOVAL OF CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER | L.FT. | 5,141 | \$5.00 | \$25,705 |
| 2020027 | REMOVAL OF CONCRETE BARRIER | L.FT. | 963 | \$20.00 | \$19,260 |
| 2020029 | REMOVAL OF ASPHALTIC CONCRETE PAVEMENT | SQ.YD. | 435 | \$5.00 | \$2,175 |
| 2020031 | REMOVAL OF PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENT | SQ.YD. | 3,946 | \$25.00 | \$98,650 |
| 2020052 | REMOVE (RETAINING WALL) | L.FT. | 30 | \$30.00 | \$900 |
| 2020053 | REMOVE (CATCH BASINS) | EACH | 4 | \$1,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| 2020116 | REMOVE (SCUPPER) | EACH | 3 | \$1,000.00 | \$3,000 |
| 2020155 | REMOVE (PULL BOX) | EACH | 1 | \$300.00 | \$300 |
| 2020162 | REMOVE (CONCRETE) | SQ.YD. | 3,377 | \$4.00 | \$13,508 |
| 2020175 | REMOVAL OF LIGHT POLES AND BASES | EACH | 1 | \$900.00 | \$900 |
| 2030301 | ROADWAY EXCAVATION | CU.YD. | 585 | \$10.00 | \$5,850 |
| 4010020 | PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENT (11" PCCP OVER 4" AB) | SQ.YD. | 3,172 | \$60.00 | \$190,320 |
| 5012524 | STORM DRAIN PIPE, 24" | L.FT. | 67 | \$100.00 | \$6,700 |
| 5030142 | CONCRETE CATCH BASIN (MEDIAN) (C-15.80) | EACH | 3 | \$5,000.00 | \$15,000 |
| 5030604 | CONCRETE CATCH BASIN (C-15.91) | EACH | 1 | \$5,000.00 | \$5,000 |
| 6070002 | BREAKAWAY SIGN POST S4X7.7 | L.FT. | 24 | \$35.00 | \$840 |
| 6070022 | FOUNDATION FOR BREAKAWAY SIGN POST S4X7.7 | EACH | 3 | \$600.00 | \$1,800 |
| 6070038 | SLIP BASE | EACH | 3 | \$250.00 | \$750 |
| 6080005 | REGULATORY, WARNING, OR MARKER SIGN PANEL | SQ.FT. | 100 | \$20.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7040005 | PAVEMENT MARKING (WHITE EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (0.090") | L.FT. | 1,238 | \$0.60 | \$743 |
| 7040074 | PAVEMENT SYMBOL (EXTRUDED THERMOPLASTIC) (ALKYD) (0.090") | EACH | 5 | \$125.00 | \$625 |
| 7060013 | PAVEMENT MARKER, RAISED, TYPE C | EACH | 31 | \$5.00 | \$155 |
| 7080201 | WATERBORNE-TYPE I PAVEMENT MARKING (PAINTED) (WHITE) | L.FT. | 1,238 | \$0.10 | \$124 |
| 7080204 | WATERBORNE-TYPE I PAVEMENT MARKING (PAINTED SYMBOL) | EACH | 5 | \$100.00 | \$500 |
| 7310010 | POLE (TYPE A) | EACH | 1 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500 |
| 7310200 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE A) | EACH | 1 | \$1,200.00 | \$1,200 |
| 7310092 | POLE (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7310197 | BREAKAWAY BASE FOR LIGHTING POLE OR SIGNAL FLASHER | EACH | 1 | \$600.00 | \$600 |
| 7310276 | POLE FOUNDATION (TYPE H) (BREAKAWAY) | EACH | 1 | \$800.00 | \$800 |
| 7310554 | MAST ARM (20 FT.) (SPECIAL) | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320040 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (1 1/2") (PVC) | L.FT. | 500 | \$12.00 | \$6,000 |
| 7320050 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (2") (PVC) | L.FT. | 500 | \$10.00 | \$5,000 |
| 7320072 | ELECTRICAL CONDUIT (3-3") (PVC) | L.FT. | 1,500 | \$20.00 | \$30,000 |
| 7320450 | PULL BOX (NO. 7) (FM-2.06) | EACH | 2 | \$1,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320455 | PULL BOX (NO. 9) | EACH | 2 | \$5,000.00 | \$10,000 |
| 7320456 | PULL BOX (4B) | EACH | 1 | \$1,000.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320461 | PULL BOX (6B) | EACH | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000 |
| 7320500 | CONDUCTOR (NO. 12) | L.FT. | 150 | \$0.80 | \$120 |
| 7320520 | CONDUCTOR (NO. 8) | L.FT. | 2,000 | \$0.95 | \$1,900 |
| 7320585 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 12) | L.FT. | 75 | \$1.00 | \$75 |
| 7320595 | CONDUCTOR (INSULATED BOND) (NO. 8) | L.FT. | 500 | \$2.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320654 | CONDUCTORS (NO. 8) | L.FT. | 1,500 | \$1.00 | \$1,500 |
| 7320740 | REMOVAL OF EXISTING CONDUCTORS | L.FT. | 2,500 | \$0.50 | \$1,250 |
| 7320787 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS) | L.FT. | 1,500 | \$3.00 | \$4,500 |
| 7320788 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (144 FIBERS) (SCOTTSDALE) | L.FT. | 1,500 | \$3.00 | \$4,500 |
| 7320789 | SINGLE MODE FIBER OPTIC CABLE (12 FIBERS) | L.FT. | 500 | \$2.00 | \$1,000 |
| 7320794 | FIBER OPTIC SPLICE CLOSURE (ITS) | EACH | 2 | \$1,500.00 | \$3,000 |
| 7320809 | CABLE INNERDUCT (1") | L.FT. | 1,500 | \$1.25 | \$1,875 |

# Arizona Department of Transportation <br> Estimated Engineering Construction Cost <br> Itemized Estimate <br> Double-Roundabout Interchange at Raintree Drive 

Project Number: 101-B(210)T
Location: SR101L - Princess to Shea DCR
Version: Final Design Concept Report, Stage I (15\%)

| ITEM NO | ITEM DESCRIPTION | UNIT | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7340120 | METER PEDESTAL CABINET | EACH | 1 | \$4,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| 7340306 | METER PEDESTAL FOUNDATION | EACH | 1 | \$1,200.00 | \$1,200 |
| 7360111 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (HORIZONTAL MOUNT) (TYPE 40L) | EACH | 1 | \$900.00 | \$900 |
| 7360113 | LUMINAIRE (LED) (UNDERDECK 15L) | EACH | 8 | \$1,000.00 | \$8,000 |
| 8082845 | MANHOLE (RESET FRAME AND COVER) | EACH | 1 | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500 |
| 9080084 | CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER (ALL TYPES) | L.FT. | 8,029 | \$20.00 | \$160,580 |
| 9080201 | CONCRETE SIDEWALK (C-05.20) | SQ.FT. | 4,382 | \$6.00 | \$26,292 |
| 9080296 | CONCRETE SIDEWALK RAMP (ALL TYPES) | EACH | 4 | \$2,500.00 | \$10,000 |
| 9080511 | SCUPPER (MAG DET. 203) | EACH | 3 | \$5,000.00 | \$15,000 |
| 9100009 | CONCRETE BARRIER (ADJACENT TO RETAINING WALL) | L.FT. | 1,043 | \$140.00 | \$146,020 |
| 9140153 | RETAINING WALL (REGULAR) | SQ.FT. | 30 | \$70.00 | \$2,100 |
| 9210021 | MEDIAN PAVING (CONCRETE PAVERS) | SQ.YD. | 3,915 | \$60.00 | \$234,900 |
| 9240052 | MISCELLANEOUS WORK (LANDSCAPE \& EROSION CONTROL) | L.SUM | 1 | \$12,000.00 | \$12,000 |
| 9240131 | MISCELLANEOUS WORK (GigE SWITCH) | EACH | 2 | \$2,500.00 | \$5,000 |
|  |  |  |  | ITEM TOTAL | \$1,111,117 |

## PROJECT WIDE

| Mobilization (10\%) | $\$ 111,112$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Dust and Water Palliative (1\%) | $\$ 11,112$ |
| Quality Control (2\%) | $\$ 22,223$ |
| Construction Surveying (2\%) | $\$ 22,223$ |
| Maintenance And Protection Of Traffic (10\%) | $\$ 111,112$ |


|  | PROJECT WIDE SUBTOTAL | \$277,782 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unidentified Item Allowance (20\%) |  | \$277,780 |
|  | PROJECT WIDE TOTAL | \$555,562 |
| OTHER COSTS |  |  |
| Construction Engineering (9\%) |  | \$135,001 |
| Construction Contingencies (5\%) |  | \$75,001 |
| Consultant Services (1\%) |  | \$15,001 |
| PCCP Materials Quality Incentive ( $\$ 2$ per Sq Yd) | 3,172 SQ. YD. | \$6,344 |
| Right-of-Way (\$30 per Sq Ft) | 5,974 SQ. YD. | \$179,226 |
|  | OTHER COSTS TOTAL | \$410,602 |
| SUMMARY |  |  |
| ITEM TOTAL |  | \$1,111,117 |
| PROJECT WIDE |  | \$555,562 |
| OTHER COST TOTAL |  | \$410,602 |
| SUBTOTAL PROJECT COST |  | \$2,077,281 |
| INDIRECT COST ALLOCATION (9.90\%) |  | \$205,651 |
|  | TOTAL PROJECT COST | \$2,282,931 |
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## 101 Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd

Initial Traffic Report Update

### 1.0 Introduction

his Initial Traffic Report Update has been developed to support the Design Concept Report (DCR) Update of the 2010 DCR for widening an pproximately 4.5 -mile-long segment of State Route Loop 101 (SR 101L) from Princess Drive to south of Shea Boulevard. This project is locate in the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Central District and is within the City of Scottsdale in Maricopa County in Arizona (from SR 101L milepost (MP) 36.54 to MP 41.08). The project location and project vicinity map are shown in Figure 1.1 and Figure 1.2, respectively.

The purposes of this report are to:

- Document the existing safety and operational conditions of the SR 101 L freeway mainline and all traffic interchanges (TIS) within the project limits except the Cactus Road TI (because no improvements are contemplated there - see the prior 2010 DCR for more information)
- Forecast and evaluate future traffic conditions for the SR $101 L$ freeway mainline and project $T / s$
- Provide recommendations for improvements that promote safety, reduce congestion, and improve operations, thereby enhancing local and regional mobility

The traffic analysis includes the evaluation of the following improvements:

- Freeway mainline - Addition of a single general-purpose lane on SR 101L in the northbound (NB) and southbound (SB) trave directions from just south of Princess Drive to just south of Shea Boulevard
- Project Tls - Safety and operational improvements at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard TIs and at the intersection of Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street (because of its proximity to the Raintree Drive TI)

Improvements being contemplated at the TIs include:

- Improving/expanding the existing single-point urban interchange (SPUI) at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive and Shea Boulevard TIs
- Converting the existing SPUI to a tight diamond interchange (TDI) at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard and Raintree Drive TIs only
- Converting the existing SPUI to a double-roundabout interchange (DRI) at the Raintree Drive TI only


[^16]

Figure 1.2 - Project Vicinity Map

### 2.0 Existing Conditions

2.1 Existing Freeway and TI Geometry

### 2.1.1 SR 101L

SR 101L is a major regional freeway within Maricopa County that is approximately 60 miles long. SR 101L starts at l-10 west of Phoenix heading north, bends east through northern Phoenix, and then goes south through Scottsdale before terminating at the Loop 202 Santan Freeway (south) east of Phoenix.

The posted speed limit on SR 101L within the project limits is 65 miles per hour (mph). Between Princess Drive and Raintree Drive and between Cactus Road and Shea Boulevard, the SR 101L NB and SB roadway sections include three general-purpose lanes (GPLs) and one high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction that are each $12^{\prime}$ wide. Between Raintree Drive and Cactus Road and south of Shea Boulevard, the SR 101L NB and SB roadway sections include four GPLs and one HOV lane in each direction. SR 101L north of Princess Drive is currently being widened from three GPLs and one HOV lane to four GPLs and one HOV lane.

NB and SB frontage roads (also known as Pima Road) are located adjacent to SR 101L. The NB frontage road extends between Raintree Drive and Princess Drive. The SB frontage road extends between Princess Drive and Thunderbird Road. ADOT classifies the frontage road as a Minor Collector.
North of Bell Road, the median separating the SR 101L NB and SB travel lanes is a $15^{\prime}$ raised concrete median. Inside and outside paved Northle fer Road, the median separating the SR $101 L N B$ and $\operatorname{SB}$ travel lanes is a $15^{\prime}$ raised concrete median. Inside and outside paved
shoulders are approximately $10^{\prime}$ wide. South of Bell Road, the median separating the SR $101 L$ NB and SB travel lanes is a $2^{\prime}$ raised shoulders are approximately 10 wide. South of Bell Road, the median se
concrete median. Inside and outside paved shoulders are $10^{\prime}$ wide or less.

The existing freeway mainline lane geometry is shown in Figure 2.1.

### 2.1.2 Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is located along SR 101L at approximately MP 37.8 and is a SPUI with NB and SB on-ramps and off-ramps that connect to SR 101L via the frontage road/Pima Road. Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard currently has three through lanes in each direction. ADOT classifies Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard as a Minor Arterial adjacent to SR 101L. The City of Scottsdale classifies Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard as a Major Arterial - Suburban with an ultimate six-lane roadway section.

The SB off-ramp consists of a single exit lane from the freeway mainline that becomes a third through lane on the frontage road/Pima Road. The frontage road/Pima Road adds an auxiliary right-turn lane at Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard and becomes two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a right-turn lane. The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard turning movements that contribute to the SB frontage road/Pima Road consist of two SB through lanes, one EB right-turn lane, and two WB left-turn lanes near the TI that merge down to two SB through lanes on the frontage road/Pima Road. Farther south, the frontage road/Pima Road provides one diverging lane that opens to two SB on-ramp lanes.
The NB off-ramp consists of a single exit lane from the freeway mainline that becomes a third through lane on the frontage road/Pima Road. The frontage road/Pima Road adds a fourth lane between the freeway mainline exit and the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard intersection. The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard NB off-ramp intersection consists of two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a shared through/right-turn lane. The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard turning movements that contribute to the NB frontage road consist of three NB through lanes, two WB right-turn lanes, and two EB left-turn lanes that merge down to four NB through lanes on the frontage road/Pima Road. Two lanes diverge from the NB frontage road/Pima Road to the NB on-ramp.

The NB and SB ramp intersections at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI are signalized as a SPUI, operating as a single intersection. WB right-turn lanes onto the NB frontage road/Pima Road are yield-controlled.

The area north and south of the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI primarily consists of commercial developments. Directly north of the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal running east-west under SR 101L and the frontage road/Pima Road. North of the CAP canal, the TPC golf course is located west of SR 101L and the Westworld event venue is located east of SR 101L.

The existing Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI lane geometry is shown in Figure 2.2.
2.1.3 Raintree Drive TI and Intersection at $87^{\text {th }}$ Street

The Raintree Drive TI is located along SR 101L at approximately MP 38.6 and is a SPUI with NB and SB on-ramps and off-ramps that connect to SR 101L via the frontage road/Pima Road with the exception of the NB off-ramp, which connects directly between SR 101L and Raintree Drive because the NB frontage road/Pima Road does not extend south past Raintree Drive. Raintree Drive currently has two through lanes in each direction. ADOT classifies Raintree Drive as a Minor Arterial adjacent to SR 101L. The City of Scottsdale classifies Raintree Drive as a Major Arterial - Suburban with an ultimate six-lane roadway section west of SR 101L and a Minor Arterial - Suburban with an ultimate four-lane roadway section east of SR 101 L .

The SB off-ramp consists of a single exit lane from the freeway mainline, which becomes a fourth through lane on the frontage road/Pima Road. The frontage road/Pima Road adds an auxiliary left-turn lane at Raintree Drive and becomes two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a right-turn lane. The Raintree Drive turning movements that contribute to the SB frontage road/Pima Road consist of two SB through lanes, one EB right-turn lane, and two WB left-turn lanes that merge down to three SB through lanes on the frontage road/Pima Road. Two lanes diverge from the SB frontage road/Pima Road to the SB on-ramp.

The NB off-ramp consists of a single exit lane from the freeway mainline, which becomes the NB approach to the off-ramp intersection consisting of two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and a shared through/right-turn lane. The Raintree Drive TI turning movements that contribute to the NB frontage road/Pima Road consist of two NB through lanes, one WB right-turn lane, and two EB left-turn lanes merging down to two NB through lanes on the frontage road/Pima Road. Further north, one lane diverges from the frontage road/Pima Road and opens to two lanes on the NB on-ramp.

The NB and SB ramp intersections at the Raintree Drive TI are signalized as a SPUI, operating as a single intersection. EB and WB rightturn lanes onto the on-ramps are yield-controlled.

Directly west of the Raintree Drive Tl is the signalized intersection of Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street. Raintree Drive includes two through lanes in the east-west direction with one left-turn and one right-turn auxiliary lane on both the east and west legs of the intersection. $87^{\text {th }}$ Street includes two through lanes in each direction south of Raintree Drive and one through lane in each direction north of Raintree Drive. The northbound approach to the intersection consists of one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane. The southbound approach to the intersection consists of one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane.
The area adjacent to the Raintree Drive TI on the east side of SR 101L primarily consists of office land use. Residential land uses are located further east and southeast of the TI. The area adjacent to Raintree Drive on the west side of SR 101 L primarily consists of commercial and office developments with some vacant land on the south side of Raintree Drive between Northsight Boulevard and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street.

The existing Raintree Drive TI and Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection lane geometry is shown in Figure 2.2.

### 2.1.4 Shea Boulevard TI

The Shea Boulevard TI is located along SR 101L at approximately MP 41.81 and is a SPUI with NB and SB on-ramps and off-ramps that connect to SR 101L. Shea Boulevard currently has three through lanes in each direction. ADOT classifies Shea Boulevard as a Principal Arterial adjacent to SR 101L. The City of Scottsdale classifies Shea Boulevard as a Major Arterial - Suburban with an ultimate six-lane roadway section.
The SB off-ramp consists of two exit lanes from the freeway mainline, adds an additional lane from adjacent parcel access, and becomes two left-turn lanes and one right-turn lane at the Shea Boulevard TI. The Shea Boulevard turning movements that contribute becomes two left-turn lanes and one right-turn lane at the Shea Boulevard II. The Shea Boulevard turning movements that contribute
to the SB on-ramp consist of one EB right-turn lane, and two WB left-turn lanes. The EB right-turn lane merges with the outside WB eft-turn lane into two SB on-ramp lanes.

The NB off-ramp consists of two exit lanes from the freeway mainline and adds two auxiliary lanes to become two left-turn lanes and two right-turn lanes at the Shea Boulevard TI intersection. The Shea Boulevard turning movements that contribute to the NB on-ramp consist of one WB right-turn lane and two EB left-turn lanes. The WB right-turn lane merges with the outside EB left-turn lane into two NB on ramp lanes.

The NB and SB ramp intersections at the Shea Boulevard TI are signalized as a SPUI, operating as a single intersection. EB and WB right furn lanes onto the on-ramps and the SB off-ramp right-turn lane are yield-controlled.

The area north and south of the Shea Boulevard TI largely consists of commercial and residential developments. Immediately adjacent to the $T I$ in the southwest corner are residential land uses while the southeast and northwest corners consist of various commercia land uses including restaurants and the northeast corner consists of commercial, hotel and office land uses.
The existing Shea Boulevard TI lane geometry is shown in Figure 2.2.

### 2.2 Existing Traffic Volumes

Recent daily and peak hour roadway traffic volume data for the SR 101L mainline and ramps at Princess Drive, Frank Lloyd Wright Recent daily and peak hour roadway traffic volume data for the SR 101 mainline and ramps at Princess Drive, Frank Lloyd Wright
Boulevard, Raintree Drive, Cactus Rd, and Shea Boulevard was obtained from the ADOT Multimodal Planning Division (MPD) Boulevard, Raintree Drive, Cactus Rd, and Shea Boulevard was obtained from the ADOT Moltimodal Panning 20 (mivion (MPD)
Transportation Data Management System (TDMS) for 2018 (mainline volumes) and 2017 (ramp volumes). Mainline 2018 volumes were Transportation Data Management System (TDMS) for 2018 (mainline volumes) and 2017 (ramp volumes). Mainline 2018 volumes were
grown annually by $2.5 \%$ to represent 2020 existing mainline volumes. The $2.5 \%$ rate was based on the average growth rate between 2017 and 2018 for mainline segments on SR 101L. Ramp 2017 volumes were grown annually by $1.0 \%$ to represent 2020 existing ramp volumes. and 2018 for mainline segments on SR 101L. Ramp 2017 volumes were grown annually by $1.0 \%$ to represe

In addition, historical AM and PM peak hour turning movement count (TMC) data was provided by the City of Scottsdale at:

- Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI in 2016

Raintree Drive TI in 2018

- Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection in 2018
- Shea Boulevard TI in 2016

TMCs were collected on a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday between 7:00 AM and 9:00 AM and between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM. Newer TMCs were not collected as part of the project effort due to recent drastic changes in travel patterns as a result of COVID-19. The provided TMCs were grown annually by $1.0 \%$ to represent 2020 existing TMCs.

Heavy vehicle percentages were assumed to be $7 \%$ ( $4 \%$ medium and $3 \%$ heavy vehicles) on the freeway mainline and $4 \%$ ( $3 \%$ medium and $1 \%$ heavy vehicles) on the ramps and TIs based on available ADOT TDMS data.

Because of the use of count data from various times and sources, efforts were made to balance volumes between TMCs at Tls and the collected ramp volumes. In most cases, there were driveways or frontage road access between the TMC and ramp count location. Any volume imbalance in those situations was attributed to the driveways or frontage road. For the few locations (Shea Boulevard ramps and the Raintree Dr NB off-ramp) where there was a direct relation between the TMC and ramp volume, the volumes were balanced by adjusting the ramp volume. The mainline and ramp peak hour volumes were balanced with the goal of minimizing volume adjustments and generally remaining conservative in the overall adjustment.

Additionally, a review of the mainline and ramp volume balancing revealed that the TDMS traffic count station between Cactus Road and Shea Boulevard is believed to be over-counting traffic volumes. The mainline annual average daily traffic (AADT) count of 191,445 was adjusted to 162,000 to minimize the difference between the upstream and downstream count stations.
The 2020 existing daily and peak hour link volumes for the freeway mainline and ramp volumes are shown in the previously referenced Figure 2.1. The 2020 existing SR 101L mainline GPL daily volumes within the project limits range from approximately 61,000 vehicles per day (vpd) to approximately $83,000 \mathrm{vpd}$. The 2020 existing ramp volumes at the Tls range from approximately $6,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ to approximately $21,000 \mathrm{vpd}$.

The 2020 existing peak hour TMC volumes at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard TIs, along with at the Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection, are shown in the previously referenced Figure 2.2.

Detailed data on existing traffic volumes can be found in Appendix 1.
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Figure 2.1 - Existing Freeway Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes


Figure 2.2 - Existing TI Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes
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### 3.0 Future Traffic Volumes Analysis and Alternatives

3.1 2040 Baseline/No-Build Traffic Volumes and Geometry

Future 2040 traffic volumes developed for analysis were based on the 2040 regional travel demand model developed by the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) to evaluate the Phoenix metropolitan area's transportation system. The MAG regional travel demand model is based on projected socioeconomic, population, employment, origin-destination, and other regionally-based data.

The following network model outputs were provided by MAG as part of this analysis:

- Baseline (also known as No-Build) - Existing roadway network plus near-term programmed improvements
- Improved (also known as Build) - Existing roadway network plus long-term anticipated improvements by 2040

The 2040 Baseline/No-Build MAG model assumes only minor improvements to the existing roadway network in the vicinity of the project limits, with the SR 101L mainline remaining unchanged between Princess Drive and Shea Boulevard. A 1.0\% average annual growth rate was determined for the mainline in the project limits by comparing MAG model estimated daily volumes for the 2020 No-Build scenario and the 2040 No-Build scenario. A $0.5 \%$ average annual growth rate was determined to be the composite average growth rate of ramps, TIs , and arterials within the project limits between the 2020 No -Build scenario and the 2040 No -Build scenario. These growth rates were applied to the 2020 existing volumes to develop 2040 No-Build volumes. 2040 No-Build heavy vehicle percentages were assumed to be $7 \%$ on the freeway mainline and $4 \%$ on the ramps and TI , similar to existing heavy vehicle percentages.
The 2040 No-Build daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour link volumes and geometry for the freeway mainline and ramps are shown in Figure 3.1. The 2040 No-Build SR 101L mainline GPL daily volumes within the project limits range from approximately $74,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ to approximately 101,000 vpd. The 2040 No-Build ramp volumes at the TIs range from approximately 7,000 vpd to approximately 23,000 vpd.

The 2040 No-Build AM and PM peak hour volumes and No-Build intersection geometry are shown in Figure $\mathbf{3 . 2}$
3.2 2040 Analysis Alternatives

For the SR 101L mainline, two alternatives were analyzed as part of the 2040 traffic analysis:

- No-Build alternative - where SR 101L remains as it currently exists
- Build alternative - where SR 101L is widened by adding one GPL in each direction throughout the project limits

For the TIs, four alternatives were analyzed as part of the 2040 traffic analysis:
No-Build alternative - where the Tls remain as existing SPUIs with no improvements

- Improved SPUI alternative - where the existing SPUIs are improved/expanded at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive and Shea Boulevard TIs
- TDI alternative - where the existing SPUIS are converted to tight diamond interchanges at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevar and Raintree Drive TIs only
- DRI alternative - where the existing SPUI is converted to a double-roundabout interchange at the Raintree Drive TI only


### 3.3 2040 Improved/Build Traffic Volumes and Geometry

The $2040 \mathrm{lmproved} /$ Build MAG model assumes the SR 101L mainline is widened by one lane in each direction between Princess Drive and Shea Boulevard. A $1.2 \%$ annual growth was determined to be the average annual growth rate for the mainline in the project limits by comparing MAG model estimated daily volumes for the 2020 Build scenario and the 2040 Build scenario. A $0.5 \%$ average annual growth rate was determined to be the composite average growth rate of ramps, TIs, and arterials within the project limits between the 2020 Build scenario and the 2040 Build scenario. These growth rates were applied to the 2020 existing volumes to develop 2040 Build volumes. 2040 Build heavy vehicle percentages were assumed to be $7 \%$ on the freeway mainline and $4 \%$ on the ramps and TIs , similar to existing heavy vehicle percentages.
The 2040 Build daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour link volumes and geometry for the freeway mainline and ramps are shown in Figure 3.3. The 2040 Build SR 101L mainline GPL daily volumes within the project limits range from approximately 77,000 vpd to approximately $105,000 \mathrm{vpd}$. The 2040 Build ramp volumes at the Tls range from approximately $7,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ to approximately $23,000 \mathrm{vpd}$.

The 2040 Build AM and PM peak hour volumes at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard TIs, along with at the Raintree Drive and $87^{7 n}$ Street intersection, are shown in Figure 3.4, Figure 3.5, and Figure 3.6, respectively. Detailed data on the 2040 traffic volumes can be found in Appendix 2.

Figure 3.4, Figure 3.5, and Figure 3.6 also show the various recommended 2040 TI configurations for the Build alternatives, which includes the number of lanes, type of lanes, traffic control, and recommended storage lengths of those lanes. The geometry and traffic control of the Build alternatives was developed through an iterative process based on trying to promote safety and provide appropriate geometry to address level of service, delay, and queuing issues identified through an operational analysis of the 2040 alternatives. The 2040 operational analysis results (i.e., level of service, delay, and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues) using this assumed Build geometry are discussed in Section 6.0 of this documen


Figure 3.1 - 2040 No-Build Freeway Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes
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Figure 3.2-2040 No-Build TI Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes


Figure 3.3-2040 Build Freeway Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes


Figure 3.4-2040 Build Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes


Figure 3.5-2040 Build Raintree Drive TI Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes
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### 4.0 Crash Analysis

Historical crash data was obtained from the ADOT crash database for the segment of the SR 101L corridor from Princess Drive to south of Shea Boulevard and the SR 101L TIs of Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard. The analysis evaluated reported crashes between January 1, 2015 and December 31, 2019.

### 4.1 Mainline Crash Analysis

The mainline analysis evaluated the SR 101L corridor within the project limits. A total of 928 crashes was reported between January 1 2015 and December 31, 2019. The following is a summary of the mainline crash characteristics

- Of the 928 crashes reported, $42 \%$ ( 390 crashes) occurred in the NB direction and $58 \%$ ( 538 crashes) occurred in the SB direction
- 675 crashes resulted in property damage only ( $73 \%$ ), 250 resulted in injuries ( $27 \%$ ) and 3 resulted in a fatality ( $<1 \%$ )
- $56 \%$ ( 522 crashes) were rear-end crashes, $21 \%$ ( 198 crashes) were sideswipe crashes, and $17 \%$ ( 154 crashes) were single vehicle/fixed object crashes. The remaining $6 \%$ of crashes involved less common manners of collision (e.g., angle, head-on, rear-to-side, other/unknown)
- $75 \%$ of the crashes occurred during daylight hours, $3 \%$ occurred at dusk or dawn, and the remaining $22 \%$ occurred during hours of darkness

Historical traffic count data was referenced to calculate crash rates, which are summarized for each segment in Table 4.1. The crash rate are depicted by year and by segment in Figure 4.1 and Figure 4.2. The crash rates are expressed in terms of million vehicle miles (MVM).

Table 4.1 - SR 101L Mainline Crash Summary, 2015-2019

| Freeway Segment | Segment Length (mi.) | Northbound SR 101L |  | Southbound SR 101L |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. of Crashes } \\ \text { (Jan 2015-Dec 2019) } \end{gathered}$ | Crash Rate (Crashes/MVM) | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. of Crashes } \\ \text { (Jan 2015-Dec 2019) } \end{gathered}$ | Crash Rate (Crashes/MVM) |
| Princess Drive/Pima Road to Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | 1.26 | 98 | 0.65 | 72 | 0.47 |
| Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd to Raintree Drive | 0.80 | 37 | 0.39 | 81 | 0.76 |
| Raintree Drive to Cactus Road | 1.40 | 105 | 0.57 | 229 | 1.04 |
| Cactus Road to Shea Boulevard | 1.08 | 150 | 0.89 | 156 | 0.85 |

The 2010 SR 101L Design Concept Report analyzed crash data from 2002 to 2006. The comparison of crash rates from the previous analysis is summarized in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 - SR 101L Mainline Crash Rate Comparison to 2010 SR 101L Design Concept Report

| Freeway Segment | Segment Length (mi.) | Northbound SR 101L Crash Rate (Crashes/MVM) |  | Southbound SR 101L Crash Rate (Crashes/MVM) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2002-2006 | 2015-2019 | 2002-2006 | 2015-2019 |
| Princess Drive/Pima Road to Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | 1.26 | 0.51 | 0.65 | 0.54 | 0.47 |
| Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd to Raintree Drive | 0.80 | 0.44 | 0.39 | 0.72 | 0.76 |
| Raintree Drive to Cactus Road | 1.40 | 0.54 | 0.57 | 1.22 | 1.04 |
| Cactus Road to Shea Boulevard | 1.08 | 0.78 | 0.89 | 1.38 | 0.85 |
| Weighted Average |  | 0.57 | 0.64 | 0.98 | 0.79 |

Historical crash rates in Arizona were reviewed to compare to the values calculated in this analysis. Crash rate data was identified in the Arizona Motor Vehicle Crash Facts Report (published annually), the 2035 Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Regional Transportation Plan (2014), and in local crash rate reporting.

- The Arizona Motor Vehicle Crash Facts Reports (2014 to 2018) indicates a statewide crash rate based on the total number of crashes and the estimated number of vehicle miles traveled each year. This data includes crashes from all roadway types, from local roadways to interstate freeways. This data source provided an average crash rate of 1.88 crashes per MVM based on the five-year period of data from 2014 to 2018
- In 2010, citywide crash rate reports were prepared by the City of Scottsdale and the City of Phoenix. Scottsdale and Phoenix reported average segment crash rates of 1.63 crashes per MVM (2000 to 2008) and 2.24 crashes per MVM (2006 to 2010), respectively. This data represents arterial and collector roadways and does not include freeway segments. It is noted that freeway segments typically have lower crash rates than arterial segments, due to the nature of uninterrupted flow on freeways
- The 2035 MAG Regional Transportation Plan identified segment crash rates on various freeway corridors within the MAG region. The analysis evaluated crash data from 1999 to 2011 on the following freeway corridors: I-10, I-17, SR 51, SR 101L, SR 202L, and US 60 . The average freeway segment crash rate ranged from 1.30 to 2.10 crashes per MVM. From 1999 to 2011, SR 101L had an average crash rate of approximately 1.36 crashes per MVM
The 2015 to 2019 SR 101L crash rates from Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard are generally lower than the other regional crash rates reviewed.
A spatial heat map of the SR 101L mainline crashes, based on crash frequency, is shown in Figure 4.3. During the 2015 to 2019 analysis period, the location of greatest crash frequency occurred on SR 101L between Thunderbird Road and Shea Boulevard. The crash trends observed on the spatial heat map are consistent with the crash summaries provided in Table 4.1.

Spatial maps of injury crashes along the SR 101L project limits are shown in Figure 4.4 and Figure 4.5. Crashes that resulted in property damage only (no injury) are omitted from Figure 4.4 and Figure 4.5 to display patterns of more critical crashes. Further characteristics of the SR 101L mainline crash analysis are summarized in Figure 4.6.

Widening SR 101L to four GPLs is expected to reduce crashes related to congestion, particularly on SR 101L NB south of Shea Boulevard where the segment currently tapers from four GPLs to three GPLs.

$$
z-\Phi=
$$

| Northbound - MP 36.54 to MP 37.80 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | AADT (NB) | No. of Crashes | Crash Rate |
| 2015 | 58,378 | 10 | 0.37 |
| 2016 | 60,395 | 20 | 0.72 |
| 2017 | 66,141 | 27 | 0.89 |
| 2018 | 68,919 | 21 | 0.66 |
| 2019 | 70,751 | 20 | 0.61 |
| Average | $\mathbf{6 4 , 9 1 7}$ | 19.6 | $\mathbf{0 . 6 5}$ |


| Northbound - MP 37.81 to MP 38.60 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | AADT (NB) | No. of Crashes | Crash Rate |
| 2015 | 58,776 | 8 | 0.47 |
| 2016 | 60,822 | 7 | 0.39 |
| 2017 | 66,935 | 9 | 0.46 |
| 2018 | 68,139 | 7 | 0.35 |
| 2019 | 69,854 | 6 | 0.29 |
| Average | $\mathbf{6 4 , 9 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 9}$ |


| Southbound - MP 36.54 to MP 37.80 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | AADT (SB) | No. of Crashes | Crash Rate |
| 2015 | 60,532 | 18 | 0.65 |
| 2016 | 62,411 | 13 | 0.45 |
| 2017 | 68,908 | 16 | 0.50 |
| 2018 | 71,801 | 11 | 0.33 |
| 2019 | 73,488 | 14 | 0.41 |
| Average | $\mathbf{6 7 , 4 2 8}$ | 14.4 | $\mathbf{0 . 4 7}$ |


| Southbound - MP 37.81 to MP 38.60 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | AADT (SB) | No. of Crashes | Crash Rate |
| 2015 | 65,830 | 13 | 0.68 |
| 2016 | 67,618 | 8 | 0.41 |
| 2017 | 74,358 | 17 | 0.78 |
| 2018 | 75,942 | 22 | 0.99 |
| 2019 | 77,830 | 21 | 0.92 |
| Average | $\mathbf{7 2 , 3 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 6}$ |

1. Crash data includes reported crashes on the SR 101L mainline from January 1 to December 31 of each year Ramp crashes are not included.
2. The crash rate is calculated per million vehicle miles


Figure 4.2 - SR 101L Mainline Crash Rate by Year, Thunderbird Road to Shea Boulevard, 2015-2019
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Figure 4.5 - SR 101L Mainline Crash Severity, Thunderbird Road to Shea Boulevard, 2015-2019
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SR 101L Mainline, 2015-2019



Figure 4.6-SR 101L Mainline Crash Summary, 2015-2019

### 4.2 Traffic Interchange Crash Analysis

Historical crash data was evaluated at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard Tls. For each interchange, the crash analysis area included the following:

- Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard TIs: 300 feet west of the SR 101 L SB ramps to 300 feet east of the SR 101L NB ramps
- SR 101L Ramps: within 300 feet north and south of the intersecting roadway

All offset measurements were taken from the centerline of roadway intersections. During the five-year crash analysis period, a total of 774 crashes occurred at the three TIs. Historical traffic count data from ADOT and the City of Scottsdale was referenced to calculate crash rates, which are summarized in Table 4.3. The crash rates of each TI are shown by year in Figure 4.7 and are expressed in terms of Million Entering Vehicles (MEV).

Table 4.3 - SR 101L Traffic Interchange Crash Rates, 2015-2019

| Traffic Interchange | Daily Entering Volume <br> (Average, 2015-2019) | No. of Crashes <br> (2015-2019) | Intersection Crash Rate <br> (Crashes/MEV) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 101L / Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | 78,205 | 338 | 2.43 |
| SR 101L / Raintree Drive | 67,431 | 161 | 1.36 |
| SR 101L / Shea Blva | 87,760 | 275 | 1.74 |

A spatial diagram of the crashes by collision manner is provided in Figure 4.8. at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard TIs. Crash characteristics are summarized for these three TIs in Figure 4.9, Figure 4.10, and Figure 4.11, respectively, with aggregated results for all three TIs summarized below:

- Of the 774 crashes reported at the three traffic interchanges, 603 resulted in property damage only $(78 \%), 168$ resulted in injuries ( $22 \%$ ) and 3 resulted in a fatality ( $<1 \%$ )
- $64 \%$ ( 496 crashes) were rear-end crashes, $15 \%$ ( 117 crashes) were sideswipe crashes, $11 \%$ ( 86 crashes) were angle crashes, $5 \%$ ( 35 crashes) were single vehicle/fixed object crashes, and $3 \%$ ( 23 crashes) were left-turn crashes. The remaining $2 \%$ of crashes involved less common manners of collision (e.g., head-on, rear-to-side, other/unknown)
- $84 \%$ of the crashes occurred during daylight hours, $3 \%$ occurred at dusk or dawn, and the remaining $13 \%$ occurred during hours of darkness

Expected safety characteristics of the TI configuration alternatives (No-Build and Improved SPUI, TDI, DRI) include the following:

- No-Build SPUI: contains 28 potential conflict points, including 12 crossing points, and prohibits wrong-way travel by signage
- Improved SPUI: contains 28 potential conflict points, including 12 crossing points, and prohibits wrong-way travel by signage a slight reduction in the overall crash rate is expected due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements
- TDI: contains 26 potential conflict points, including 10 crossing points, and prohibits wrong-way travel by signage; a slight reduction in the overall crash rate is expected due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements; a moderate reduction in the severe crash rate is expected due to the reduced number of crossing points
- DRI: contains 38 potential conflict points, including 10 crossing points, and prohibits wrong-way travel by raised concrete islands; a moderate reduction in the overall crash rate is expected due to a significant reduction in congestion from operational improvements; a significant reduction in the severe crash rate is expected due to the reduced number of crossing points and lower operating speeds
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SR 101L / Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, 2015-2019


Figure 4.9 - Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd TI Crash Summary, 2015-2019


Figure 4.10 - Raintree Drive TI Crash Summary, 2015-2019


Figure 4.11 - Shea Boulevard TI Crash Summary, 2015-2019

### 4.3 Review of Previous Studies

The following studies conducted in the project limits were reviewed to summarize key safety findings and recommendations:

- SR 101L/Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd and SR 101L/Raintree Drive Road Safety Assessment (RSA) (May 2011)
- Raintree Drive Extension Design Concept Report: Scottsdale Road to SR 101 L (June 2014)
- Traffic Alternatives Study: State Route 101 L from Princess Drive to Raintree Drive (May 2017)

No prior relevant studies were identified that included safety findings and recommendations for the Shea Boulevard TI.
4.3.1 Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI

The 2011 RSA recommended several minor improvements related to yield-compliance and bicycle/pedestrian safety, along with separating out the shared NB and SB left-turn/through lanes.
The 2017 Traffic Alternatives Study recommended that the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI be converted to a TDI. The 2011 RSA indicated that converting the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI to a TDI should be given consideration. The conversion from a SPUI to a TDI is anticipated to address or improve the following safety issues identified in the Road Safety Assessment:

- High-speed eastbound (EB) and westbound (WB) right-turns onto the frontage road/Pima Road due to roadway geometry
- High-speed merging section of multiple movements at the entrance to the SR 101 NB and SB on-ramps
- Driver yielding and pedestrian conflicts in the crosswalks spanning the channelized $E B$ and $W B$ right-turn lanes
- The need for additional EB and WB left-turn lane storage length/capacity
- U-turns from the outer lane of the NB and SB dual left-turn lanes due to driver confusion
- Skewed north-south crosswalks
- Narrow pedestrian refuge area within the north-south crosswalks
4.3.2 Raintree Drive TI

Recommendations provided for the Raintree Drive TI included:

- The 2017 Traffic Alternatives Study recommended the addition of a WB right-turn lane
- The 2017 Traffic Alternatives Study recommended improved NB on-ramp pavement markings at the Raintree Drive TI. The recommendation to improve the NB on-ramp pavement markings was also discussed in the 2011 Road Safety Assessment. As the dual EB left-turn lanes transition to the NB frontage road/Pima Road, a lane reduction creates a merge section approximately 100 feet north of the intersection. The left-side lane reduction causes the inside left-turn lane to merge with the outside left-turn lane. In addition to the immediate merge of EB left-turning vehicles, a potential conflict exists as WB right-turning vehicles enter the merge section, and often merge into the left lane in anticipation of entering the freeway on-ramp farther north. Based on the roadway geometry and multiple merge conditions, the 2011 Road Safety Assessment recommended pavement marking and/or geometric improvements to this area
- The 2011 RSA recommended several minor improvements related to yield-compliance and bicycle/pedestrian safety, including widening the pedestrian refuge area within the north-south crosswalks
- The 2011 RSA recommended consideration of strategies to reduce driver confusion of stopping locations at the SPUI. Vehicles occasionally enter the intersection before realizing they need to stop due to a red signal indication. The 2011 RSA recommended evaluating the existing pavement markings within the intersection to give more visual cues of the intersection and the appropriate stopping positions on the interchange approaches


## Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd

Initial Traffic Report Update

### 5.0 Freeway Operational Analysis

5.1 Analysis Methodology

An operational analysis was performed for the GPLs and ramp merge/diverge areas of SR 101L within the project limits. HOV lanes were excluded to simplify the analysis, although a preliminary review indicated they should operate below capacity through 2040. The operational analysis was conducted for the 2020 Existing, 2040 Baseline/No-Build, and 2040 Improved/Build scenarios.

The VISSIM microscopic traffic simulation software was used to provide a simulation of traffic conditions on the freeway within the project limits. VISSIM can provide measures of effectiveness for each link within the network. Average vehicle density results from VISSIM were used as the measure of effectiveness to come up with a level of service (LOS) for each analysis segment. Average vehicle speed results from VISSIM were also noted. VISSIM uses random seeds to better match how traffic congestion levels change slightly every day, so ten model runs were conducted and then averaged together to provide the VISSIM model results.

The concept of LOS uses qualitative measures that characterize operational conditions for roadway segments. They are given lette designations from LOS A to LOS F, with LOS A representing uncongested free-flow conditions and LOS F representing an overcapacity condition with a high degree of congestion and vehicle delay. Each LOS grade represents a range of operational conditions.

Table 5.1 shows the average freeway vehicle density ranges that correspond with each segment LOS letter grade for urban conditions. ADOT considers LOS D or better "acceptable" LOS for freeway operations in urban conditions.

Table 5.1 - Freeway Segment Vehicle Density Ranges and Level of Service

| Level of Service | Urban Density Range <br> (vehicles/mile/lane) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $\leq 11$ |
| B | $>11$ and $\leq 18$ |
| C | $>18$ and $\leq 26$ |
| D | $>26$ and $\leq 35$ |
| E | $>35$ and $\leq 45$ |
| F | $>45$ <br> $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c} \mathrm{ratio}>1.0$ |

Definitions provided from the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), Exhibit 12-15, Transportation Research Board (TRB), 2016
5.2 2020 Existing Freeway Traffic Conditions

The 2020 Existing freeway mainline operational analysis was based on the existing lane geometries and configurations of the existing freeway as described in Section 2.0 of this document. The VISSIM-modeled average vehicle speed, vehicle density, and corresponding LOS for each segment and peak hour for the 2020 Existing scenario are presented in Table 5.2, with the corresponding VISSIM output reports provided in Appendix 3.

Per the 2020 Existing freeway mainline LOS analysis, all freeway segments within the project limits operate at LOS D or better during the 2020 AM and PM peak hours except for the NB segment between Shea Boulevard and the Shea Boulevard NB on-ramp (LOS E in AM), the NB Shea Boulevard on-ramp merge segment (LOS E in AM and PM), and the NB Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard on-ramp merge segment (LOS F in PM). The highest density in the project limits is 50 vehicles per mile per lane (vpmpl), which occurs at the NB Frank Lloyd Wrigh Boulevard on-ramp merge segment in the PM peak hour. These results indicate most of the freeway segments in the project limits currently provide acceptable freeway traffic operations but there are a few locations with significant congestion.

Table 5.2-2020 Existing Freeway Mainline Level of Service by Segment

| Mainline Segment | 2020 Existing |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Speed } \\ & \text { (mph) } \end{aligned}$ | Density (vpmpl) | LOS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Speed } \\ & \text { (mph) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Density } \\ & \text { (ypmpl) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS |
| Loop 101 Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West of Hayden EB On-Ramp | 59 | 35 | LOS D | 62 | 24 | LOS C |
| Hayden On-Ramp Merge | 64 | 25 | LOS C | 66 | 18 | LOS C |
| Between Hayden On-Ramp \& Princess On-Ramp | 65 | 28 | LOS D | 66 | 20 | LOS C |
| Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 59 | 30 | LOS D | 59 | 23 | LOS C |
| Between Princess Dr On-Ramp \& FLW Off-Ramp | 60 | 30 | LOS D | 63 | 22 | LOS C |
| Between FLW Off-Ramp \& Raintree Off-Ramp | 60 | 26 | LOS C | 66 | 18 | LOS B |
| Between Raintree Off-Ramp \& FLW On-Ramp | 65 | 27 | LOS D | 66 | 22 | LOS C |
| FLW On-Ramp Merge | 61 | 23 | LOS C | 61 | 21 | LOS C |
| Between FLW On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 65 | 24 | LOS C | 66 | 22 | LOS C |
| Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 60 | 29 | LOS D | 48 | 32 | LOS D |
| Between Raintree On-Ramp \& Cactus Road On-Ramp | 65 | 31 | LOS D | 56 | 33 | LOS D |
| Cactus Road On-Ramp Merge | 65 | 27 | LOS D | 64 | 27 | LOS D |
| Between Cactus Road On-Ramp and Shea Blvd On-Ramp | 66 | 21 | LOS C | 66 | 23 | LOS C |
| Shea Blvd On-Ramp Merge | 61 | 30 | LOS D | 64 | 27 | LOS D |
| Loop 101 Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Between Shea Blvd \& Shea Blvd On-Ramp | 50 | 36 | LOS E | 55 | 35 | LOS D |
| Shea Blvd On-Ramp Merge | 49 | 39 | LOS E | 48 | 39 | LOS E |
| Between Cactus Rd Off-Ramp \& On-Ramp | 61 | 34 | LOS D | 61 | 33 | LOS D |
| Cactus Road On-Ramp Merge | 60 | 22 | LOS C | 61 | 20 | LOS C |
| Between Cactus Road On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 60 | 22 | LOS C | 63 | 24 | LOS C |
| Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 65 | 21 | LOS C | 62 | 21 | LOS C |
| Between Raintree On-Ramp and FLW On-Ramp | 66 | 17 | LOS B | 65 | 21 | LOS C |
| FLW On-Ramp Merge | 62 | 19 | LOS C | 46 | 50 | LOS F |
| Between FLW On-Ramp and Princess Drive On-Ramp | 66 | 21 | LOS C | 65 | 25 | LOS C |
| Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 65 | 18 | LOS B | 63 | 23 | LOS C |
| West of Princess Drive | 66 | 21 | LOS C | 65 | 26 | LOS C |

### 5.3 2040 Baseline/No-Build Freeway Traffic Conditions

An analysis was completed using the 2040 Baseline/No-Build freeway mainline volumes and geometry, as described in Section 3.0 of this document The VISSIM-moded 20 a 2040 Baseline/No-Build scenario are presented in Table 5.3, with the corresponding VISSIM output reports provided in Appendix 3

Per the 2040 Baseline/No-Build freeway mainline LOS analysis, only about half of the freeway segments within the project limits are expected to operate at LOS D or better in the 2040 AM and PM peak hours. The highest density in the project limits is 116 vpmpl which
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occurs at the SB Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard on-ramp merge segment in the PM peak hour. These results indicate many of the segments in the project limits will likely experience significant congestion by 2040 if no additional GPLs are provided.

Table 5.3-2040 Baseline/No-Build Freeway Mainline Level of Service by Segment

| Mainline Segment | 2040 No-Build |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Speed } \\ & (\mathrm{mph}) \end{aligned}$ | Density (vpmpl) | LOS | Speed (mph) | Density (pmpl) | LOS |
| Loop 101 Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West of Hayden EB On-Ramp | 27 | 81 | LOS F | 60 | 31 | LOS D |
| Hayden On-Ramp Merge | 52 | 34 | LOS D | 65 | 22 | LOS C |
| Between Hayden On-Ramp \& Princess On-Ramp | 60 | 34 | LOS D | 60 | 24 | LOS C |
| Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 53 | 37 | LOS E | 40 | 41 | LOS E |
| Between Princess Dr On-Ramp \& FLW Off-Ramp | 49 | 41 | LOS E | 33 | 50 | LOS F |
| Between FLW Off-Ramp \& Raintree Off-Ramp | 37 | 50 | LOS F | 20 | 69 | LOS F |
| Between Raintree Off-Ramp \& FLW On-Ramp | 25 | 78 | LOS F | 15 | 102 | LOS F |
| FLW On-Ramp Merge | 18 | 86 | LOS F | 11 | 116 | LOS F |
| Between FLW On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 20 | 81 | LOS F | 13 | 111 | LOS F |
| Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 27 | 61 | LOS F | 22 | 74 | LOS F |
| Between Raintree On-Ramp \& Cactus Road On-Ramp | 64 | 34 | LOS D | 52 | 35 | LOS D |
| Cactus Road On-Ramp Merge | 60 | 31 | LOS D | 64 | 27 | LOS D |
| Between Cactus Road On-Ramp and Shea Blvd On-Ramp | 65 | 26 | LOS C | 66 | 23 | LOS C |
| Shea Blvd On-Ramp Merge | 53 | 39 | LOS E | 64 | 27 | LOS D |
| Loop 101 Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Between Shea Blvd \& Shea Blvd On-Ramp | 14 | 112 | LOS F | 24 | 89 | LOS F |
| Shea Blvd On-Ramp Merge | 35 | 58 | LOS F | 38 | 57 | LOS F |
| Between Cactus Rd Off-Ramp \& On-Ramp | 59 | 37 | LOS E | 59 | 37 | LOS E |
| Cactus Road On-Ramp Merge | 59 | 26 | LOS C | 60 | 25 | LOS C |
| Between Cactus Road On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 59 | 24 | LOS C | 60 | 29 | LOS D |
| Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 63 | 21 | LOS C | 58 | 28 | LOS D |
| Between Raintree On-Ramp and FLW On-Ramp | 66 | 19 | LOS C | 59 | 29 | LOS D |
| FLW On-Ramp Merge | 59 | 23 | LOS C | 46 | 51 | LOS F |
| Between FLW On-Ramp and Princess Drive On-Ramp | 65 | 24 | LOS C | 64 | 29 | LOS D |
| Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 64 | 20 | LOS C | 61 | 27 | LOS D |
| West of Princess Drive | 65 | 25 | LOS C | 63 | 31 | LOS D |

### 5.4 2040 Improved/Build Freeway Traffic Conditions

An analysis was completed using the $2040 \mathrm{Improved} /$ Build freeway mainline volumes and geometry, as described in Section 3.0 of this An analysis was completed using the 2040 Improved/Build freeway mainline volumes and geometry, as described in Section 3.0 of this 2040 Improved/Build scenario are presented in Table 5.4, with the corresponding VISSIM output reports provided in Appendix 3.

Per the $20401 \mathrm{mproved} /$ Build freeway mainline LOS analysis, all freeway segments within the project limits are expected to operate at LOS D or better in the 2040 AM and PM peak hours except for the NB Shea Boulevard on-ramp merge segment (LOS E in AM and PM). The highest density in the project limits is 38 vpmpl, which occurs at the NB Shea Boulevard on-ramp merge segment in the PM peak hour. These results indicate that the addition of one GPL lane in each direction will generally provide acceptable freeway traffic operations through 2040, with some congestion present at the NB Shea Boulevard on-ramp merge segment in the PM peak hour. If LOS D or better is desired for all mainline segments in 2040 during all time periods, additional improvements would be required at the NB Shea Boulevard on-ramp merge segment.

Table 5.4-2040 Improved/Build Freeway Mainline Level of Service by Segment

| Mainline Segment | 2040 Improved/Build |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Speed } \\ & \text { (mph) } \end{aligned}$ | Density (pmpl) | LOS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Speed } \\ & (\mathrm{mph}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Density } \\ & \text { (vpmpl) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS |
| Loop 101 Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| West of Hayden EB On-Ramp | 60 | 33 | LOS D | 62 | 24 | LOS C |
| Hayden On-Ramp Merge | 64 | 26 | LOS C | 66 | 19 | LOS C |
| Between Hayden On-Ramp \& Princess On-Ramp | 65 | 27 | LOS D | 67 | 20 | LOS C |
| Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 60 | 29 | LOS D | 62 | 22 | LOS C |
| Between Princess Dr On-Ramp \& FLW Off-Ramp | 58 | 31 | LOS D | 62 | 22 | LOS C |
| Between FLW Off-Ramp \& Raintree Off-Ramp | 58 | 28 | LOS D | 65 | 18 | LOS B |
| Between Raintree Off-Ramp \& FLW On-Ramp | 65 | 26 | LOS C | 67 | 21 | LOS C |
| FLW On-Ramp Merge | 62 | 23 | LOS C | 62 | 22 | LOS C |
| Between FLW On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 65 | 24 | LOS C | 65 | 22 | LOS C |
| Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 59 | 29 | LOS D | 56 | 25 | LOS C |
| Between Raintree On-Ramp \& Cactus Road On-Ramp | 65 | 30 | LOS D | 65 | 30 | LOS D |
| Cactus Road On-Ramp Merge | 63 | 28 | LOS D | 64 | 26 | LOS C |
| Between Cactus Road On-Ramp and Shea Blvd On-Ramp | 66 | 22 | LOS C | 67 | 22 | LOS C |
| Shea Blvd On-Ramp Merge | 60 | 30 | LOS D | 65 | 25 | LOS C |
| Loop 101 Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Between Shea Blvd \& Shea Blvd On-Ramp | 60 | 31 | LOS D | 52 | 34 | LOS D |
| Shea Blvd On-Ramp Merge | 61 | 37 | LOS E | 51 | 38 | LOS E |
| Between Cactus Rd Off-Ramp \& On-Ramp | 62 | 33 | LOS D | 62 | 33 | LOS D |
| Cactus Road On-Ramp Merge | 53 | 28 | LOS D | 57 | 25 | LOS C |
| Between Cactus Road On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 56 | 25 | LOS C | 63 | 25 | LOS C |
| Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 64 | 18 | LOS B | 63 | 23 | LOS C |
| Between Raintree On-Ramp and FLW On-Ramp | 66 | 18 | LOS B | 65 | 22 | LOS C |
| FLW On-Ramp Merge | 62 | 21 | LOS C | 60 | 26 | LOS C |
| Between FLW On-Ramp and Princess Drive On-Ramp | 66 | 21 | LOS C | 65 | 24 | LOS C |
| Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 65 | 19 | LOS C | 63 | 23 | LOS C |
| West of Princess Drive | 66 | 21 | LOS C | 65 | 26 | LOS C |

## Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd

Initial Traffic Report Update

### 6.0 Traffic Interchange Operational Analysis

6.1 Analysis Methodology

An operational analysis was performed for all freeway ramp/arterial roadway intersections at the Frank Lloyd Wright, Raintree Drive, and Shea Boulevard TIs, as well as at the Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection. The operational analysis was conducted for the 2020 Existing, 2040 Baseline/No-Build, and 2040 Improved/Build scenarios.

The VISSIM microscopic traffic simulation software was used to provide a simulation of traffic conditions at the TIs. Ten model runs were conducted and then averaged together to provide the VISSIM model results. Intersections were analyzed in VISSIM using the 2016 HCM methodology. For the double-roundabouts interchange alternative at the Raintree Drive TI , the RODEL analysis software was used to model the LOS, delay, and queues.
Similar to roadway segment LOS, each intersection, approach, or movement is given a letter designation from LOS A to LOS F, with LOS A representing uncongested free-flow conditions and LOS F representing an overcapacity condition with a high degree of congestion and vehicle delay. Each LOS grade represents a range of operational conditions.
Table 6.1 shows the average vehicle delay ranges for both signalized and unsignalized intersections that correspond with each LOS letter grade, along with average vehicle delay ranges and corresponding LOS letter grades for diamond TIs (for the TDI alternative), which are effectively two closely-spaced intersections that act as one. ADOT considers LOS D or better "acceptable" LOS for overall Tl and intersection operations in urban conditions. Average vehicle queues in VISSIM that do not exceed available storage or do not block upstream driveways/intersections are generally considered to have acceptable queue lensths.

Table 6.1 - Average Vehicle Delay Ranges and Corresponding Level of Service

$\left.$|  | Average Delay Range (seconds/vehicle) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level of Service | Diamond <br> Interchanges | Signalized <br> Intersections |  | | Unsignalized |
| :---: |
| Intersections | \right\rvert\,

1. Definitions for diamond interchanges provided from the HCM, Exxibit 23-10, TRB, 2016. 3. Definitions for unsignalized intersections provided from the HCM, Exhibit 20-2, TRB, 2016.
6.2 2020 Existing TI/Intersection Traffic Conditions

The 2020 Existing TI/intersection operational analysis was based on the existing lane geometries and configurations of the existing TIs/intersections as described in Section 2.0 of this document. Current signal timings were provided by the City of Scottsdale, which include a 120 -second cycle length for all analyzed intersections. The VISSIM-modeled delay, corresponding LOS, and queues at the project TIs/intersections for the 2020 Existing scenario are presented in Table 6.2 for the AM peak hour and in Table 6.3 for the PM peak hour with the corresponding VISSIM output reports provided in Appendix 4.

Table 6.2-2020 Existing TI/Intersection Analysis Results: AM Peak Hour

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | E | D | C | - | D | F | B | - | F | D | B | E | D | B | D |
| Delay (sec) | 65 | 50 | 33 | - | 52 | 93 | 15 | - | 125 | 38 | 13 | 66 | 45 | 14 | 51 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 164 | 89 | 86 | - | 94 | 144 | 143 | - | 493 | 137 | 46 | 65 | 89 | 53 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | C | C | F | E | F | F | E | D | D | A | E | D | C | F |
| Delay (sec) | 150 | 32 | 21 | 152 | 60 | 117 | 286 | 64 | 52 | 53 | 7 | 63 | 40 | 22 | 92 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 889 | 801 | 683 | 889 | 250 | 1208 | 1208 | 250 | 43 | 36 | 11 | 168 | 85 | 36 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | A | - | D | D | C | - | B | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Delay (sec) | 52 | 50 | 7 | - | 51 | 54 | 27 | - | 11 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 4 | 4 | 3 | - | 13 | 29 | 45 | - | 166 | 166 | 166 | 190 | 217 | 67 | - |
| Shea Boulevard \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | - | A | - | D | - | B | - | D | C | B | F | C | B | C |
| Delay (sec) | 36 | - | 4 | - | 46 | - | 13 | - | 43 | 29 | 14 | 86 | 29 | 20 | 35 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 51 | - | 3 | - | 131 | - | 4 | - | 48 | 62 | 35 | 465 | 47 | 285 |  |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI currently operates at LOS D overall in the AM peak hour. The EB left-turn (EBL) queue of 493' exceeds the 185 ' of available storage, impacting EB through (EBT) operations.

The Raintree Drive TI currently operates at LOS F overall in the AM peak hour. The NB left-turn (NBL) and U-turn (NBU) queue of 889' exceeds the 475' of available storage, impacting NB through (NBT) operations. The SB through (SBT) and right-turn (SBR) queue of $1,208^{\prime}$ blocks upstream driveways and intersections, impacting upstream operations. The WB right-turn (WBR) queue of $36^{\prime}$ exceeds the $25^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WB through (WBT) operations.

The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection currently operates at LOS A overall in the AM peak hour. The EBL and EB right-turn (EBR) queues of $166^{\prime}$ exceed the $125^{\prime}$ and $120^{\prime}$ of available storage, respectively, impacting EBT operations. The WB left-turn (WBL) queue of $190^{\prime}$ exceeds the $60^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.

The Shea Boulevard TI currently operates at LOS C overall in the AM peak hour. The WBL queue of $465^{\prime}$ exceeds the $275^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations. The WBR queue of $285^{\prime}$ exceeds the $130^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.
These results indicate the Raintree Drive TI does not provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2020 Existing AM peak hour. The other project TIs/intersections provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2020 Existing AM peak hour. There are a few locations/movements that have congestion and queuing issues.

Table 6.3-2020 Existing TI/Intersection Analysis Results: PM Peak Hour

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | $F$ | D | C | - | D | F | B | - | E | E | D | F | E | B | E |
| Delay (sec) | 99 | 45 | 27 | - | 44 | 85 | 16 | - | 59 | 60 | 51 | 377 | 57 | 14 | 68 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 244 | 80 | 76 | - | 93 | 197 | 194 | - | 74 | 349 | 344 | 715 | 311 | 32 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | D | D | D | D | B | D | E | E | D | F | E | D | E |
| Delay (sec) | 42 | 53 | 40 | 43 | 43 | 40 | 15 | 42 | 60 | 57 | 43 | 156 | 74 | 51 | 60 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 65 | 108 | 140 | 65 | 34 | 42 | 35 | 34 | 103 | 105 | 354 | 574 | 372 | 253 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | F | F | - | F | E | D | - | D | F | E | B | A | A | F |
| Delay (sec) | 214 | 224 | 699 | - | 157 | 74 | 45 | - | 46 | 102 | 80 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 87 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 7 | 4 | 1638 | - | 104 | 18 | 28 | - | 6 | 942 | 942 | 0 | 6 | 0 | - |
| Shea Boulevard \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | - | A | - | D | - | B | - | D | C | A | E | C | E | C |
| Delay (sec) | 44 | - | 5 | - | 44 | - | 11 | - | 47 | 24 | 9 | 57 | 29 | 62 | 35 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 97 | - | 5 | - | 111 | - | 0 | - | 58 | 52 | 21 | 366 | 311 | 1083 | - |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI currently operates at LOS E overall in the PM peak hour. The EBR queue of 344 exceeds the 175' of available storage, impacting EBT operations. The WBL queue of $715^{\prime}$ ' exceeds the $245^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.
The Raintree Drive TI currently operates at LOS E overall in the PM peak hour. The EBR queue of $354^{\prime}$ exceeds the $250^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting EBT operations. The WBL queue of $574^{\prime}$ exceeds the $210^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations. The WBR queue of $253^{\prime}$ exceeds the $25^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.

The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection currently operates at LOS F overall in the PM peak hour. The NB right-turn (NBR) queue of $1,638^{\prime}$ blocks upstream driveways and intersections, impacting upstream operations. The EBT and EBR queue of $942^{\prime}$ blocks an upstream intersection, impacting upstream operations.

The Shea Boulevard TI currently operates at LOS C overall in the PM peak hour. The WBL queue of $366^{\prime}$ exceeds the $275^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations. The WBR queue of $1,083^{\prime}$ exceeds the $130^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.
These results indicate the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI , Raintree Drive T , and Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection do not provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2020 Existing PM peak hour. The Shea Boulevard TI provides acceptable overall LOS in the 2020 Existing PM acceptable overall LOS in the 2020 Existing PM peak hour. The Shea Boulevard TI provides
peak hour. There are a few locations/movements that have congestion and queuing issues
6.3 2040 Baseline/No-Build TI/Intersection Traffic Conditions

An analysis was completed of the project TIs/intersections using the 2040 Baseline/No-Build volumes and geometry as described in Sectio 3.0 of this document. The VISSIM-modeled delay, corresponding LOS, and queues at the project TIs/intersections for the 2040 Baseline/No-Build scenario are presented in Table 6.4 for the AM peak hour and in Table 6.5 for the PM peak hour, with the corresponding VISSIM output reports provided in Appendix 4.

Table 6.4-2040 Baseline/No-Build TI/Intersection Analysis Results: AM Peak Hour

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | E | D | - | E | F | D | - | F | D | C | E | D | B | E |
| Delay (sec) | 115 | 60 | 44 | - | 59 | 147 | 41 | - | 167 | 47 | 23 | 66 | 48 | 17 | 68 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 330 | 196 | 195 | - | 203 | 312 | 319 | - | 1050 | 913 | 609 | 65 | 110 | 67 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | C | C | F | F | F | F | F | D | D | A | F | D | C | F |
| Delay (sec) | 151 | 35 | 22 | 153 | 93 | 244 | 341 | 100 | 54 | 55 | 8 | 88 | 47 | 29 | 110 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 886 | 751 | 614 | 886 | 739 | 1315 | 1315 | 739 | 51 | 40 | 15 | 454 | 252 | 156 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | A | - | D | D | C | - | B | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Delay (sec) | 55 | 50 | 8 | - | 54 | 54 | 30 | - | 12 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 4 | 3 | 3 | - | 16 | 35 | 52 | - | 8 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 0 | - |
| Shea Boulevard \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | - | A | - | D | - | B | - | D | C | B | F | D | C | D |
| Delay (sec) | 37 | - | 4 | - | 46 | - | 13 | - | 45 | 30 | 20 | 125 | 46 | 32 | 44 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 42 | - | 3 | - | 123 | - | 2 | - | 54 | 69 | 56 | 1259 | 620 | 1211 | - |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS E overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build AM peak hour. The SBR queue of $319^{\prime}$ exceeds the $235^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting SBT operations. The EBL queue of $1,050^{\prime}$ exceeds the $185^{\prime}$ of available storage and of $319^{\prime}$ exceeds the $235^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting SBT operations. The EBL queue of $1,050^{\prime}$ exceeds the $185^{\prime}$ of available storage and
blocks the upstream driveway and intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operations. The EBT queue of $913^{\prime}$ blocks the upstream driveway and intersection, impacting upstream operations. The EBR queue of $609^{\prime}$ exceeds the $175^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway, impacting EBT and upstream operations.

The Raintree Drive Tl is expected to operate at LOS F overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build AM peak hour. The NBL and NBU queue of $886^{\prime}$ exceeds the 475' of available storage, impacting NBT operations. The SBT and SBR queue of $1,315^{\prime}$ blocks upstream driveways and intersections, impacting upstream operations. The WBL queue of 454' exceeds the $210^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks an upstream driveway, impacting WBT and upstream operations. The WBR queue of $156^{\prime}$ exceeds the $25^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.

The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is expected to operate at LOS A overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build AM peak hour with no queuing issues. It should be noted that the 2020 Existing results showed slight queuing issues at this intersection while the 2040 Baseline/No-Build results don't show any queuing issues - this is likely due to the WBL queuing issues at the Raintree Drive TI blocking WBT vehicles from reaching the Raintree Drive and $87{ }^{\mathrm{h}}$ Street intersection.

The Shea Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build AM peak hour. The WBL queue of 1,259' exceeds the 275' of available storage and blocks upstream driveways, impacting WBT and upstream operations. The WBT queue of 620' blocks upstream driveways, impacting upstream operations. The WBR queue of $1,211^{\prime}$ exceeds the $130^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks upstream driveways, impacting WBT and upstream operations.
These results indicate the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI and the Raintree Drive TI are not expected to provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build AM peak hour. The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection and Shea Boulevard TI are expected to provide acceptable overall LOS in the PM peak hour. Several locations/movements are expected to have congestion and queuing issues.

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | D | D | - | D | F | D | - | E | F | E | F | E | B | F |
| Delay (sec) | 178 | 54 | 38 | - | 49 | 129 | 43 | - | 78 | 86 | 74 | 443 | 67 | 20 | 94 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 525 | 311 | 310 | - | 241 | 432 | 438 | - | 544 | 1225 | 1246 | 1036 | 876 | 34 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | F | F | D | D | D | B | D | E | E | D | F | F | E | E |
| Delay (sec) | 41 | 135 | 116 | 42 | 44 | 40 | 17 | 42 | 58 | 59 | 43 | 184 | 97 | 72 | 76 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 282 | 429 | 472 | 282 | 70 | 50 | 45 | 70 | 99 | 12 | 353 | 1007 | 965 | 915 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | F | F | - | F | F | E | - | D | F | F | C | A | A | F |
| Delay (sec) | 249 | 232 | 741 | - | 181 | 97 | 64 | - | 52 | 105 | 82 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 158 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 69 | 3 | 1650 | - | 154 | 54 | 68 | - | 980 | 980 | 980 | 1 | 8 | 1 | - |
| Shea Boulevard \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | - | A | - | D | - | B | - | D | C | A | E | D | E | D |
| Delay (sec) | 43 | - | 5 | - | 44 | - | 11 | - | 50 | 23 | 10 | 63 | 38 | 80 | 38 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 110 | - | 5 | - | 125 | - | 0 | - | 66 | 55 | 25 | 1120 | 975 | 1555 | - |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS F overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build PM peak hour. The SBR queue of $438^{\prime}$ exceeds the $235^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting SBT operations. The EBL queue of $544^{\prime}$ exceeds the $185^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway, impacting EBT and upstream operations. The EBT queue of $1,225^{\prime}$ ' blocks the upstream driveway and intersection, impacting upstream operations. The EBR queue of $1,246^{\prime}$ 'exceeds the $175^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream intersection and driveway, impacting EBT and upstream operations. The WBL queue of $1,036^{\prime}$ exceeds the $245^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream intersection and driveways, impacting WBT operations.

The Raintree Drive TI is expected to operate at LOS E overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build PM peak hour. The NBU queue of $282^{\prime}$ exceeds the $225^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting NBL operations. The EBR queue of $353^{\prime}$ exceeds the $250^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting EB operations. The WBL queue of $1,007^{\prime}$ exceeds the $210^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway, impacting WBT and upstream operations. The WBT queue of $965^{\prime}$ blocks the upstream driveway, impacting upstream operations. The WBR queue of 915 exceeds the $25^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway, impacting WBT and upstream operations.
The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is expected to operate at LOS F overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build PM peak hour. The NBR queue of $1,650^{\prime}$ blocks upstream driveways and intersections, impacting upstream operations. The SBR queue of $154^{\prime}$ exceeds the $110^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting SBT and SBR operations. The EBL queue of $980^{\prime}$ exceeds the $125^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks an upstream intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operations. The EBT queue of $980^{\prime}$ blocks an upstream intersection, impacting upstream operations. The EBR queue of $980^{\prime}$ exceeds the $120^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks an upstream intersection, impacting upstream operations.

The Shea Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build PM peak hour. The WBL queue of 1,120 exceeds the $275^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks upstream driveways, impacting WBT and upstream operations. The WBT queue of $975^{\circ}$ blocks upstream driveways, impacting upstream operations. The WBR queue of $1,555^{\prime}$ ' exceeds the $130^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream intersection and driveways, impacting WBT and upstream operations.

These results indicate the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI, Raintree Drive TI, and Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection are not expected to provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build PM peak hour. The Shea Boulevard TI provides acceptable overall LOS in the 2040 Baseline/No-Build. Several locations/movements are expected to have congestion and queuing issues

### 6.4 2040 Improved/Build TI/Intersection Conditions

An analysis was completed of the project TIs/intersections using the 2040 Improved/Build volumes and geometry as described in Section An analysis was completed of the project $1 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{intersections} \mathrm{using} \mathrm{the} 2040$ mproved/Build volumes and ge.

- Improved SPUI alternative - where the existing SPUIs are improved/expanded at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard, Raintree Drive and Shea Boulevard TIs
- TDI alternative - where the existing SPUls are converted to tight diamond interchanges at the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard and Raintree Drive TIs only
- DRI alternative - where the existing SPUI is converted to a double-roundabout interchange at the Raintree Drive TI only


### 6.4.1 Improved Single-Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) Analysis

Improvements included in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative consisted of the following:

- At the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI, the assumed SPUI configuration improvements included exclusive dual NBL and SBL lanes (as opposed to a shared left-turn/through lane), adding a SBT lane, adding a NBR lane, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments
- At the Raintree Drive TI, the assumed SPUI configuration improvements included adding a NBR lane and SBR lane, additional WBR storage capacity, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments
- At the Raintree Drive and 87 th Street intersection, the only assumed improvements were signal timing adjustments, where At the Raintree Drive and 87 th Street intersection, the only assumed improvements were signal timin
the EBL and WBL phasing was changed to permitted/protected and NBR overlap phasing was added
- At the Shea Boulevard TI, the assumed SPUI configuration improvements included extending the WBR storage to be $600^{\prime}$ and associated signal timing adjustments; geometric constraints restricted the ability to improve the WBL movement
The VISSIM-modeled delay, corresponding LOS, and queues at the project TIs/intersections for the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative are presented in Table 6.6 for the AM peak hour and in Table 6.7 for the PM peak hour, with the corresponding VISSIM output reports provided in Appendix 4.


## Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd

Initial Traffic Report Update
Table 6.6 - 2040 Improved/Build SPUI Alternative TI/Intersection Analysis Results: AM Peak Hour

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | B | - | D | D | C | - | F | D | B | F | E | D | D |
| Delay (sec) | 51 | 53 | 10 | - | 37 | 51 | 21 | - | 95 | 53 | 16 | 82 | 74 | 51 | 54 |
| Avg. Queue ( ft ) | 126 | 92 | 10 | - | 70 | 62 | 44 | - | 299 | 194 | 69 | 78 | 505 | 387 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | C | B | F | D | D | D | E | D | E | B | E | D | B | D |
| Delay (sec) | 117 | 28 | 13 | 117 | 53 | 57 | 41 | 57 | 44 | 76 | 14 | 74 | 42 | 12 | 55 |
| Avg. Queue ( ft ) | 896 | 6 | 15 | 896 | 74 | 58 | 87 | 74 | 39 | 53 | 27 | 260 | 99 | 127 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | B | - | D | D | C | - | B | C | A | B | A | A | B |
| Delay (sec) | 42 | 40 | 13 | - | 47 | 45 | 25 | - | 22 | 35 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 2 | 17 |
| Avg. Queue ( ft ) | 3 | 3 | 4 | - | 14 | 27 | 43 | - | 71 | 71 | 71 | 73 | 149 | 3 | - |
| Shea Boulevard \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | C | - | A | - | D | - | B | - | E | D | C | E | C | C | C |
| Delay (sec) | 32 | - | 4 | - | 41 | - | 13 | - | 58 | 41 | 20 | 64 | 27 | 23 | 34 |
| Avg. Queue ( ft ) | 45 | - | 4 | - | 129 | - | 5 | - | 69 | 97 | 57 | 340 | 53 | 167 | - |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative AM peak hour. The EBL queue of $299^{\prime}$ exceeds the $185^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway and intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operations. The WBT queue of505' blocks the upstream driveway, impacting upstream operations. The WBR queue of $387^{\prime}$ exceeds the $150^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.
he Raintree Drive $T$ is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 improved /Build SPUl alternative AM peak hour. The NBL and NBU queue of $896^{\prime}$ exceeds the $475^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting NBT operations. The WBL queue of $260^{\prime}$ exceeds the $210^{\prime}$ of vailable storage, impacting WBT operations.

The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is expected to operate at LOS B overall in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative AM peak hour with no queuing issues.
The Shea Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS C overall in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative AM peak hour. The WBL queue of $340^{\prime}$ exceeds the 275' of available storage, impacting WBT operations.
these results indicate all project TIs/intersections are expected to provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2040 Improved/Build SPU alternative AM peak hour. Only a few locations/movements are expected to have congestion and queuing issues.

Table 6.7-2040 Improved/Build SPUI Alternative TI/Intersection Analysis Results: PM Peak Hour

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | D | C | - | E | E | B | - | E | D | C | E | D | B | D |
| Delay (sec) | 94 | 47 | 30 | - | 68 | 67 | 20 | - | 69 | 38 | 23 | 75 | 40 | 11 | 48 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 241 | 58 | 47 | - | 163 | 157 | 31 | - | 101 | 163 | 144 | 88 | 74 | 29 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | C | D | D | D | B | D | D | D | B | D | D | B | D |
| Delay (sec) | 50 | 41 | 26 | 46 | 45 | 41 | 18 | 47 | 53 | 46 | 21 | 51 | 51 | 10 | 38 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 76 | 7 | 118 | 76 | 73 | 40 | 14 | 73 | 106 | 89 | 202 | 92 | 79 | 80 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | E | F | - | F | D | B | - | E | E | D | C | B | A | D |
| Delay (sec) | 83 | 65 | 159 | - | 93 | 47 | 19 | - | 77 | 65 | 52 | 24 | 12 | 3 | 55 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 155 | 18 | 1023 | - | 75 | 30 | 44 | - | 956 | 956 | 956 | 1 | 61 | 5 | - |
| Shea Boulevard \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | C | - | A | - | C | - | A | - | D | D | B | E | E | E | D |
| Delay (sec) | 32 | - | 5 | - | 35 | - | 10 | - | 48 | 36 | 11 | 62 | 57 | 58 | 40 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 66 | - | 7 | - | 94 | - | 1 | - | 63 | 90 | 30 | 450 | 1515 | 1624 | - |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative PM peak hour with no queuing issues.

The Raintree Drive TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative PM peak hour with no queueing issues.

The Raintree Drive and 87 Street intersection is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative PM peak hour. The NBR queue of $1,023^{\prime}$ blocks upstream driveways, impacting upstream operations. The EBL queue of $956^{\prime}$ exceeds the $125^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks an upstream intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operations. The EBT queue of 956' blocks an upstream intersection, impacting upstream operations. The EBR queue of $956^{\prime}$ exceeds the $120^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks an upstream intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operations.
The Shea Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Improved/Build SPUI alternative PM peak hour. The WBL queue of $450^{\prime}$ exceeds the $275^{\prime}$ ' of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway, impacting WBT and upstream operations. The WBT queue of $1,515^{\prime}$ blocks the upstream intersection and driveways, impacting upstream operations. The WBR queue of $1,624^{\prime}$ exceeds the $600^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream intersection and driveways, impacting WBT and upstream operations.
alternative PM peak hour. Only a few locations/movements are expected to have congestion and queuing issues.
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6.4.2 Tight Diamond Interchange (TDI) Analysis

Improvements included in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative consisted of the following

- At the Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI , the assumed TDI configuration improvements included the same number of approach lanes for each movement as the existing SPUI configuration along with adding a NBR lane, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments
- At the Raintree Drive TI, the assumed TDI configuration improvements included the same number of approach lanes for each movement as the existing SPUI configuration along with adding a NBR lane and SBR lane, additional WBR storage capacity, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments
- At the Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection, the only assumed improvements were signal timing adjustments, where the EBL and WBL phasing was changed to permitted/protected and NBR overlap phasing was added
The VISSIM-modeled delay, corresponding LOS, and queues at the project TIs/intersections for the 2040 Improved/Build TD alternative are presented in Table 6.8 for the AM peak hour and in Table 6.9 for the PM peak hour, with the corresponding VISSIM output reports provided in Appendix 4

Table 6.8 - 2040 Improved/Build TDI Alternative TI/Intersection Analysis Results: AM Peak Hour

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | B | A | - | D | C | A | - | E | C | A | E | C | B | C |
| Delay (sec) | 64 | 30 | 7 | - | 63 | 43 | 9 | - | 116 | 39 | 15 | 116 | 45 | 20 | 47 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 76 | 51 | 13 | - | 66 | 83 | 43 | - | 105 | 105 | 56 | 110 | 110 | 71 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | F | C | B | - | D | B | B | - | D | C | B | D | D | B | D |
| Delay (sec) | 130 | 37 | 19 | - | 69 | 30 | 30 | - | 81 | 40 | 17 | 53 | 64 | 16 | 56 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 845 | 9 | 30 | - | 50 | 53 | 63 | - | 42 | 42 | 21 | 117 | 117 | 25 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | D | B | - | D | D | C | - | B | D | A | B | B | A | B |
| Delay (sec) | 41 | 39 | 16 | - | 47 | 45 | 25 | - | 17 | 35 | 6 | 11 | 11 | 3 | 18 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 3 | 3 | 16 | - | 14 | 27 | 43 | - | 67 | 67 | 67 | 100 | 176 | 5 | - |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS C overall in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative AM peak hour with no queuing issues.

The Raintree Drive Tl is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the $2040 \mathrm{Improved} /$ Build TDI alternative AM peak hour. The NBL queue of $845^{\prime}$ exceeds the $475^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting NBT operations.
The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is expected to operate at LOS B overall in the 2040 Improved /Build TDI alternative AM peak hour. The WBL queue of $100^{\prime}$ exceeds the $60^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting WBT operations.

These results indicate all project TIs/intersections are expected to provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative AM peak hour. Only a few locations/movements are expected to have congestion and queuing issues.

Table 6.9-2040 Improved/Build TDI Alternative TI/Intersection Analysis Results: PM Peak Hour

| Intersection | NB Approach |  |  |  | SB Approach |  |  |  | EB Approach |  |  | WB Approach |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | C | B | - | D | C | A | - | D | D | C | D | C | A | C |
| Delay (sec) | 64 | 32 | 17 | - | 62 | 39 | 9 | - | 79 | 68 | 53 | 70 | 38 | 11 | 49 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 86 | 38 | 22 | - | 79 | 77 | 85 | - | 751 | 751 | 988 | 76 | 76 | 26 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& Loop 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | D | B | B | - | D | C | B | - | D | C | B | D | D | A | C |
| Delay (sec) | 63 | 30 | 27 | - | 61 | 34 | 16 | - | 66 | 41 | 22 | 74 | 61 | 15 | 44 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 60 | 5 | 112 | - | 68 | 64 | 15 | - | 134 | 134 | 210 | 106 | 106 | 33 | - |
| Raintree Drive \& 87th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | E | D | D | - | E | D | B | - | D | F | E | C | A | A | D |
| Delay (sec) | 62 | 41 | 37 | - | 117 | 67 | 19 | - | 51 | 104 | 75 | 24 | 9 | 2 | 50 |
| Avg. Queue (ft) | 48 | 15 | 97 | - | 217 | 82 | 97 | - | 970 | 970 | 970 | 1 | 53 | 3 | - |

The Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard TI is expected to operate at LOS C overall in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative PM peak hour. The EBL queue of751' exceeds the $240^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway and intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operations. The EBT queue of751' blocks the upstream driveway, impacting upstream operations. The EBR queue of 988' exceeds the $175^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks the upstream driveway, impacting EBT and upstream operations.
The Raintree Drive Tl is expected to operate at LOS C overall in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative PM peak hour with no queueing issues.

The Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is expected to operate at LOS D overall in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative PM peak hour. The SBL queue of $217^{\prime}$ exceeds the $110^{\prime}$ of available storage, impacting SBT and SBR operations. The EBL queue of $970^{\prime}$ exceeds the 125 ' of available storage and blocks an upstream intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operations. The EBT queue of $970^{\prime}$ blocks an upstream intersection, impacting upstream operations. The EBR queue of $970^{\prime}$ exceeds the $120^{\prime}$ of available storage and blocks an upstream intersection, impacting EBT and upstream operations.

These results indicate all project TIs/intersections are expected to provide acceptable overall LOS in the 2040 Improved/Build TDI alternative PM peak hour. Only a few locations/movements are expected to have congestion and queuing issues
6.4.3 Double-Roundabout Interchange (DRI) Analysis

Improvements included in the 2040 Improved/Build DRI alternative consisted of the following three scenarios for the SB Ramps roundabout:

- Scenario A: one SBR bypass lane and one SBU bypass lane
- Scenario B: two SBR bypass lanes
- Scenario C: two SBR bypass lanes and one SBU bypass lane

The RODEL-modeled delay, corresponding LOS, and queues at the project TIs/intersections for the 2040 Improved/Build DRI alternative are presented in Table 6.10 for the AM peak hour and in Table 6.11 for the PM peak hour, with the corresponding RODEL output reports provided in Appendix 4.

| Leg Name | Number of Lanes |  | Average Delay（sec） |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 95 \% \text { Queue (ft) } \\ & \text { Per Lane } \end{aligned}$ |  | Level of Service |  |  | Total Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Ent |  | Bypa |  |  |  |
| L101 SB \＆Raintree（A： 1 SB Rt Bypass， 1 SB U－Turn Bypass） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB SB | 2 | 1 | 32 | 365 | 215 | 275 | 5，400 | D | F | F | 19 | c | 271 | F | 73 | F |
| Raintree EB | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB NB |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 |  | 17 | － | 17 | 525 | － | c | － | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB \＆Raintree（B： 2 SB Rt Bypass） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB SB | 2 | 2 | 59 | 5 | 32 | 675 | 50 | F | A | F | 28 | D | 4 | A | 19 | c |
| Raintree EB | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB NB |  |  |  | － |  | － | － |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 |  | 17 | － | 17 | 525 | － | c | － | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB \＆Raintree（C： 2 SB Rt Bypass， 1 SB U－Turn Bypass） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB SB | 2 | 2 | 32 | 5 | 17 | 275 | 50 | D | A | C | 19 | c | 4 | A | 14 | B |
| Raintree EB | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB NB |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 |  | 17 | － | 17 | 525 | － | c | － | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB \＆Raintree（A： 1 SB Rt Bypass， 1 SB U－Turn Bypass） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB SB |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | 8 | A | 3 | A | 7 | A |
| Raintree EB | 2 |  | 3 | － | 3 | 25 | － | A | － | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB NB | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 25 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 11 | 275 | 0 | B | A | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB \＆Raintree（B： 2 SB Rt Bypass） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB SB |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | 14 | в | 3 | A | 11 | B |
| Raintree EB | 2 |  | 4 | － | 4 | 50 | － | A | － | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB NB | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 75 | 25 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 21 | 600 | 0 | D | A | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB \＆Reintree（C： 2 SB Rt Bypass， 1 SB U－Turn Bypass） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB SB |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － |  | A | 3 | A | 7 | A |
| Raintree EB | 2 |  | 3 | － |  | 25 | － | A | － | A | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB NB |  | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 | 25 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 11 | 275 | 0 | B | A | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1．L101 SB \＆Raintree SB Bypass results were analyzed with separate models to accurately capture the opposing flow volumes．
2．L101 SB \＆Raintree SB Apporoach results were analyzed with separate models due to RODEL coding limitations．The SB Appro 2．L101 SB \＆Raintree SB Approach results were analyzed with separate models due to RODEL coding limitations．The SB Approach
capacity in RODEL was impacted by the SB Bypass contiguration．The separate SB Approach models provided consistent capacity for the
three alternatives．
3．L101 NB \＆Raintree（1 SB Rt Bypass， 1 SB U－Turn Bypass）and（2 SB Rt Bypass， 1 SB U－Turn Bypass）alternative models and results are 3．L101 NB
the same．

The Raintree Drive TI NB Ramps roundabout is expected to operate overall at LOS A for Scenario A，LOS B for Scenario B，and LOS A fo Scenario C during the 2040 Improved／Build DRI alternative AM peak hour．The only queuing issue is that in Scenario B the WBT queue of $600^{\prime}$ blocks an upstream driveway，impacting upstream operations．

The Raintree Drive TI SB Ramps roundabout is expected to operate overall at LOS F for Scenario A，LOS C for Scenario B，and LOS B for Scenario C during the 2040 Improved／Build DRI alternative PM peak hour．In Scenario A，the SBR bypass queue of 5，400＇blocks the upstream intersections，driveways，and ramp junction，significantly impacting upstream operations－this is a potential fatal flaw due to the magnitude of the impact．In Scenario B，the SBT queue of $675^{\prime}$ blocks an upstream driveway，impacting upstream operations．In Scenarios A，B，and C，the WBT queue of $525^{\prime}$ blocks the adjacent NB Ramps roundabout，significantly impacting operations within the NB Ramps roundabout－this is a potential fatal flaw due to the magnitude of the impact as it could gridlock the TI．

$$
\text { Table } 6.11 \text { - } 2040 \text { Improved/Build DRI Alternative TI Analysis Results: PM Peak Hour }
$$

| Leg Name | Number of Lanes |  | Average Delay（sec） |  |  | 95\％Queue（ft） Per Lane |  | Level of Service |  |  | Total Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entr |  | Bypa |  |  |  |
| L101 SB \＆Raintree（A： 1 SB Rt Bypass， 1 SB U－Turn Bypass） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB SB | 2 | 1 | 11 | 兂 | 10 | 100 | 75 | в | A | B | 10 | A | 2 | A | 7 | A |
| Raintree EB | 2 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 250 | 0 | B | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB NB |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 |  | 6 | － | 6 | 100 | － | A | － | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB \＆Raintree（B： 2 SB Rt Bypass） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB SB | 2 | 2 | 13 | 3 | 10 | 150 | 25 | B | A | B | 13 | B | 1 | A | 9 | A |
| Raintree EB | 2 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 11 | 450 | 0 | C | A | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB NB |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 |  | 6 | － | 6 | 100 | － | A | － | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB \＆Raintree（C： 2 SB Rt Bypass， 1 SB U－Turn Bypass） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB SB | 2 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 8 | 100 | 25 | B | A | A | 10 | A | 1 | A | 7 | A |
| Raintree EB | 2 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 250 | 0 | B | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 SB NB |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 |  | 6 | － | 6 | 100 | － | A | － | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB \＆Raintree（A： 1 SB Rt Bypass， 1 SB U－Turn Bypass） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB SB |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | 7 | A | 9 | A | 7 | A |
| Raintree EB | 2 |  | 7 | － | 7 | 125 | － | A | － | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB NB | 2 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 50 | 175 | A | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 100 | 0 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB \＆Raintree（B： 2 SB Rt Bypass） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB SB |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | 8 | A | 9 | A | 8 | A |
| Raintree EB | 2 |  | 8 | － | 8 | 175 | － | A | － | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB NB |  | 1 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 50 | 175 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 150 | 0 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB \＆Raintree（C： 2 SB Rt Bypass， 1 SB U－Turn Bypass） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101 NB SB |  |  | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | 7 | A |  | A | 7 | A |
| Raintree EB | 2 |  | 7 | － | 7 | 125 | － | A | － | A |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |
| L101 NB NB |  | 1 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 50 | 175 | A | B | A |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |
| Raintree WB | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 100 | 0 | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1．L101 SB \＆Raintree SB Bypass results were analyzed with separate models to accurately capture the opposing flow volumes．
2．L101 SB \＆Raintree SB Approach results were analyzed with separate models due to RODL coding limitations．The SB Appro信 RODEL was impacted by the SB Bypass configuration．The separate SB Approach models provided consistent capacity for the three alternatives
3．L101 NB \＆Raintree（1 SB Rt Bypass， 1 SB U－Turn Bypass）and（2 SB Rt Bypass， 1 SB U－Turn Bypass）alternative models and results are the same．

## 101 Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd

Initial Traffic Report Update
The Raintree Drive TI NB Ramps roundabout is expected to operate overall at LOS A for Scenarios A, B, and C during the 2040 Improved/Build DRI alternative PM peak hour with no queuing issues.

The Raintree Drive TI SB Ramps roundabout is expected to operate overall at LOS A for Scenarios A,B, and C during the 2040 Improved/Build DRI alternative PM peak hour. The only queuing issues is that in Scenario $B$, the EBT queue of $450^{\prime}$ blocks the upstream Raintree Drive and 87 Street intersection, impacting operations at that intersection.

## Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd

Initial Traffic Report Update

### 7.0 Summary

The following is a summary of the principal findings of the traffic analysis.

## SR 101L Mainline

- The only identified mainline crash issue was the concentration of NB crashes south of Shea Boulevard where the mainline currently tapers from four GPLs to three GPL
2040 traffic volumes are projected to be approximately $25 \%$ higher than 2020 existing traffic volumes
- There will be significant mainline and ramp junction congestion by 2040 if additional GPLs are not provided on SR 101

Widening SR 101L to four GPLs is expected to reduce crashes related to congestion, particularly on SR 101 L NB south of Shea Boulevard where the segment currently tapers from four GPLs to three GPLs
By adding a GPL in each direction, SR 101L is expected to provide LOS D or better through 2040 throughout the project limits except at the Shea Boulevard NB on-ramp merge segment (which provides LOS E)

## Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard T

- This TI had the highest crash rate of the TIs assessed within the project limits
- An improved SPUI is expected to provide a slight reduction in the overall crash rate due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements
- ATDI is expected to provide a slight reduction in the overall crash rate due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements and a moderate reduction in the severe crash rate due to the reduced number of crossing points
- Traffic LOS with the existing SPUI configuration is poor now (LOS E) during peak times and will get worse (LOS F) in the future if no improvements are made
- An improved SPUI is expected to provide LOS D through 2040 if exclusive dual NBL and SBL lanes, an additional SBT lane, an additional NBR lane, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments are provided, although there will still be long EB and WB queues
- A TDI with the same approach lanes as the existing SPUI along with adding a NBR lane and signal control for all right-turn movements is expected to provide LOS C through 2040, although there will still be long EB queues
- The improved SPUI and TDI are relatively similar in terms of anticipated traffic performance and both are considered viable improvements from a traffic standpoint


## Raintree Drive TI

- An improved SPUI is expected to provide a slight reduction in the overall crash rate due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements
- ATDI is expected to provide a slight reduction in the overall crash rate due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements A DDl is expected to provide a slight reduction in the overall crash rate due to a reduction in conges
and a moderate reduction in the severe crash rate due to the reduced number of crossing points
- A DRI is expected to provide a moderate reduction in the overall crash rate due to a significant reduction in congestion from operational improvements and a significant reduction in the severe crash rate due to the reduced number of crossing points and lower operating speeds
- Traffic LOS with the existing SPUI configuration is poor now (LOS F) during peak times and will get worse (LOS F with higher delays) in the future if no improvements are made
- An improved SPUI is expected to provide LOS D through 2040 if adding a NBR lane and SBR lane, additional WBR storage capacity, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments are provided, although there will still be long NB queues
- A TDI with the same approach lanes as the existing SPUI except with adding a NBR lane and SBR lane, additional WBR storage capacity, signal control for all right-turn movements, and associated signal timing adjustments is expected to provide LOS D through 2040, although there will still be some long NB queues
- A DRI is expected to provide LOS C or better through 2040 but the projected long WB queue at the SB Ramps roundabout will extend through the adjacent NB Ramps roundabout, significantly impacting operations - this is a potential fatal flaw due to the magnitude of the impact
- The improved SPUI and TDI are relatively similar in terms of anticipated traffic performance and both are considered viable improvements from a traffic standpoint
- Even though the DRI theoretically provides acceptable overall LOS, it is not considered a viable improvement due to the WB queuing issue that could potentially gridlock the TI


## Raintree Drive and $87^{\text {th }}$ Street

- Traffic LOS is poor now (LOS F) during peak times and will get worse (LOS F with higher delays) in the future if no improvements are made
- Recommended improvements are limited to signal timing/phasing adjustments, namely EBL/WBL permitted/protected phasing and NBR overlap phasing
- With these signal timing/phasing improvements, the intersection is expected to provide LOS D through 2040, although there will still be long EB queues


## Shea Boulevard TI

- An improved SPUI is expected to provide a slight reduction in the overall crash rate due to a reduction in congestion from operational improvements
- Traffic LOS with the existing SPUI configuration is acceptable now (LOS C) during peak times and is still expected to be acceptable (LOS D) in the future if no improvements are made, but there are long WB queues
- Extending the WBR storage length to $600^{\prime}$ and signal timing adjustments will maintain LOS D in the future and will help reduce, but not eliminate, the WB queues
- Other WB improvements are not considered feasible due to geometric constraints at the TI

101 Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd
Initial Traffic Report Update

APPENDIX 1 - Existing Traffic Volumes and Signal Timings

Mainline and Ramp Traffic Counts

| Location Info |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Location ID | 101236_SB |  |
| Tyye | UNK |  |
| Functional Class |  |  |
| Located On | SR 101 |  |
| Between | Exi 36 Princess Dr- Pima Rd AND Exit 37 Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd |  |
| Direction | SB |  |
| Community |  |  |
| MPO_ID |  |  |
| HPMS ID |  |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |



| Interval: 15 mins |  |  |  |  |  | PeriodVolume |  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume | Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | 15 Min |  |  |  | Hourly Count |  | 15-Minute Hourl Volume |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:00-01:00 | 76 | 68 | 65 | 48 | 257 |  | 257 | 228 | 198 | 177 |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 | 47 | 38 | 44 | 36 | 165 |  | 165 | 149 | 135 | 133 |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 | 31 | 24 | 42 | 36 | 133 |  | 133 | 126 | 166 | 211 |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 | 24 | 64 | 87 | 118 | 293 |  | 293 | 407 | 569 | 789 |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 | 138 | 226 | 307 | 345 | 1016 |  | 1016 | 1290 | 1653 | 2194 |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 | 412 | 589 | 848 | 1012 | 2861 |  | 2861 | 3534 | 4117 | 4687 |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 1085 | 1172 | 1418 | 1466 | 5141 | 18126 | 5141 | 5577 | 6177 | 6425 | 6713 | 37.0\% |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1521 | 1772 | 1666 | 1669 | 6628 |  | 6628 | 6713 | 6615 | 6619 |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1606 | 1674 | 1670 | 1407 | 6357 |  | 6357 | 6181 | 5818 | 5425 |  |  |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1430 | 1311 | 1277 | 1230 | 5248 | 22687 | 5248 | 4899 | 4639 | 4484 | 5248 | 23.1\% |
| 10:00-11:00 | 1081 | 1051 | 1122 | 1073 | 4327 |  | 4327 | 4333 | 4375 | 4304 |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 1087 | 1093 | 1051 | 1114 | 4345 |  | 4345 | 4323 | 4329 | 4372 |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 1065 | 1099 | 1094 | 1086 | 4344 |  | 4344 | 4298 | 4333 | 4377 |  |  |
| 13:00-14:00 | 1019 | 1134 | 1138 | 1132 | 4423 |  | 4423 | 4463 | 4456 | 4541 |  |  |
| 14:00-15:00 | 1059 | 1127 | 1223 | 1305 | 4714 | 21005 | 4714 | 4917 | 5086 | 5204 | 5752 | 27.4\% |
| 15:00-16:00 | 1262 | 1296 | 1341 | 1317 | 5216 |  | 5216 | 5404 | 5619 | 5709 |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 1450 | 1511 | 1431 | 1360 | 5752 |  | 5752 | 5717 | 5648 | 5429 |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1415 | 1442 | 1212 | 1254 | 5323 |  | 5323 | 4862 | 4370 | 3974 |  |  |
| 18:00-19:00 | 954 | 950 | 816 | 726 | 3446 | 11280 | 3446 | 3127 | 2697 | 2402 | 3446 | 30.5\% |
| 19:00-20:00 | 635 | 520 | 521 | 469 | 2145 |  | 2145 | 1926 | 1806 | 1659 |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 | 416 | 400 | 374 | 284 | 1474 |  | 1474 | 1364 | 1298 | 1170 |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 | 306 | 334 | 246 | 270 | 1156 |  | 1156 | 1055 | 918 | 879 |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 | 205 | 197 | 207 | 143 | 752 |  | 752 | 692 | 609 | 498 |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 | 145 | 114 | 96 | 88 | 443 |  | 443 | 298 | 184 | 88 |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 75959 | 75959 |  |  |  |  | 6713 | 8.8\% |



| Location Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location ID | 101237 _SB |
| Type | LINK |
| Functional Class |  |
| Located On | SR 101 |
| Between | Exi 37 Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd AND Exit 39 Raintree Dr |
| Direction | SB |
| Community |  |
| MPO_ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation |
|  |  |






| Location Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location ID | $101238 \_$SB |
| Type | LINK |
| Functional Class |  |
| Loctated On | SR101 |
| Between | Exit 39 Raintree Dr AND Exit 40 Cactus Rd |
| Direction | SB |
| Community |  |
| MPO_ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation |
|  |  |
|  | 0 |
|  |  |




| Location Info |  | Count Data Info |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location ID | 101238_NB | Start Date | 8/23/2018 |
| Type | LINK | End Date | 8/24/2018 |
| Functional Class | 2 | Start Time | 12:00 AM |
| Located On | SR 101 | End Time | 12:00 AM |
| Between | Exit 39 Raintree Dr AND Exit 40 Cactus Rd | Direction |  |
| Direction | NB | Notes | adot |
| Community |  | Count Source | 101238 |
| MPO_ID | 0 | File Name |  |
| HPMS ID | 0 | Weather |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation | Study |  |
|  |  | Owner | adotits |



| Location Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location ID | 101239_SB |
| Type | LINK |
| Functional Class |  |
| Located On | SR 101 |
| Between | Exit 40 Cactus Rd AND Exit 41 Shea Blvd |
| Direction | SB |
| Community |  |
| MPO_ID |  |
| HPMS ID | P00005110101 |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation |
|  |  |
|  |  |


| Count Data Info |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Start Date | $8 / 14 / 2018$ |
| End Date | $8 / 15 / 2018$ |
| Start Time | $12: 00$ AM |
| End Time | $12: 00$ AM |
| Direction |  |
| Notes | adot |
| Count Source | 101239 |
| File Name |  |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Owner | adotits |


| Interval: 15 mins |  |  |  |  |  | Period Volume |  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume | Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | 15 Min |  |  |  | Hourly Count |  | 15-Minute Hourly Volume |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:00-01:00 | 40 | 104 | 72 | 57 | 273 | 16002 | 273 | 291 | 223 | 187 | 8541 | 53.4\% |
| 01:00-02:00 | 58 | 36 | 36 | 22 | 152 |  | 152 | 119 | 112 | 108 |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 | 25 | 29 | 32 | 39 | 125 |  | 125 | 133 | 136 | 139 |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 | 33 | 32 | 35 | 39 | 139 |  | 139 | 176 | 206 | 236 |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 | 70 | 62 | 65 | 99 | 296 |  | 296 | 309 | 299 | 267 |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 | 83 | 52 | 33 | 80 | 248 |  | 248 | 216 | 211 | 312 |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 51 | 47 | 134 | 252 | 484 |  | 484 | 1650 | 3607 | 5802 |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1217 | 2004 | 2329 | 2123 | 7673 | 30211 | 7673 | 8523 | 8541 | 8173 | 6619 | 21.9\% |
| 08:00-09:00 | 2067 | 2022 | 1961 | 1795 | 7845 |  | 7845 | 7545 | 7196 | 6919 |  |  |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1767 | 1673 | 1684 | 1495 | 6619 |  | 6619 | 6199 | 5949 | 5636 |  |  |
| 10:00-11:00 | 1347 | 1423 | 1371 | 1468 | 5609 |  | 5609 | 5698 | 5705 | 5863 |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 1436 | 1430 | 1529 | 1421 | 5816 |  | 5816 | 5742 | 5797 | 5730 |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 1362 | 1485 | 1462 | 1479 | 5788 |  | 5788 | 5981 | 5996 | 6213 |  |  |
| 13:00-14:00 | 1555 | 1500 | 1679 | 1645 | 6379 |  | 6379 | 6485 | 6831 | 7024 |  |  |
| 14:00-15:00 | 1661 | 1846 | 1872 | 1798 | 7177 | 29723 | 7177 | 7289 | 7226 | 7222 | 7832 | 26.3\% |
| 15:00-16:00 | 1773 | 1783 | 1868 | 1812 | 7236 |  | 7236 | 7375 | 7602 | 7621 |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 1912 | 2010 | 1887 | 1983 | 7792 |  | 7792 | 7832 | 7753 | 7809 |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1952 | 1931 | 1943 | 1692 | 7518 |  | 7518 | 7089 | 6646 | 6036 |  |  |
| 18:00-19:00 | 1523 | 1488 | 1333 | 1137 | 5481 | 11573 | 5481 | 5114 | 4751 | 4354 | 5481 | 47.4\% |
| 19:00-20:00 | 1156 | 1125 | 936 | 707 | 3924 |  | 3924 | 3344 | 2609 | 1689 |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 | 576 | 390 | 16 | 56 | 1038 |  | 1038 | 462 | 72 | 56 |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 | 0 | 0 |  | 27 | 27 |  | 27 | 43 | 104 | 128 |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 | 16 | 61 | 24 | 14 | 115 |  | 115 | 99 | 39 | 15 |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 87757 | 87757 |  |  |  |  | 8541 | 9.7\% |


| Location Info |  | Count Data Info |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location ID | 101239_NB | Start Date | 8/14/2018 |
| Type | LINK | End Date | 8/15/2018 |
| Functional Class | 2 | Start Time | 12:00 AM |
| Located On | SR 101 | End Time | 12:00 AM |
| Between | Exit 40 Cactus Rd AND Exit 41 Shea Blvd | Direction |  |
| Direction | NB | Notes | adot |
| Community |  | Count Source | 101239 |
| MPO_ID | 0 | File Name |  |
| HPMS ID | P00005110101 | Weather |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation | Study |  |
|  |  | Owner | adotits |



| Location Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location ID | 101240_SB |
| Type | LNK |
| Functional Class |  |
| Located On | SR 101 |
| Between | Exit 41 Shea Blvd AND Exit 42 Pima Rd - 90th St |
| Direction | SB |
| Community | - |
| MPO_I |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation |
|  |  |
|  |  |


| Count Data Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date | $8 / 20 / 2018$ |
| End Date | $8 / 21 / 2018$ |
| Start Time | $12: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| End Time | $12: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction |  |
| Notes | adot |
| Count Source | 101240 |
| File Name |  |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Owner | adotits |


| Interval: 15 mins |  |  |  |  |  | Period Volume | 15-Minute Hourly Volume |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume | Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | 15 Min |  |  |  | Hourly Count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:00-01:00 | 49 | 69 | 67 | 78 | 263 |  | 263 | 272 | 254 | 225 |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 | 58 | 51 | 38 | 42 | 189 |  | 189 | 174 | 156 | 164 |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 | 43 | 33 | 46 | 43 | 165 |  | 165 | 177 | 209 | 261 |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 | 55 | 65 | 98 | 124 | 342 |  | 342 | 453 | 653 | 930 |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 | 166 | 265 | 375 | 398 | 1204 |  | 1204 | 1447 | 1706 | 2027 |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 | 409 | 524 | 696 | 813 | 2442 |  | 2442 | 2899 | 3503 | 4165 |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 866 | 1128 | 1358 | 1474 | 4826 | 18385 | 4826 | 5550 | 6244 | 6767 | 7290 | 39.7\% |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1590 | 1822 | 1881 | 1836 | 7129 |  | 7129 | 7290 | 7037 | 6821 |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1751 | 1569 | 1665 | 1445 | 6430 |  | 6430 | 5907 | 5523 | 4956 |  |  |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1228 | 1185 | 1098 | 1019 | 4530 | 21687 | 4530 | 4282 | 4074 | 4037 | 4542 | 20.9\% |
| 10:00-11:00 | 980 | 977 | 1061 | 1017 | 4035 |  | 4035 | 4059 | 4148 | 4181 |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 1004 | 1066 | 1094 | 1103 | 4267 |  | 4267 | 4267 | 4324 | 4351 |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 1004 | 1123 | 1121 | 1065 | 4313 |  | 4313 | 4416 | 4437 | 4429 |  |  |
| 13:00-14:00 | 1107 | 1144 | 1113 | 1178 | 4542 |  | 4542 | 4621 | 4755 | 4942 |  |  |
| 14:00-15:00 | 1186 | 1278 | 1300 | 1217 | 4981 | 22504 | 4981 | 5136 | 5283 | 5452 | 6158 | 27.4\% |
| 15:00-16:00 | 1341 | 1425 | 1469 | 1418 | 5653 |  | 5653 | 5865 | 6060 | 6048 |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 1553 | 1620 | 1457 | 1528 | 6158 |  | 6158 | 6143 | 6079 | 6043 |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1538 | 1556 | 1421 | 1197 | 5712 |  | 5712 | 5446 | 5056 | 4614 |  |  |
| 18:00-19:00 | 1272 | 1166 | 979 | 895 | 4312 | 14144 | 4312 | 3852 | 3434 | 3044 | 4312 | 30.5\% |
| 19:00-20:00 | 812 | 748 | 589 | 549 | 2698 |  | 2698 | 2431 | 2205 | 2122 |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 | 545 | 522 | 506 | 467 | 2040 |  | 2040 | 1898 | 1774 | 1610 |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 | 403 | 398 | 342 | 305 | 1448 |  | 1448 | 1330 | 1205 | 1083 |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 | 285 | 273 | 220 | 165 | 943 |  | 943 | 835 | 695 | 608 |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 | 177 | 133 | 133 | 97 | 540 |  | 540 | 363 | 230 | 97 |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 79162 | 79162 |  |  |  |  | 7290 | 9.2\% |


| Location Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location ID | 101240_NB |
| Type | LINK |
| Functional Class |  |
| Located On | SR 101 |
| Between | Exit 41 Shea Blvd AND Exit 42 Pima Rd - 90th St |
| Direction | NB |
| Community | - |
| MPO_ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation |
|  |  |
|  | 0 |


| Count Data Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date | $8 / 20 / 2018$ |
| End Date | $8 / 21 / 2018$ |
| Start Time | $12: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| End Time | $12: 00$ AM |
| Direction |  |
| Notes | adot |
| Count Source | 101240 |
| File Name |  |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Owner | adotits |


| Interval: 15 mins |  |  |  |  |  | Period Volume |  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume | Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | 15 Min |  |  |  | Hourly Count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |  |  |  | e Hour | lume |  |  |  |
| 00:00-01:00 | 79 | 127 | 91 | 82 | 379 | 18417 | 379 | 363 | 285 | 249 | 6840 | 37.1\% |
| 01:00-02:00 | 63 | 49 | 55 | 53 | 220 |  | 220 | 208 | 209 | 208 |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 | 51 | 50 | 54 | 40 | 195 |  | 195 | 200 | 213 | 238 |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 | 56 | 63 | 79 | 106 | 304 |  | 304 | 368 | 530 | 829 |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 | 120 | 225 | 378 | 413 | 1136 |  | 1136 | 1450 | 1737 | 2117 |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 | 434 | 512 | 758 | 905 | 2609 |  | 2609 | 3136 | 3850 | 4558 |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 961 | 1226 | 1466 | 1566 | 5219 |  | 5219 | 5832 | 6318 | 6605 |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1574 | 1712 | 1753 | 1749 | 6788 | 22250 | 6788 | 6840 | 6706 | 6582 | 4826 | 21.7\% |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1626 | 1578 | 1629 | 1577 | 6410 |  | 6410 | 6075 | 5741 | 5269 |  |  |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1291 | 1244 | 1157 | 1134 | 4826 |  | 4826 | 4546 | 4378 | 4252 |  |  |
| 10:00-11:00 | 1011 | 1076 | 1031 | 1063 | 4181 | 24949 | 4181 | 4159 | 4110 | 4145 |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 989 | 1027 | 1066 | 1168 | 4250 |  | 4250 | 4358 | 4413 | 4484 |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 1097 | 1082 | 1137 | 1091 | 4407 |  | 4407 | 4387 | 4460 | 4490 |  |  |
| 13:00-14:00 | 1077 | 1155 | 1167 | 1187 | 4586 |  | 4586 | 4722 | 4808 | 5015 |  |  |
| 14:00-15:00 | 1213 | 1241 | 1374 | 1363 | 5191 |  | 5191 | 5499 | 5805 | 6021 | 6963 | 27.9\% |
| 15:00-16:00 | 1521 | 1547 | 1590 | 1612 | 6270 | 15551 | 6270 | 6344 | 6514 | 6656 |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 1595 | 1717 | 1732 | 1695 | 6739 |  | 6739 | 6938 | 6963 | 6902 |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1794 | 1742 | 1671 | 1542 | 6749 |  | 6749 | 6332 | 5891 | 5329 |  |  |
| 18:00-19:00 | 1377 | 1301 | 1109 | 1012 | 4799 |  | 4799 | 4259 | 3737 | 3393 | 4799 | 30.9\% |
| 19:00-20:00 | 837 | 779 | 765 | 640 | 3021 |  | 3021 | 2763 | 2509 | 2235 |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 | 579 | 525 | 491 | 491 | 2086 |  | 2086 | 1983 | 1945 | 1832 |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 | 476 | 487 | 378 | 329 | 1670 |  | 1670 | 1550 | 1367 | 1243 |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 | 356 | 304 | 254 | 190 | 1104 |  | 1104 | 948 | 812 | 707 |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 | 200 | 168 | 149 | 120 | 637 |  | 637 | 437 | 269 | 120 |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 83776 | 83776 |  |  |  |  | 6963 | $8.3 \%$ |

Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd SB On-Ramp

| Location Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location ID | 7330 |
| Type | I-SECTION |
| Functional Class |  |
| Located On | SR-101 Exit 38 G-Ramp |
| Between | AND |
| Direction | RAMP |
| Community | - |
| MPO_I |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation |
|  |  |
|  |  |


| Count Data Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date | $7 / 11 / 2017$ |
| End Date | $7 / 12 / 2017$ |
| Start Time | $12: 00$ PM |
| End Time | $12: 00$ PM |
| Direction |  |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source |  |
| File Name | $7330 . x$ xlsx |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Owner | jasonc |


| Interval: 15 mins |  |  |  |  |  | Period Volume | 15-Minute Hourly Volume |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume | Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | 15 Min |  |  |  | Hourly Count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:00-01:00 | 23 | 19 | 19 | 20 | 81 |  | 81 | 78 | 78 | 69 |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 | 20 | 19 | 10 | 10 | 59 |  | 59 | 48 | 35 | 31 |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 31 |  | 31 | 29 | 26 | 27 |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 22 |  | 22 | 35 | 50 | 68 |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 | 20 | 18 | 25 | 28 | 91 |  | 91 | 109 | 121 | 158 |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 | 38 | 30 | 62 | 68 | 198 |  | 198 | 231 | 278 | 344 |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 71 | 77 | 128 | 137 | 413 | 2087 | 413 | 514 | 643 | 751 | 863 | 41.4\% |
| 07:00-08:00 | 172 | 206 | 236 | 210 | 824 |  | 824 | 856 | 857 | 863 |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | 204 | 207 | 242 | 197 | 850 |  | 850 | 844 | 843 | 787 |  |  |
| 09:00-10:00 | 198 | 206 | 186 | 190 | 780 | 4532 | 780 | 773 | 740 | 773 | 1076 | 23.7\% |
| 10:00-11:00 | 191 | 173 | 219 | 187 | 770 |  | 770 | 772 | 838 | 838 |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 193 | 239 | 219 | 254 | 905 |  | 905 | 935 | 971 | 1002 |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 223 | 275 | 250 | 262 | 1010 |  | 1010 | 1044 | 1040 | 1076 |  |  |
| 13:00-14:00 | 257 | 271 | 286 | 253 | 1067 |  | 1067 | 1085 | 1086 | 1065 |  |  |
| 14:00-15:00 | 275 | 272 | 265 | 269 | 1081 | 4808 | 1081 | 1125 | 1179 | 1172 | 1352 | 28.1\% |
| 15:00-16:00 | 319 | 326 | 258 | 264 | 1167 |  | 1167 | 1196 | 1177 | 1232 |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 348 | 307 | 313 | 320 | 1288 |  | 1288 | 1298 | 1352 | 1351 |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 358 | 361 | 312 | 241 | 1272 |  | 1272 | 1218 | 1136 | 1047 |  |  |
| 18:00-19:00 | 304 | 279 | 223 | 178 | 984 | 3401 | 984 | 928 | 831 | 794 | 984 | 28.9\% |
| 19:00-20:00 | 248 | 182 | 186 | 163 | 779 |  | 779 | 694 | 680 | 629 |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 | 163 | 168 | 135 | 113 | 579 |  | 579 | 529 | 482 | 420 |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 | 113 | 121 | 73 | 63 | 370 |  | 370 | 348 | 287 | 256 |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 | 91 | 60 | 42 | 59 | 252 |  | 252 | 202 | 180 | 177 |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 | 41 | 38 | 39 | 35 | 153 |  | 153 | 112 | 74 | 35 |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 15026 | 15026 |  |  |  |  | 1352 | 9.0\% |

Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd NB On-Ramp

| Location Info |  | Count Data Info |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location ID | 7323 |  | Start Date |  |


| Interval: 15 mins |  |  |  |  |  | Period Volume |  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume | Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | 15 Min |  |  |  | Hourly Count |  | 15-Minute Hourly Volume |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:00-01:00 | 13 | 25 | 7 | 13 | 58 |  | 58 | 49 | 30 | 29 |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 26 |  | 26 | 22 | 19 | 15 |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 |  | 8 | 15 | 18 | 21 |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 24 |  | 24 | 24 | 31 | 44 |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 | 7 | 13 | 18 | 17 | 55 |  | 55 | 96 | 130 | 176 |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 | 48 | 47 | 64 | 73 | 232 |  | 232 | 284 | 363 | 462 |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 100 | 126 | 163 | 124 | 513 | 2321 | 513 | 609 | 657 | 773 | 954 | 41.1\% |
| 07:00-08:00 | 196 | 174 | 279 | 212 | 861 |  | 861 | 906 | 954 | 934 |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | 241 | 222 | 259 | 225 | 947 |  | 947 | 892 | 852 | 812 |  |  |
| 09:00-10:00 | 186 | 182 | 219 | 186 | 773 | 4369 | 773 | 773 | 765 | 762 | 1009 | 23.1\% |
| 10:00-11:00 | 186 | 174 | 216 | 185 | 761 |  | 761 | 776 | 811 | 827 |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 201 | 209 | 232 | 230 | 872 |  | 872 | 916 | 944 | 963 |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 245 | 237 | 251 | 221 | 954 |  | 954 | 957 | 949 | 989 |  |  |
| 13:00-14:00 | 248 | 229 | 291 | 241 | 1009 |  | 1009 | 1037 | 1023 | 1001 |  |  |
| 14:00-15:00 | 276 | 215 | 269 | 279 | 1039 | 4113 | 1039 | 1040 | 1095 | 1125 | 1125 | 27.4\% |
| 15:00-16:00 | 277 | 270 | 299 | 230 | 1076 |  | 1076 | 1085 | 1084 | 1008 |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 286 | 269 | 223 | 251 | 1029 |  | 1029 | 1008 | 967 | 992 |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 265 | 228 | 248 | 228 | 969 |  | 969 | 953 | 955 | 907 |  |  |
| 18:00-19:00 | 249 | 230 | 200 | 195 | 874 | 3065 | 874 | 802 | 739 | 703 | 874 | 28.5\% |
| 19:00-20:00 | 177 | 167 | 164 | 147 | 655 |  | 655 | 654 | 634 | 623 |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 | 176 | 147 | 153 | 123 | 599 |  | 599 | 563 | 494 | 436 |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 | 140 | 78 | 95 | 74 | 387 |  | 387 | 330 | 319 | 298 |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 | 83 | 67 | 74 | 47 | 271 |  | 271 | 227 | 185 | 132 |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 | 39 | 25 | 21 | 23 | 108 |  | 108 | 69 | 44 | 23 |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 14100 | 14100 |  |  |  |  | 1125 | 8.0\% |

## Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd SB Off-Ramp

| Location Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location ID | 7320 |
| Type | 1-SECTION |
| Functional Class |  |
| Located On | SR-101 Exit 37 A-Ramp |
| Between | AND |
| Direction | RAMP |
| Community |  |
| MPO_ID |  |
| HPMS D |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation |
|  |  |
|  |  |


| Count Data Info |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Start Date | 5/10/2017 |
| End Date | 5/11/2017 |
| Start Time | 12:00 AM |
| End Time | 12:00 AM |
| Direction |  |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source |  |
| File Name | 7320.xsx |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Owner | jasonc |



Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd NB Off-Ramp


| Location Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location ID | 7331 |
| Type | I-SECTON |
| Functional Class |  |
| Located On | SR-101 Exit 38 G1-Ramp |
| Between | AND |
| Direction | RAMP |
| Community | - |
| MPO_ID |  |
| HPS ID |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation |
|  |  |
|  |  |


| Count Data Info |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Start Date | 7/12/2017 |
| End Date | 7/13/2017 |
| Start Time | 10:00 AM |
| End Time | 10:00 AM |
| Direction |  |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source |  |
| File Name | 7331.xsx |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Owner | jasonc |



## Raintree Drive NB On-Ramp



## Raintree Drive SB Off-Ramp

| Location Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location ID | 7321 |
| Type | I-SECTION |
| Functional Class |  |
| Located On | SR-101 Exit 38 A-Ramp |
| Between | AND |
| Direction | RAMP |
| Community | - |
| MPO_I |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation |
|  |  |
|  |  |


| Count Data Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date | $7 / 12 / 2017$ |
| End Date | $7 / 13 / 2017$ |
| Start Time | $12: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| End Time | $12: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction |  |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source |  |
| File Name | $7321 . x \mid$ IsX |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Owner | jasonc |


| Interval: 15 mins |  |  |  |  |  | Period Volume |  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume | Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | 15 Min |  |  |  | Hourly Count |  | 15-Minute Hourly Volume |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:00-01:00 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 27 |  | 27 | 26 | 24 | 23 |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 21 |  | 21 | 16 | 10 | 9 |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 7 |  | 7 | 9 | 13 | 23 |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 23 | 44 |  | 44 | 57 | 69 | 88 |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 | 16 | 16 | 33 | 64 | 129 |  | 129 | 154 | 190 | 242 |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 | 41 | 52 | 85 | 137 | 315 |  | 315 | 386 | 484 | 567 |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 112 | 150 | 168 | 223 | 653 | 2771 | 653 | 712 | 817 | 905 | 1166 | 42.1\% |
| 07:00-08:00 | 171 | 255 | 256 | 316 | 998 |  | 998 | 1105 | 1150 | 1166 |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | 278 | 300 | 272 | 270 | 1120 |  | 1120 | 1100 | 997 | 916 |  |  |
| 09:00-10:00 | 258 | 197 | 191 | 225 | 871 | 3340 | 871 | 777 | 742 | 692 | 871 | 26.1\% |
| 10:00-11:00 | 164 | 162 | 141 | 196 | 663 |  | 663 | 658 | 643 | 634 |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 159 | 147 | 132 | 151 | 589 |  | 589 | 593 | 605 | 636 |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 163 | 159 | 163 | 160 | 645 |  | 645 | 618 | 608 | 580 |  |  |
| 13:00-14:00 | 136 | 149 | 135 | 152 | 572 |  | 572 | 548 | 527 | 519 |  |  |
| 14:00-15:00 | 112 | 128 | 127 | 147 | 514 | 2045 | 514 | 510 | 520 | 503 | 552 | 27.0\% |
| 15:00-16:00 | 108 | 138 | 110 | 129 | 485 |  | 485 | 491 | 509 | 530 |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 114 | 156 | 131 | 142 | 543 |  | 543 | 552 | 537 | 542 |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 123 | 141 | 136 | 103 | 503 |  | 503 | 474 | 431 | 392 |  |  |
| 18:00-19:00 | 94 | 98 | 97 | 76 | 365 | 1303 | 365 | 340 | 293 | 257 | 365 | 28.0\% |
| 19:00-20:00 | 69 | 51 | 61 | 47 | 228 |  | 228 | 217 | 218 | 204 |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 | 58 | 52 | 47 | 53 | 210 |  | 210 | 191 | 171 | 164 |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 | 39 | 32 | 40 | 32 | 143 |  | 143 | 126 | 109 | 87 |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 | 22 | 15 | 18 | 14 | 69 |  | 69 | 65 | 62 | 61 |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 | 18 | 12 | 17 | 13 | 60 |  | 60 | 42 | 30 | 13 |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 9774 | 9774 |  |  |  |  | 1166 | 11.9\% |

Raintree Drive NB Off-Ramp

| Location Info |  |  |  |  |  |  | Count Data Info |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location ID | 7332 |  |  |  |  |  | Start Date | 5/10/2017 |  |  |  |  |
| Type | I-SECTION |  |  |  |  |  | End Date | 5/11/2017 |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Class | $2$ |  |  |  |  |  | Start Time | 12:00 AM |  |  |  |  |
| Located On | SR-101 Exit 38 C1-Ramp |  |  |  |  |  | End Time | 12:00 AM |  |  |  |  |
| Between | AND |  |  |  |  |  | Direction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction | RAMP |  |  |  |  |  | Notes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community | - |  |  |  |  |  | Count Source |  |  |  |  |  |
| MPO_ID | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | File Name | 7332.x\|sx |  |  |  |  |
| HPMS ID |  |  |  |  |  |  | Weather |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agency |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Arizona Department of Transportation |  |  |  |  |  | Owner | jasonc |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Interval: 15 mins |  |  |  |  | Period Volume | 15-Minute Hourly Volume |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume | Factor |
| Time | 15 Min |  |  |  | Hourly Count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:00-01:00 | 15 | 20 | 21 | 11 | 67 |  | 67 | 60 | 46 | 31 |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 | 8 | 6 | - 6 | 9 | 29 |  | 29 | 28 | 32 | 39 |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 5 | 35 |  | 35 | 32 | 35 | 35 |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 | 4 | 13 | 13 | 26 | 56 |  | 56 | 61 | 73 | 90 |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 | 9 | 25 | 30 | 62 | 126 |  | 126 | 157 | 201 | 272 |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 | 40 | 69 | 101 | 166 | 376 |  | 376 | 479 | 579 | 714 |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 143 | 169 | 236 | 331 | 879 | 4154 | 879 | 1063 | 1233 | 1351 | 1891 | 45.5\% |
| 07:00-08:00 | 327 | 339 | 354 | 484 | 1504 |  | 1504 | 1685 | 1854 | 1891 |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | 508 | 508 | 391 | 364 | 1771 |  | 1771 | 1578 | 1318 | 1211 |  |  |
| 09:00-10:00 | 315 | 248 | 284 | 396 | 1243 | 5560 | 1243 | 1194 | 1173 | 1140 | 1243 | 22.4\% |
| 10:00-11:00 | 266 | 227 | 251 | 293 | 1037 |  | 1037 | 1026 | 1056 | 1056 |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 255 | 257 | 251 | 259 | 1022 |  | 1022 | 1046 | 1049 | 1067 |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 279 | 260 | 269 | 339 | 1147 |  | 1147 | 1160 | 1161 | 1176 |  |  |
| 13:00-14:00 | 292 | 261 | 284 | 274 | 1111 |  | 1111 | 1053 | 1046 | 1019 |  |  |
| 14:00-15:00 | 234 | 254 | 257 | 260 | 1005 | 4171 | 1005 | 996 | 993 | 985 | 1156 | 27.7\% |
| 15:00-16:00 | 225 | 251 | 249 | 251 | 976 |  | 976 | 1020 | 1008 | 1062 |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 269 | 239 | 303 | 291 | 1102 |  | 1102 | 1145 | 1156 | 1145 |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 312 | 250 | 292 | 234 | 1088 |  | 1088 | 1025 | 975 | 875 |  |  |
| 18:00-19:00 | 249 | 200 | 192 | 169 | 810 | 2752 | 810 | 711 | 672 | 608 | 810 | 29.4\% |
| 19:00-20:00 | 150 | 161 | 128 | 128 | 567 |  | 567 | 560 | 492 | 463 |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 | 143 | 93 | 99 | 98 | 433 |  | 433 | 392 | 381 | 341 |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 | 102 | 82 | 59 | 73 | 316 |  | 316 | 268 | 239 | 229 |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 | 54 | 53 | 49 | 41 | 197 |  | 197 | 179 | 167 | 136 |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 | 36 | 41 | 18 | 21 | 116 |  | 116 | 80 | 39 | 21 |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 17013 | 17013 |  |  |  |  | 1891 | 11.1\% |

## Shea Boulevard SB On-Ramp

| Location Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location ID | 7351 |
| Type | I-SECTION |
| Functional Class |  |
| Located On | SR-101 Exit 41 G-Ramp |
| Between | AND |
| Direction | RAMP |
| Community | - |
| MPO_ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation |
|  |  |
|  |  |


| Count Data Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date | $7 / 12 / 2017$ |
| End Date | $7 / 13 / 2017$ |
| Start Time | $12: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| End Time | $12: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction |  |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source |  |
| File Name | $7351 . x \mid$ xx |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Owner | jasonc |


| Interval: 15 mins |  |  |  |  |  | Period <br> Volume | 15-Minute Hourly Volume |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume | Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | 15 Min |  |  |  | Hourly Count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:00-01:00 | 27 | 25 | 17 | 12 | 81 |  | 81 | 63 | 45 | 36 |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 29 |  | 29 | 23 | 23 | 31 |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 | 3 | 7 | 16 | 7 | 33 |  | 33 | 38 | 43 | 41 |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 | 8 | 12 | 14 | 14 | 48 |  | 48 | 59 | 71 | 94 |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 | 19 | 24 | 37 | 39 | 119 |  | 119 | 144 | 184 | 234 |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 | 44 | 64 | 87 | 78 | 273 |  | 273 | 343 | 432 | 493 |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 114 | 153 | 148 | 156 | 571 | 2187 | 571 | 624 | 676 | 721 | 859 | 39.3\% |
| 07:00-08:00 | 167 | 205 | 193 | 244 | 809 |  | 809 | 835 | 829 | 859 |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | 193 | 199 | 223 | 192 | 807 |  | 807 | 805 | 779 | 760 |  |  |
| 09:00-10:00 | 191 | 173 | 204 | 180 | 748 | 3813 | 748 | 750 | 755 | 731 | 817 | 21.4\% |
| 10:00-11:00 | 193 | 178 | 180 | 188 | 739 |  | 739 | 749 | 731 | 744 |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 203 | 160 | 193 | 173 | 729 |  | 729 | 742 | 778 | 778 |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 216 | 196 | 193 | 175 | 780 |  | 780 | 760 | 777 | 797 |  |  |
| 13:00-14:00 | 196 | 213 | 213 | 195 | 817 |  | 817 | 836 | 818 | 801 |  |  |
| 14:00-15:00 | 215 | 195 | 196 | 192 | 798 | 2803 | 798 | 794 | 781 | 760 | 798 | 28.5\% |
| 15:00-16:00 | 211 | 182 | 175 | 145 | 713 |  | 713 | 699 | 683 | 679 |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 197 | 166 | 171 | 147 | 681 |  | 681 | 666 | 667 | 640 |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 182 | 167 | 144 | 118 | 611 |  | 611 | 596 | 555 | 558 |  |  |
| 18:00-19:00 | 167 | 126 | 147 | 100 | 540 | 2281 | 540 | 515 | 488 | 444 | 540 | 23.7\% |
| 19:00-20:00 | 142 | 99 | 103 | 4 | 428 |  | 428 | 393 | 390 | 385 |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 | 107 | 96 | 98 | 7 | 378 |  | 378 | 378 | 347 | 312 |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 | 107 | 65 | 63 | 63 | 298 |  | 298 | 254 | 236 | 215 |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 | 63 | 47 | 42 | 44 | 196 |  | 196 | 163 | 161 | 147 |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 | 30 | 45 | 28 | 28 | 131 |  | 131 | 101 | 56 | 28 |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 11357 | 11357 |  |  |  |  | 859 | 7.6\% |

## Shea Boulevard NB On-Ramp

| Location Info |  | Count Data Info |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location ID | 7353 | Start Date | 7/11/2017 |
| Type | I-SECTION | End Date | 7/12/2017 |
| Functional Class |  | Start Time | 12:00 PM |
| Located On | SR-101 Exit 41 J-Ramp | End Time | 12:00 PM |
| Between | AND | Direction |  |
| Direction | RAMP | Notes |  |
| Community |  | Count Source |  |
| MPO_ID |  | File Name | 7353.x\|sx |
| HPMS ID |  | Weather |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation | Study |  |
|  |  | Owner | jasonc |


| Interval: 15 mins |  |  |  |  |  | Period Volume |  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume | Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | 15 Min |  |  |  | Hourly Count |  | 15-Minute Hourly Volume |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:00-01:00 | 38 | 26 | 24 | 17 | 105 |  | 105 | 76 | 64 | 54 |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 | 9 | 14 | 14 | 10 | 47 |  | 47 | 43 | 39 | 33 |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 30 |  | 30 | 42 | 42 | 46 |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 | 17 | 10 | 12 | 11 | 50 |  | 50 | 55 | 61 | 81 |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 | 22 | 16 | 32 | 39 | 109 |  | 109 | 130 | 156 | 189 |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 | 43 | 42 | 65 | 84 | 234 |  | 234 | 278 | 362 | 469 |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 87 | 126 | 172 | 175 | 560 | 3060 | 560 | 650 | 718 | 868 | 1435 | 46.9\% |
| 07:00-08:00 | 177 | 194 | 322 | 390 | 1083 |  | 1083 | 1232 | 1391 | 1435 |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | 326 | 353 | 366 | 372 | 1417 |  | 1417 | 1366 | 1306 | 1206 |  |  |
| 09:00-10:00 | 275 | 293 | 266 | 274 | 1108 | 6413 | 1108 | 1145 | 1137 | 1204 | 1398 | 21.8\% |
| 10:00-11:00 | 312 | 285 | 333 | 296 | 1226 |  | 1226 | 1245 | 1294 | 1290 |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 331 | 334 | 329 | 339 | 1333 |  | 1333 | 1343 | 1363 | 1382 |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 341 | 354 | 348 | 345 | 1388 |  | 1388 | 1398 | 1382 | 1387 |  |  |
| 13:00-14:00 | 351 | 338 | 353 | 316 | 1358 |  | 1358 | 1368 | 1388 | 1415 |  |  |
| 14:00-15:00 | 361 | 358 | 380 | 377 | 1476 | 6693 | 1476 | 1483 | 1501 | 1522 | 1897 | 28.3\% |
| 15:00-16:00 | 368 | 376 | 401 | 476 | 1621 |  | 1621 | 1725 | 1813 | 1897 |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 472 | 464 | 485 | 443 | 1864 |  | 1864 | 1862 | 1896 | 1830 |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 470 | 498 | 419 | 345 | 1732 |  | 1732 | 1601 | 1439 | 1259 |  |  |
| 18:00-19:00 | 339 | 336 | 239 | 236 | 1150 | 3939 | 1150 | 1031 | 927 | 884 | 1150 | 29.2\% |
| 19:00-20:00 | 220 | 232 | 196 | 174 | 822 |  | 822 | 797 | 728 | 685 |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 | 195 | 163 | 153 | 134 | 645 |  | 645 | 588 | 550 | 517 |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 | 138 | 125 | 120 | 96 | 479 |  | 479 | 444 | 386 | 334 |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 | 103 | 67 | 68 | 59 | 297 |  | 297 | 263 | 251 | 220 |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 | 69 | 55 | 37 | 44 | 205 |  | 205 | 136 | 81 | 44 |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 20339 | 20339 |  |  |  |  | 1897 | 9.3\% |

## Shea Boulevard SB Off-Ramp

| Location Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location ID | 7350 |
| Type | I-SECTION |
| Functional Class |  |
| Located On | SR-101 Exit 41 A-Ramp |
| Between | AND |
| Direction | RAMP |
| Community | - |
| MPO_ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation |
|  |  |
|  |  |


| Count Data Info |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date | $7 / 11 / 2017$ |
| End Date | 7/12/2017 |
| Start Time | $1: 00$ PM |
| End Time | 1:00 PM |
| Direction |  |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source |  |
| File Name | $7350 . x$ xlsx |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Owner | jasonc |



| Location Info |  | Count Data Info |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location ID | 7352 | Start Date | 7/12/2017 |
| Type | I-SECTION | End Date | 7/13/2017 |
| Functional Class | 2 | Start Time | 12:00 AM |
| Located On | SR-101 Exit 41 C-Ramp | End Time | 12:00 AM |
| Between | AND | Direction |  |
| Direction | RAMP | Notes |  |
| Community | - | Count Source |  |
| MPO_ID | 0 | File Name | 7352.x\|sx |
| HPMS ID |  | Weather |  |
| Agency | Arizona Department of Transportation | Study |  |
|  |  | Owner | jasonc |


| Interval: 15 mins |  |  |  |  |  | Period Volume | 15-Minute Hourly Volume |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume | Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | 15 Min |  |  |  | Hourly Count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:00-01:00 | 24 | 17 | 11 | 18 | 70 |  | 70 | 67 | 59 | 57 |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 | 21 | 9 | 9 | 13 | 52 |  | 52 | 42 | 47 | 48 |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 | 11 | 14 | 10 | 10 | 45 |  | 45 | 41 | 42 | 43 |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 | 7 | 15 | 11 | 18 | 51 |  | 51 | 57 | 64 | 94 |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 | 13 | 22 | 41 | 65 | 141 |  | 141 | 177 | 214 | 268 |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 | 49 | 59 | 95 | 127 | 330 |  | 330 | 394 | 494 | 583 |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 113 | 159 | 184 | 210 | 666 | 2550 | 666 | 761 | 827 | 848 | 1026 | 40.2\% |
| 07:00-08:00 | 208 | 225 | 205 | 220 | 858 |  | 858 | 900 | 913 | 992 |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | 250 | 238 | 284 | 254 | 1026 |  | 1026 | 1009 | 970 | 928 |  |  |
| 09:00-10:00 | 233 | 199 | 242 | 230 | 904 | 4151 | 904 | 856 | 866 | 833 | 904 | 21.8\% |
| 10:00-11:00 | 185 | 209 | 209 | 204 | 807 |  | 807 | 791 | 786 | 780 |  |  |
| 11:00-12:00 | 169 | 204 | 03 | 222 | 798 |  | 798 | 832 | 851 | 869 |  |  |
| 12:00-13:00 | 203 | 223 | 1 | A | 831 |  | 831 | 815 | 778 | 778 |  |  |
| 13:00-14:00 | 187 | 18 | 221 | 217 | 811 |  | 811 | 804 | 843 | 849 |  |  |
| 14:00-15:00 | 180 | 225 | 227 | 199 | 831 | 3655 | 831 | 824 | 795 | 790 | 1103 | 30.2\% |
| 15:00-16:00 | 173 | 196 | 222 | 203 | 794 |  | 794 | 854 | 883 | 893 |  |  |
| 16:00-17:00 | 233 | 225 | 232 | 237 | 927 |  | 927 | 927 | 1053 | 1099 |  |  |
| 17:00-18:00 | 233 | 351 | 278 | 241 | 1103 |  | 1103 | 1080 | 944 | 875 |  |  |
| 18:00-19:00 | 210 | 215 | 209 | 174 | 808 | 2707 | 808 | 733 | 656 | 545 | 808 | 29.8\% |
| 19:00-20:00 | 135 | 138 | 98 | 112 | 483 |  | 483 | 448 | 408 | 418 |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 | 100 | 98 | 108 | 7 | 393 |  | 393 | 389 | 377 | 332 |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 | 6 | 86 | 3 | 91 | 336 |  | 336 | 295 | 259 | 248 |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 | 55 | 50 | 2 | 49 | 206 |  | 206 | 194 | 171 | 148 |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 | 43 | 27 | 29 | 23 | 122 |  | 122 | 79 | 52 | 23 |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 13393 | 13393 |  |  |  |  | 1103 | 8.2\% |

Traffic Interchange and Study Intersection Traffic Counts

Intersection Turning Movement
A Prepared by


Project \#: $\quad$ 16-1363-011
TMC SUMMARY OF Loop 101 Ramps \& Shea Blvd.


Project \#: _16-1198-008
TMC SUMMARY OF Loop 101 - SB Ramps \& Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd.


Project \#: _16-1198-007
TMC SUMMARY OF Loop 101 - NB Ramps \& Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd.




Traffic Interchange and Study Intersection Signal Timing

| FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT \& SR 101 |  | System \# 174 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BASIC TIMING PLAN 1 | Section \# | I.P. Address |  |
|  | 1618 | MM1-5-1 | Date Designed |



| FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT \& SR 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | System \# |  | 174 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COORDINATOR |  |  |  |  |  | Section \# |  |  | Date Updated |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1618 |  |  | 12/11/2018 |  |  |
|  | PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |
|  | FDW |  | 20 |  | 40 |  | 17 |  | 38 |  |  |
|  | YELLOW | 3.6 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 4.4 |  |  |
|  | ALL RED | 3.5 | 6.5 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 3.5 | 6.5 | 1.8 | 1.8 |  |  |
|  | WALK |  | 20 |  | 40 |  | 17 |  | 38 |  |  |
| PLAN 1 <br> AM PLAN OPERATIVE TIMES 6:00 | R1 | 2 | $\rightarrow$ | 1 | Г | 4 | $\downarrow$ | 3 | $\vdash$ | TIMING PLAN | OFFSET |
|  | R2 | 6 | $\leftarrow$ | 5 | $\uparrow$ | 8 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ |  | 114 |
|  |  | RING 1 |  |  |  | RING 2 |  |  |  | Target Cycle Length |  |
|  | PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |
|  | SPLIT | 21 | 42 | 33 | 24 | 30 | 33 | 28 | 29 |  |  |
|  | COORD |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  | 120 |  |
|  | RECALLS | V | V | V | V | V | V | V | V | Actual Cycle Length |  |
|  | GREEN | 13.9 | 31.1 | 27.6 | 17.8 | 22.9 | 22.1 | 22.6 | 22.8 | 120 |  |
| PLAN 2 <br> MIDDAY PLAN OPERATIVE TIMES 9:00 | R1 | 2 | $\rightarrow$ | 1 | Г | 4 | $\downarrow$ | 3 | $\vdash$ | TIMING PLAN | OFFSET |
|  | R2 | 6 | $\leftarrow$ | 5 | $\uparrow$ | 8 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | $\longrightarrow$ |  | 103 |
|  |  | RING 1 |  |  |  | RING 2 |  |  |  | Target Cycle Length |  |
|  | PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |
|  | SPLIT | 19 | 35 | 33 | 33 | 26 | 28 | 36 | 30 |  |  |
|  | COORD |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  | 120 |  |
|  | RECALLS | V | V | V | V | V | V | V |  | Actual Cycle Length |  |
|  | GREEN | 11.9 | 24.1 | 27.6 | 26.8 | 18.9 | 17.1 | 30.6 | 23.8 | 120 |  |
| PLAN 3 <br> PM PLAN OPERATIVE TIMES 15:00 | R1 | 2 | $\rightarrow$ | 1 | 「 | 4 | $\downarrow$ | 3 | $\checkmark$ | timing plan | OFFSET |
|  | R2 | 6 | $\leftarrow$ | 5 | $\uparrow$ | 8 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ |  | 113 |
|  |  | RING 1 |  |  |  | RING 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |
|  | SPLIT | 18 | 38 | 30 | 34 | 30 | 26 | 34 | 30 | Target Cycle Length |  |
|  | COORD |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  | 120 |  |
|  | RECALLS | V | V | V | V | V | V | V | V | Actual Cycle Length |  |
|  | GREEN | 10.9 | 27.1 | 24.6 | 27.8 | 22.9 | 15.1 | 28.6 | 23.8 | 120 |  |


| Raintree Dr \& SR-101 Ramps |  | System \# 173 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BASIC TIMING PLAN | Section \# | I.P. Address <br> MM1-5-1 | Date Designed |
|  |  | 172.17 .11 .73 | $1 / 10 / 2019$ |




| Raintree Dr \& 87th St |  | System \# 267 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BASIC TIMING PLAN | Section \# | I.P. Address <br> MM1-5-1 | Date Designed |
|  |  | 172.17 .12 .67 | $2 / 20 / 2018$ |



Advance detection on phase $4 \& 8$.


| Raintree Dr \& 87th St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | System \# |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COORDINATOR |  |  |  |  |  | Section \# |  |  | Date Updated |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 101 |  |  | 2/20/2018 |  |  |
|  | PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |
|  | FDW |  | 29 |  | 20 |  | 29 |  | 20 |  |  |
|  | YELLOW |  | 4.4 |  | 4 |  | 4.4 |  | 4 |  |  |
|  | ALL RED |  | 2 |  | 1.7 |  | 2 |  | 1.7 |  |  |
|  | WALK |  | 29 |  | 20 |  | 29 |  | 20 |  |  |
| PLAN 1 AM PLAN OPERATIVE TIMES | R1 | 2 | $\downarrow$ |  |  | 4 | $\leftarrow$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { COORD } \\ & \text { PATTERN } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | OFFSET |
|  | R2 | 6 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 8 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | Balanced | 100 |
|  |  | RING 1 |  |  |  | RING 2 |  |  |  | Target Cycle Length |  |
|  | PHASE |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |
|  | SPLIT |  | 35 |  | 85 |  | 35 |  | 85 |  |  |
|  | COORD |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X | 120 |  |
|  | RECALLS |  |  |  | V |  |  |  | V | Actual Cycle Length |  |
|  | GREEN |  | 28.6 |  | 79.3 |  | 28.6 |  | 79.3 | 120 |  |
| PLAN 4 <br> MIDDAY PLAN OPERATIVE TIMES | R1 | 2 | $\downarrow$ |  |  | 4 | $\leftarrow$ |  |  | COORD PATTERN | OFFSET |
|  | R2 | 6 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 8 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | Balanced | 68 |
|  |  | RING 1 |  |  |  | RING 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PHASE |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |
|  | SPLIT |  | 40 |  | 80 |  | 40 |  | 80 | Target Cycle Length |  |
|  | COORD |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X | 120 |  |
|  | RECALLS |  |  |  | V |  |  |  | V | Actual Cycle Length |  |
|  | GREEN |  | 33.6 |  | 74.3 |  | 33.6 |  | 74.3 | 120 |  |
| PLAN 7 <br> PM PLAN OPERATIVE TIMES | R1 | 2 | $\downarrow$ |  |  | 4 | $\leftarrow$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { COORD } \\ & \text { PATTERN } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | OfFSET |
|  | R2 | 6 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 8 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | Balanced | 4 |
|  |  | RING 1 |  |  |  | RING 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PHASE |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |
|  | SPLIT |  | 40 |  | 80 |  | 40 |  | 80 | Target Cycle Length |  |
|  | COORD |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X | 120 |  |
|  | RECALLS |  |  |  | V |  |  |  | V | Actual Cycle Length |  |
|  | GREEN |  | 33.6 |  | 74.3 |  | 33.6 |  | 74.3 | 120 |  |


| SHEA \& 101 |  | System \# 113 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BASIC TIMING PLAN | Section \# | I.P. Address <br> MM1-5-1 | Date Designed |
|  |  | 172.27 .11 .13 | $3 / 12 / 2020$ |



NOTES
NBR overlap is delayed 3 seconds from star
No existing vehicle detection on EBT, WBT.

 Use Timing plan:
TOD: MIDDAY


Use Timing plan:


Use Timing plan:
TOD: NIGHT


Use Timing plan:
FREE
Use
REE

| R1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R2 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  |
|  | 6 | 5 | 8 |  |

Use Timing plan: 254



101 Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd
Initial Traffic Report Update

APPENDIX 2-2040 Traffic Volumes

| Southbound SR 101 |  |  | 2018 Balanced Volumes |  | 020 Grown Volumes |  | 2040 (No Build) Grown Volumes |  | 2040 (Build) Grown Volumes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route | Start/End or Ramp |  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| SR 101 | Exit 35 Hayden Rd | Exit 36 Princess Dr - Pima Rd | 5,700 | 4,200 | 6,000 | 4,450 | 7,400 | 5,550 | 7,700 | 5,800 |
| SR 101 | Hayden Rd EB On-Ramp |  | 523 | 367 | 534 | 374 | 590 | 413 | 590 | 413 |
| SR 101 | Princess Dr/Pima Rd SB Off-Ramp |  | 950 | 800 | 969 | 816 | 1,071 | 902 | 1,071 | 902 |
| SR 101 | Princess Dr/Pima Rd SB On-Ramp |  | 2,127 | 2,046 | 2,170 | 2,087 | 2,398 | 2,306 | 2,398 | 2,306 |
| SR 101 | Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd SB Off-Ramp |  | 1,000 | 850 | 1,020 | 867 | 1,127 | 958 | 1,127 | 958 |
| SR 101 | Exit 36 Princess Dr - Pima Rd | Exit 37 Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | 6,400 | 4,963 | 6,715 | 5,228 | 8,190 | 6,409 | 8,490 | 6,659 |
| SR 101 | Raintree Dr SB Off-Ramp |  | 1,000 | 510 | 1,020 | 520 | 1,127 | 575 | 1,127 | 575 |
| SR 101 | Exit 37 Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | Exit 39 Raintree Dr | 5,400 | 4,453 | 5,695 | 4,708 | 7,063 | 5,834 | 7,363 | 6,084 |
| SR 101 | Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd SB On-Ramp |  | 1,000 | 1,381 | 1,020 | 1,409 | 1,127 | 1,557 | 1,127 | 1,557 |
| SR 101 | Exit 39 Raintree Dr | Exit 40 Cactus Rd | 6,400 | 5,834 | 6,715 | 6,117 | 8,190 | 7,391 | 8,490 | 7,641 |
| SR 101 | Raintree Dr SB On-Ramp |  | 780 | 1,519 | 796 | 1,550 | 879 | 1,713 | 879 | 1,713 |
| SR 101 | Cactus Rd SB Off-Ramp |  | 900 | 900 | 918 | 918 | 1,014 | 1,014 | 1,014 | 1,014 |
| SR 101 | Cactus Rd SB On-Ramp |  | 761 | 633 | 776 | 646 | 857 | 714 | 857 | 714 |
| SR 101 | Shea Blvd SB Off-Ramp |  | 1,200 | 1,100 | 1,224 | 1,122 | 1,352 | 1,240 | 1,352 | 1,240 |
| SR 101 | Exit 40 Cactus Rd | Exit 41 Shea Blvd | 5,841 | 5,986 | 6,145 | 6,273 | 7,560 | 7,564 | 7,860 | 7,814 |
| SR 101 | Shea Blvd SB On-Ramp |  | 1,133 | 797 | 1,156 | 813 | 1,277 | 899 | 1,277 | 899 |
| SR 101 | Exit 41 Shea Blvd | Exit 42 Pima Rd - 90th St | 6,974 | 6,783 | 7,301 | 7,086 | 8,837 | 8,463 | 9,137 | 8,713 |

Note: Mainline volumes are non-HOV volumes.

| Northbound SR 101 |  |  | 2018 Balanced Volumes |  | 2020 Grown Volumes |  | 2040 (No Build) Grown$\qquad$ |  | 2040 (Build) Grown$\qquad$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route | Start/End or Ramp |  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| SR 101 | Exit 36 Princess Dr - Pima Rd | Exit 35 Hayden Rd | 4,000 | 5,160 | 4,242 | 5,444 | 5,293 | 6,728 | 5,593 | 7,028 |
| SR 101 | Hayden Rd WB Off-Ramp |  | 500 | 800 | 510 | 816 | 563 | 902 | 563 | 902 |
| SR 101 | Princess Dr/Pima Rd NB On-Ramp |  | 644 | 1,100 | 657 | 1,122 | 726 | 1,240 | 726 | 1,240 |
| SR 101 | Princess Dr/Pima Rd NB Off-Ramp |  | 1,134 | 1,500 | 1,157 | 1,530 | 1,278 | 1,690 | 1,278 | 1,690 |
| SR 101 | Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd NB On-Ramp |  | 817 | 1,100 | 833 | 1,122 | 920 | 1,240 | 920 | 1,240 |
| SR 101 | Exit 37 Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | Exit 36 Princess Dr - Pima Rd | 4,173 | 5,260 | 4,419 | 5,546 | 5,488 | 6,840 | 5,788 | 7,140 |
| SR 101 | Raintree Dr NB On-Ramp |  | 364 | 780 | 371 | 796 | 410 | 879 | 410 | 879 |
| SR 101 | Exit 39 Raintree Dr | Exit 37 Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | 3,809 | 4,480 | 4,048 | 4,750 | 5,078 | 5,961 | 5,378 | 6,261 |
| SR 101 | Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd NB Off-Ramp |  | 1,371 | 847 | 1,399 | 864 | 1,546 | 955 | 1,546 | 955 |
| SR 101 | Exit 40 Cactus Rd | Exit 39 Raintree Dr | 5,180 | 5,327 | 5,447 | 5,614 | 6,624 | 6,916 | 6,924 | 7,216 |
| SR 101 | Raintree Dr NB Off-Ramp |  | 1,330 | 1,046 | 1,356 | 1,067 | 1,498 | 1,179 | 1,498 | 1,179 |
| SR 101 | Cactus Rd NB On-Ramp |  | 455 | 484 | 464 | 494 | 513 | 546 | 513 | 546 |
| SR 101 | Cactus Rd NB Off-Ramp |  | 987 | 1,210 | 1,007 | 1,234 | 1,113 | 1,363 | 1,113 | 1,363 |
| SR 101 | Shea Blvd NB On-Ramp |  | 1,097 | 1,389 | 1,119 | 1,417 | 1,237 | 1,566 | 1,237 | 1,566 |
| SR 101 | Exit 41 Shea Blvd | Exit 40 Cactus Rd | 5,945 | 5,710 | 6,227 | 6,004 | 7,485 | 7,346 | 7,785 | 7,646 |
| SR 101 | Shea Blvd NB Off-Ramp |  | 855 | 1,290 | 873 | 1,316 | 965 | 1,454 | 965 | 1,454 |
| SR 101 | Exit 42 Pima Rd - 90th St | Exit 41 Shea Blvd | 6,800 | 7,000 | 7,100 | 7,320 | 8,450 | 8,800 | 8,750 | 9,100 |

Note: Mainline volumes are non-HOV volumes.

2040 Traffic Interchange Turning Movement Volumes

| AM | U-N | NL | NT | NR | U-S | SL | ST | SR | U-E | EL | ET | ER | U-W | WL | WT | WR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FLW \& Loop 101 | 0 | 789 | 719 | 96 | 0 | 604 | 510 | 396 | 0 | 634 | 1045 | 503 | 0 | 333 | 1031 | 1091 |
| Raintree \& Loop 101 | 96 | 915 | 82 | 405 | 127 | 294 | 274 | 691 | 0 | 272 | 221 | 240 | 0 | 724 | 508 | 355 |
| Raintree \& 87th St | 0 | 19 | 17 | 75 | 0 | 61 | 69 | 87 | 0 | 21 | 597 | 94 | 0 | 380 | 1524 | 210 |
| Shea \& Loop 101 | 0 | 481 | 0 | 484 | 0 | 992 | 0 | 457 | 0 | 385 | 1082 | 422 | 0 | 855 | 863 | 852 |


| PM | U-N | NL | NT | NR | U-S | SL | ST | SR | U-E | EL | ET | ER | U-W | WL | WT | WR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FLW \& Loop 101 | 0 | 763 | 477 | 214 | 0 | 682 | 707 | 345 | 0 | 450 | 1589 | 737 | 0 | 379 | 905 | 716 |
| Raintree \& Loop 101 | 14 | 493 | 43 | 629 | 139 | 371 | 312 | 385 | 0 | 688 | 531 | 894 | 0 | 565 | 501 | 250 |
| Raintree \& 87th St | 0 | 138 | 69 | 467 | 0 | 129 | 43 | 69 | 0 | 40 | 1517 | 11 | 0 | 27 | 1153 | 199 |
| Shea \& Loop 101 | 0 | 760 | 0 | 694 | 0 | 884 | 0 | 359 | 0 | 431 | 1139 | 377 | 0 | 522 | 1086 | 1135 |

101 Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd
Initial Traffic Report Update

APPENDIX 3 - VISSIM Freeway Output Reports (2020 Existing, 2040 Baseline/No-Build, 2040 Improved/Build)

## Mainline and Ramps 2020 AM Existing Peak Hour Results

| Link No. Segment | Volume | Density | Speed | LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loop 101 SB Ramps |  |  |  |  |
| 12 Princess Dr. Off-Ramp | 971 | 17 | 59 | B |
| 17 Princess Dr. On-Ramp | 2120 | 43 | 38 | E |
| 19 Frank Lloyd Wright Off-Ramp | 1020 | 18 | 57 | B |
| 23 Raintree Dr. Off-Ramp | 925 | 16 | 57 | B |
| 27 Frank Lloyd Wright On-Ramp | 1021 | 14 | 61 | F |
| 31 Raintree Dr. On-Ramp | 780 | 24 | 34 | C |
| 138 Cactus Rd. Off-Ramp | 851 | 15 | 58 | B |
| 115 Cactus Rd. On-Ramp | 741 | 9 | 45 | A |
| 161 Shea Blvd. Off-Ramp | 1131 | 9 | 63 | A |
| 263 Shea Blvd. On-Ramp | 1067 | 37 | 23 | E |
| Loop 101 NB Ramps |  |  |  |  |
| 251 Shea Blvd. NB Off-Ramp | 604 | 7 | 59 | A |
| 274 Shea Blvd.NB On-Ramp | 886 | 12 | 45 | B |
| 279 Cactus Rd. Off-Ramp | 998 | 18 | 56 | B |
| 176 Cactus Rd. On-Ramp | 463 | 5 | 45 | A |
| 10050 Raintree Drive NB Off-Ramp | 1358 | 26 | 51 | C |
| 42 Frank Lloyd Wright NB Off-Ramp | 1369 | 25 | 24 | C |
| 46 Raintree Drive NB On-Ramp | 362 | 6 | 50 | A |
| 51 Frank Lloyd Wright NB On-Ramp | 813 | 16 | 35 | B |
| 54 Princess Drive Off-Ramp | 1159 | 19 | 60 | C |
| 58 Princess Drive On-Ramp | 614 | 14 | 47 | B |
| Loop 101 SB Mainline |  |  |  |  |
| 2 West of Hayden EB On-Ramp | 5990 | 35 | 59 | D |
| 10 Hayden On-Ramp Merge | 4900 | 25 | 64 | C |
| 11 Between Hayden On-Ramp \& Princess On-Ramp | 5394 | 28 | 65 | D |
| 18 Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 5453 | 30 | 59 | D |
| 119 Between Princess Dr On-Ramp \& FLW Off-Ramp | 6207 | 30 | 60 | D |
| 121 Between FLW Off-Ramp \& Raintree Off-Ramp | 6116 | 26 | 60 | C |
| 24 Between Raintree Off-Ramp \& FLW On-Ramp | 5269 | 27 | 65 | D |
| 167 FLW On-Ramp Merge | 5915 | 23 | 61 | C |
| 1042 Between FLW On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 6292 | 24 | 65 | C |
| 33 Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 6455 | 29 | 60 | D |

Mainline and Ramps 2020 PM Existing Peak Hour Results

| Link No. Segment | Volume | Density | Speed | LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loop 101 SB Ramps |  |  |  |  |
| 12 Princess Dr. Off-Ramp | 814 | 14 | 58 | B |
| 17 Princess Dr. On-Ramp | 1618 | 43 | 36 | E |
| 19 Frank Lloyd Wright Off-Ramp | 867 | 15 | 57 | B |
| 23 Raintree Dr. Off-Ramp | 461 | 8 | 59 | A |
| 27 Frank Lloyd Wright On-Ramp | 1466 | 105 | 9 | F |
| 31 Raintree Dr. On-Ramp | 1639 | 142 | 6 | F |
| 138 Cactus Rd. Off-Ramp | 843 | 15 | 57 | B |
| 115 Cactus Rd. On-Ramp | 634 | 8 | 46 | A |
| 161 Shea Blvd. Off-Ramp | 1060 | 8 | 63 | A |
| 263 Shea Blvd. On-Ramp | 782 | 19 | 30 | C |
| Loop 101 NB Ramps |  |  |  |  |
| 251 Shea Blvd. NB Off-Ramp | 1299 | 11 | 60 | B |
| 274 Shea Blvd.NB On-Ramp | 1347 | 16 | 43 | B |
| 279 Cactus Rd. Off-Ramp | 1226 | 22 | 55 | C |
| 176 Cactus Rd. On-Ramp | 479 | 5 | 45 | A |
| 10050 Raintree Drive NB Off-Ramp | 1068 | 20 | 54 | C |
| 42 Frank Lloyd Wright NB Off-Ramp | 845 | 15 | 56 | B |
| 46 Raintree Drive NB On-Ramp | 771 | 15 | 43 | B |
| 51 Frank Lloyd Wright NB On-Ramp | 1000 | 160 | 3 | F |
| 54 Princess Drive Off-Ramp | 1500 | 27 | 55 | D |
| 58 Princess Drive On-Ramp | 1096 | 61 | 16 | F |
| Loop 101 SB Mainline |  |  |  |  |
| 2 West of Hayden EB On-Ramp | 4451 | 24 | 62 | C |
| 10 Hayden On-Ramp Merge | 4798 | 18 | 66 | C |
| 11 Between Hayden On-Ramp \& Princess On-Ramp | 3956 | 20 | 66 | C |
| 18 Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 5516 | 23 | 59 | C |
| 119 Between Princess Dr On-Ramp \& FLW Off-Ramp | 5649 | 22 | 63 | C |
| 121 Between FLW Off-Ramp \& Raintree Off-Ramp | 4772 | 18 | 66 | B |
| 24 Between Raintree Off-Ramp \& FLW On-Ramp | 4316 | 22 | 66 | C |
| 167 FLW On-Ramp Merge | 5317 | 21 | 61 | C |
| 10042 Between FLW On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 5731 | 22 | 66 | C |
| 33 Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 6358 | 32 | 48 | D |

Mainline and Ramps 2040 AM No-Build Peak Hour Results

| Link No. Segment | Volume | Density | Speed | LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loop 101 SB Ramps |  |  |  |  |
| 12 Princess Dr. Off-Ramp | 1067 | 16 | 58 | B |
| 17 Princess Dr. On-Ramp | 2300 | 46 | 35 | F |
| 19 Frank Lloyd Wright Off-Ramp | 1114 | 18 | 57 | B |
| 23 Raintree Dr. Off-Ramp | 1117 | 16 | 57 | B |
| 27 Frank Lloyd Wright On-Ramp | 1118 | 82 | 11 | F |
| 31 Raintree Dr. On-Ramp | 877 | 37 | 27 | E |
| 138 Cactus Rd. Off-Ramp | 934 | 16 | 57 | B |
| 115 Cactus Rd. On-Ramp | 845 | 10 | 45 | A |
| 161 Shea Blvd. Off-Ramp | 1260 | 9 | 62 | A |
| 263 Shea Blvd. On-Ramp | 1184 | 47 | 21 | F |
| Loop 101 NB Ramps |  |  |  |  |
| 251 Shea Blvd. NB Off-Ramp | 862 | 7 | 55 | A |
| 274 Shea Blvd.NB On-Ramp | 1192 | 14 | 44 | B |
| 279 Cactus Rd. Off-Ramp | 976 | 18 | 48 | B |
| 176 Cactus Rd. On-Ramp | 508 | 6 | 45 | A |
| 10050 Raintree Drive NB Off-Ramp | 1450 | 26 | 52 | C |
| 42 Frank Lloyd Wright NB Off-Ramp | 1557 | 26 | 52 | C |
| 46 Raintree Drive NB On-Ramp | 401 | 7 | 49 | A |
| 51 Frank Lloyd Wright NB On-Ramp | 917 | 29 | 27 | D |
| 54 Princess Drive Off-Ramp | 1311 | 19 | 60 | C |
| 58 Princess Drive On-Ramp | 712 | 16 | 44 | B |
| Loop 101 SB Mainline |  |  |  |  |
| 2 West of Hayden EB On-Ramp | 7528 | 81 | 27 | F |
| 10 Hayden On-Ramp Merge | 8225 | 34 | 52 | D |
| 11 Between Hayden On-Ramp \& Princess On-Ramp | 7149 | 34 | 60 | D |
| 18 Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 8666 | 37 | 53 | E |
| 119 Between Princess Dr On-Ramp \& FLW Off-Ramp | 8873 | 41 | 49 | E |
| 121 Between FLW Off-Ramp \& Raintree Off-Ramp | 7747 | 50 | 37 | F |
| 24 Between Raintree Off-Ramp \& FLW On-Ramp | 6753 | 78 | 25 | F |
| 167 FLW On-Ramp Merge | 5740 | 86 | 18 | F |
| 10042 Between FLW On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 7886 | 81 | 20 | F |
| 33 Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 9809 | 61 | 27 | F |

## Mainline and Ramps 2040 PM No-Build Peak Hour Results

| Link No. Segment | Volume | Density | Speed | LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loop 101 SB Ramps |  |  |  |  |
| 12 Princess Dr. Off-Ramp | 898 | 15 | 57 | B |
| 17 Princess Dr. On-Ramp | 1614 | 60 | 25 | F |
| 19 Frank Lloyd Wright Off-Ramp | 960 | 16 | 56 | B |
| 23 Raintree Dr. Off-Ramp | 512 | 8.35 | 58 | A |
| 27 Frank Lloyd Wright On-Ramp | 1544 | 180 | 3 | F |
| 31 Raintree Dr. On-Ramp | 1596 | 147 | 6 | F |
| 138 Cactus Rd. Off-Ramp | 916 | 14 | 57 | B |
| 115 Cactus Rd. On-Ramp | 703 | 8 | 46 | A |
| 161 Shea Blvd. Off-Ramp | 1141 | 8 | 63 | A |
| 263 Shea Blvd. On-Ramp | 893 | 21 | 30 | C |
| Loop 101 NB Ramps |  |  |  |  |
| 251 Shea Blvd. NB Off-Ramp | 1246 | 14 | 55 | B |
| 274 Shea Blvd.NB On-Ramp | 1368 | 16 | 43 | B |
| 279 Cactus Rd. Off-Ramp | 1174 | 20 | 47 | C |
| 176 Cactus Rd. On-Ramp | 533 | 6 | 45 | A |
| 10050 Raintree Drive NB Off-Ramp | 1214 | 20 | 54 | C |
| 42 Frank Lloyd Wright NB Off-Ramp | 972 | 15 | 56 | B |
| 46 Raintree Drive NB On-Ramp | 852 | 17 | 42 | B |
| 51 Frank Lloyd Wright NB On-Ramp | 1200 | 177 | 3 | F |
| 54 Princess Drive Off-Ramp | 1723 | 27 | 56 | D |
| 58 Princess Drive On-Ramp | 1253 | 73 | 13 | F |
| Loop 101 SB Mainline |  |  |  |  |
| 2 West of Hayden EB On-Ramp | 5854 | 31 | 60 | D |
| 10 Hayden On-Ramp Merge | 4976 | 22 | 65 | C |
| 11 Between Hayden On-Ramp \& Princess On-Ramp | 5246 | 24 | 60 | C |
| 18 Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 6790 | 41 | 40 | E |
| 119 Between Princess Dr On-Ramp \& FLW Off-Ramp | 6955 | 50 | 33 | F |
| 121 Between FLW Off-Ramp \& Raintree Off-Ramp | 5983 | 69 | 20 | F |
| 24 Between Raintree Off-Ramp \& FLW On-Ramp | 5474 | 102 | 15 | F |
| 167 FLW On-Ramp Merge | 6543 | 116 | 11 | F |
| 10042 Between FLW On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 7038 | 111 | 13 | F |
| 33 Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 7400 | 74 | 22 | F |

## Mainline and Ramps 2040 AM Add Lane Peak Hour Results

| Link No. Segment | Volume | Density | Speed | LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loop 101 SB Ramps |  |  |  |  |
| 12 Princess Dr. Off-Ramp | 1067 | 18 | 58 | B |
| 17 Princess Dr. On-Ramp | 2300 | 43 | 37 | E |
| 19 Frank Lloyd Wright Off-Ramp | 1114 | 20 | 56 | C |
| 23 Raintree Dr. Off-Ramp | 1117 | 18 | 57 | B |
| 27 Frank Lloyd Wright On-Ramp | 1118 | 78 | 11 | F |
| 31 Raintree Dr. On-Ramp | 877 | 36 | 27 | E |
| 138 Cactus Rd. Off-Ramp | 934 | 16 | 57 | B |
| 115 Cactus Rd. On-Ramp | 845 | 10 | 45 | A |
| 161 Shea Blvd. Off-Ramp | 1260 | 10 | 61 | A |
| 263 Shea Blvd. On-Ramp | 1184 | 40 | 25 | E |
| Loop 101 NB Ramps |  |  |  |  |
| 251 Shea Blvd. NB Off-Ramp | 862 | 7 | 60 | A |
| 274 Shea Blvd.NB On-Ramp | 1192 | 14 | 44 | B |
| 279 Cactus Rd. Off-Ramp | 976 | 20 | 50 | C |
| 176 Cactus Rd. On-Ramp | 508 | 6 | 45 | A |
| 10050 Raintree Drive NB Off-Ramp | 1450 | 33 | 48 | D |
| 42 Frank Lloyd Wright NB Off-Ramp | 1557 | 31 | 51 | D |
| 46 Raintree Drive NB On-Ramp | 401 | 7 | 48 | A |
| 51 Frank Lloyd Wright NB On-Ramp | 917 | 29 | 27 | D |
| 54 Princess Drive Off-Ramp | 1311 | 22 | 58 | C |
| 58 Princess Drive On-Ramp | 712 | 16 | 44 | B |
| Loop 101 SB Mainline |  |  |  |  |
| 2 West of Hayden EB On-Ramp | 7528 | 33 | 60 | D |
| 10 Hayden On-Ramp Merge | 8225 | 26 | 64 | C |
| 11 Between Hayden On-Ramp \& Princess On-Ramp | 7149 | 27 | 65 | D |
| 18 Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 8666 | 29 | 60 | D |
| 119 Between Princess Dr On-Ramp \& FLW Off-Ramp | 8873 | 31 | 58 | D |
| 121 Between FLW Off-Ramp \& Raintree Off-Ramp | 7747 | 28 | 58 | D |
| 24 Between Raintree Off-Ramp \& FLW On-Ramp | 6753 | 26 | 65 | C |
| 167 FLW On-Ramp Merge | 5740 | 23 | 62 | C |
| 10042 Between FLW On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 7886 | 24 | 65 | C |
| 33 Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 9809 | 29 | 59 | D |

## Mainline and Ramps 2040 PM Add Lane Peak Hour Results

| Link No. Segment <br> Loop 101 SB Ramps <br> 12 Princess Dr. Off-Ramp <br> 17 Princess Dr. On-Ramp | Volume | Density | Speed | LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 Frank Lloyd Wright Off-Ramp | 898 | 15 | 58 | B |
| 23 Raintree Dr. Off-Ramp | 1614 | 43 | 37 | E |
| 27 Frank Lloyd Wright On-Ramp | 960 | 16 | 57 | B |
| 31 Raintree Dr. On-Ramp | 512 | 9 | 58 | A |
| 138 Cactus Rd. Off-Ramp | 1544 | 128 | 7 | F |
| 115 Cactus Rd. On-Ramp | 1596 | 147 | 6 | F |
| 161 Shea Blvd. Off-Ramp | 916 | 16 | 57 | B |
| 263 Shea Blvd. On-Ramp | 703 | 8 | 46 | A |
| Loop 101 NB Ramps | 1141 | 9 | 62 | A |
| 251 Shea Blvd. NB Off-Ramp | 893 | 21 | 30 | C |
| 274 Shea Blvd.NB On-Ramp |  |  |  |  |
| 279 Cactus Rd. Off-Ramp | 1246 | 11 | 59 | B |
| 176 Cactus Rd. On-Ramp | 1368 | 16 | 43 | B |
| 10050 Raintree Drive NB Off-Ramp | 1174 | 21 | 51 | C |
| 42 Frank Lloyd Wright NB Off-Ramp | 533 | 6 | 45 | A |
| 46 Raintree Drive NB On-Ramp | 1214 | 24 | 50 | C |
| 51 Frank Lloyd Wright NB On-Ramp | 972 | 17 | 55 | B |
| 54 Princess Drive Off-Ramp | 852 | 17 | 42 | B |
| 58 Princess Drive On-Ramp | 1200 | 182 | 5 | F |
| Loop 101 SB Mainline | 1723 | 35 | 49 | D |
| 2 West of Hayden EB On-Ramp | 1253 | 73 | 13 | F |
| 10 Hayden On-Ramp Merge |  |  |  |  |
| 11 Between Hayden On-Ramp \& Princess On-Ramp | 5854 | 24 | 62 | C |
| 18 Princess Drive On-Ramp Merge | 4976 | 19 | 66 | C |
| 119 Between Princess Dr On-Ramp \& FLW Off-Ramp | 5246 | 20 | 67 | C |
| 121 Between FLW Off-Ramp \& Raintree Off-Ramp | 6790 | 22 | 62 | C |
| 24 Between Raintree Off-Ramp \& FLW On-Ramp | 6955 | 22 | 62 | C |
| 167 FLW On-Ramp Merge | 5983 | 18 | 65 | B |
| 10042 Between FLW On-Ramp \& Raintree On-Ramp | 5474 | 21 | 67 | C |
| 33 Raintree On-Ramp Merge | 6543 | 22 | 62 | C |
|  | 7038 | 22 | 65 | C |

Initial Traffic Report Update

APPENDIX 4 - VISSIM/RODEL TI/Intersection Output Reports (2020 Existing, 2040 Baseline/No-Build, 2040 Improved/Build)

VISSIM Analysis Results


2020 PM Peak Hour Results

| Intersection | Approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Turning } \\ & \text { Movement } \end{aligned}$ | QLeN | QLenmax | $\begin{gathered} \text { Volume } \\ \text { (Vehicles) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (veh/sec) } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Volume | Approach Delay (sec/veh) | Approach LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TURNING MOVEMENT | QLeN | QLeNMAX | VEHS(ALL) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { VEHDELAY( } \\ & \text { ALL) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\&}{\text { Frank Lloyd Wright } 101}$ | NB | NBL | 244.09 | 567.09 | 676 | 99.17 | 1,302 | 70.6 | E |
|  |  | NBT | 80.23 | 345.06 | 433 | 45.3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 76.11 | 347.15 | 193 | 27.09 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 93.01 | 485.49 | 620 | 43.64 | 1,571 | 55.1 | E |
|  |  | SBT | 196.96 | 619.98 | 637 | 85.48 |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 193.98 | 632.89 | 314 | 15.91 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 74.15 | 397.52 | 418 | 58.62 | 2,511 | 57.5 | E |
|  |  | EBT | 348.66 | 1031.58 | 1439 | 60.18 |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBR | 343.89 | 1054.48 | 654 | 50.75 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 715.36 | 1184.37 | 279 | 377.02 | 1,736 | 92.5 | F |
|  |  | WBT | 311.29 | 839.23 | 819 | 56.73 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 32.17 | 146.6 | 638 | 14.07 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  | 7,120 | 67.9 | E |
| Raintree and Loop 101 | NB | NBL | 65.49 | 281.78 | 381 | 41.59 | 991 | 41.4 | D |
|  |  | NBT | 107.7 | 474.6 | 41 | 53.18 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 140.18 | 519.56 | 569 | 40.39 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 63.57 | 282.28 | 339 | 43.47 | 907 | 33.0 | c |
|  |  | SBT | 42.34 | 235.97 | 275 | 39.74 |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 35.04 | 235.57 | 293 | 14.68 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 103.16 | 219.11 | 428 | 60.01 | 1,310 | 51.8 | D |
|  |  | EBT | 104.84 | 404.56 | 327 | 56.56 |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBR | 352.83 | 428.03 | 555 | 42.62 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 573.67 | 1118.34 | 494 | 155.95 | 1,098 | 106.2 | F |
|  |  | WBT | 372.16 | 1030.08 | 385 | 74.07 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 252.55 | 1003.11 | 219 | 50.61 |  |  |  |
| Raintree and 87th St | NB |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  | 4,306 | 59.3 | E |
|  |  | NBL | 7.14 | 118.58 | 36 | 213.74 | 477 | 644.5 | F |
|  |  | NBT | 3.66 | 85.49 | 18 | 224.41 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 1637.63 | 1673.87 | 423 | 699 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 103.77 | 308.81 | 109 | 157.43 | 207 | 109.3 | F |
|  |  | SBT | 17.86 | 247.34 | ${ }^{36}$ | 74.3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 27.64 | 278.89 | 62 | 44.95 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 6.36 | 165.53 | 19 | 11.16 | 1,158 | 100.3 | F |
|  |  | EBT | 941.82 | 1058.34 | 1131 | 101.92 |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBR | 941.82 | 1058.34 | 8 | 80.37 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 0.27 | 25.35 | 25 | 18.58 | 1,239 | 2.4 | A |
|  |  | WBT | 6.3 | 84.46 | 1034 | 2.25 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 0.62 | 51.31 | 180 | Intersection |  | 145.8 | F |
| Shea and Loop 101 | NB | NBL | 96.83 | 417.2 | 683 | 43.78 | 1,308 | 25.0 | c |
|  |  | NBT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 4.94 | 104.25 | 625 | 4.52 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 111.34 | 401.63 | 769 | 44.4 | 1,075 | 34.9 | c |
|  |  | SBT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | EB | SBR | 0.68 | 89.57 | 306 | 11.13 |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBL | 57.91 | 224.13 | 386 | 47.19 | 1,767 | 26.1 | c |
|  |  | EBT | 51.59 | 271.48 | 1044 | 23.82 |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBR | 21.34 | 192.68 | 337 | 9.17 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 366.16 | 967.26 | 463 | 57.37 | 2,387 | 48.1 | D |
|  |  | WBT WBR | 311.78 1082.78 | 708.13 1579.16 | 939 985 | 28.76 62.27 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overall | Intersection | 6,537 | 35.4 | D |


| Intersection | Approach | Turning Movement | QLen | qlenmax | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Volume } \\ & \text { (Vehicles) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (vehlsec) } \end{gathered}$ | Approach Volume | Approach Delay (sec/veh | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Approach } \\ & \text { Los } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TURNING MOVEMENT | QLeN | QLenmax | VEHS(ALL) | $\underset{\text { LL) }}{\text { VEHDELAY(A }}$ |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\text { \& Loop } 101}{\text { Frank Loyd Wright }}$ | NB | NBL | 329.88 | ${ }^{680.05}$ | 778 | 115.09 | 1,601 | 85.9 | F |
|  |  | NBT | 196.26 | 657.29 | 727 | 60.23 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 194.74 | ${ }^{659.38}$ | 96 | 44.09 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 202.99 | 722.42 | 611 | 59.23 | 1,513 | 83.7 | F |
|  |  | SBT | 311.98 | 751.43 | 505 | 147.25 |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 319.24 | ${ }^{764.33}$ | 397 | 40.52 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 1050.39 | 1448.13 | 572 | 166.95 | 2,027 | 75.4 | E |
|  |  | EBT | 912.6 | 1449.13 | 987 | ${ }^{47.26}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBR | 608.29 | 1274.92 | 468 | 22.64 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 65.17 | 219.44 | 303 | 66.47 | 2,419 | 36.6 | D |
|  |  | WBT | 109.82 | 595.55 | 1037 | ${ }^{48.13}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 66.59 | 404.26 | 1079 | 17.22 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overa | Intersection | 7.560 | 66.9 | E |
| Raintree and Loop 101 | NB | NBL | 886.21 | 1234.62 | 627 | 150.81 | 991 | 103.9 | F |
|  |  | NBT | 751.17 | 1215.66 | 60 | 34.51 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | ${ }^{614.34}$ | 1256.51 | 304 | 20.82 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 738.27 | 1673.87 | 251 | 93.33 | 918 | 251.6 | F |
|  |  | SBT | 1314.64 | 1673.87 | 207 | 244 |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 1314.37 | 1673.85 | 460 | 341.41 |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{\text {EB }}$ | EBL | 50.95 | 20.67 | 256 | 53.64 | 713 | 38.6 | D |
|  |  | EBT | 40.42 | 146.63 | ${ }^{217}$ | 55.12 |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBR | 14.45 | 151.56 | 240 | 7.7 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 453.61 | 1161.76 | 713 | 87.6 | 1,527 | 61.9 | E |
|  |  | WBT | 252.61 | 1037.54 | 464 | 47.27 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 155.74 | 1048.99 | 350 | 28.78 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overa | Intersection | 4,149 | 109.9 | F |
| Raintree and 874 St | NB | NBL | 3.68 | 55.81 | 17 | 55.81 | 101 | 22.1 | c |
|  |  | NBT | 3.44 | 50.94 | 15 | 50 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 2.98 | 82.25 | 69 | 7.66 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 15.68 | 136.96 | 60 | 53.62 | 219 | 44.1 | D |
|  |  | SBT | 34.45 | 254.69 | 70 | 54.29 |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 52.46 | 286.25 | 89 | 29.63 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 8.31 | 176.92 | 21 | 11.92 | 700 | 5.0 | A |
|  |  | EBT | 8.31 | 176.92 | 585 | 5.34 |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBR | 8.31 | 176.92 | 94 | 1.7 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 9.45 | 212.55 | 310 | 7.79 | 1,723 | 3.4 | A |
|  |  | WBT | 8.43 | 258.22 | 1240 | 2.68 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 0.94 | 67.46 | 173 | 0.52 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overa | Intersection | 2,743 | 7.7 | A |
| Shea and Loop 101 | NB | NBL | 41.86 | 203.61 | 481 | 36.76 | 965 | 20.3 | c |
|  |  | NBT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 2.68 | 87.86 | 484 | 4.02 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 123.2 | 437.15 | 992 | 44.32 | 1,449 | 34.4 | c |
|  |  | SBT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 2.16 | 123.19 | 457 | 12.73 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 53.65 | 197.33 | 384 | 44.55 | 1,888 | 30.6 | c |
|  |  | EBR | ${ }_{56.43}^{68.85}$ | 335.7 313.42 | $\begin{array}{r}1082 \\ 422 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 29.89 19.59 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 1258.67 | 1634.88 | 855 | 125.49 | 2,570 | 67.8 | E |
|  |  | WBT | 619.15 | 1228.89 | 863 | 45.87 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 1210.87 | 1648.03 | 852 | 32.01 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overa | Intersection | 6,872 | 43.8 | D |


| Intersection | Approach | $\begin{gathered} \text { Turning } \\ \text { Movement } \end{gathered}$ | QLEN | QLENMAX | $\begin{gathered} \text { Volume } \\ \text { (Vehicles) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (veh/sec) } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Volume | Approach Delay (sec/veh | Approach LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TURNING MOVEMENT | QLen | QLENMAX | VEHS(ALL) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { VEHDELAY( } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\&}{\text { Frank Loopd Wright } 101}$ | NB | NBL | 524.74 | 819.92 | 703 | 178.05 | 1,381 | 114.9 | F |
|  |  | NBT | 310.78 | 723.79 | 469 | 54.35 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 309.66 | 725.88 | 209 | 38.27 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 240.51 | 828.74 | 685 | 48.92 | 1,711 | 79.5 | E |
|  |  | SBT | 431.87 | 920.02 | 683 | 128.73 |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 437.92 | 932.92 | 343 | 42.46 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 543.76 | 1175.39 | 431 | 78.36 | 2,585 | 81.7 | F |
|  |  | EBT | 1224.25 | 1503.1 | 1480 | 86.25 |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBR | 1244.89 | 1525.99 | 674 | 73.7 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 1035.55 | 1415.87 | 279 | 442.61 | 1,728 | 110.3 | F |
|  |  | WBT WBR | $\begin{aligned} & 875.64 \\ & 2270 \end{aligned}$ | 1416.37 | 812 637 | 67.21 19.77 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overall | Intersection | 7,405 | 94.0 | F |
| Raintree and Loop 101 | NB | NBL | 281.69 | 890.61 | 414 | 41.97 | 1,072 | 88.2 | F |
|  |  | NBT | 429.33 | 920.77 | 44 | 135.38 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 471.96 | 965.73 | 614 | 116.04 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 70.05 | 289.82 | 371 | 43.5 | 1,004 | 33.8 | c |
|  |  | SBT | 50.19 | 267.19 | 307 | 39.64 |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 44.5 | 266.8 | 326 | 17.27 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | ${ }^{98.93}$ | 224.64 | ${ }^{424}$ | 58.01 | 1,297 | 51.8 | D |
|  |  | EBT | 128.2 | 405.99 427.45 | 321 552 | 58.93 4283 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 1006.74 | 1290.38 | 505 | 183.73 | 1,126 | 130.7 | F |
|  |  | WBT | 964.74 | 1282.17 | 394 | 96.9 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 915.27 | 1342.71 | 227 | 71.52 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overall | Intersection | 4,499 | 76.2 | E |
| Raintree and 87th St | NB | NBL | 68.73 | 288.39 | 33 | 249.01 | 516 | 693.7 | F |
|  |  | NBT | 3.15 | 81.7 | 16 | 231.72 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 1647.78 | 1672.06 | 467 | 741 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 145.24 | 323.88 | 122 | 180.67 | 229 | 132.1 | F |
|  |  | SBT | 54.02 | 310.22 | 40 | 97.36 |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 67.67 | 341.78 | 67 | 64.25 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 980.28 | 1057.42 | 29 | 52.29 | 1,150 | 103.3 | F |
|  |  | EBT | 980.28 | 1057.42 | 1113 | 104.81 |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBR | 980.28 | 1057.42 | 8 | 81.59 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 0.54 | 36.7 | 28 | 21.21 | 1,329 | 2.7 | A |
|  |  | WBT | 7.96 | 98.47 | 1106 | 2.63 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 0.83 | 70.71 | Overall Intersection |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,224 | 158.4 | F |
| Shea and Loop 101 | NB | NBL | 74.79 | 346.86 | 760 | 43.06 | 1,454 | 24.7 | c |
|  |  | NBT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 4.59 | 114.71 | 694 | 4.62 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 101.69 | 369.19 | 884 | 44.41 | 1,243 | 34.7 | c |
|  |  | SBT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | EB | SBR | 0.39 66.37 | 64.18 250.05 | 359 428 | 10.91 49.29 | 1,939 | 26.2 |  |
|  |  | EBT | 54.79 | 338.73 | 1139 | 22.86 |  |  | c |
|  |  | EBR | 24.52 | 230.98 | 372 | 9.64 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 1119.03 | 1531.33 | 465 | 63.37 | 2,545 | 55.1 | E |
|  |  | WBT | 976.34 | 1529.82 | 1086 | 28.76 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | verall | 79.9 |  |  |  |


| Intersection | Approach | $\begin{gathered} \text { Turning } \\ \text { Movement } \end{gathered}$ | QLEN | QLENMAX | $\begin{gathered} \text { Volume } \\ \text { (Vehicles) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (vehsec) } \end{gathered}$ | Approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Approach } \\ & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (seclven) } \end{aligned}$ | Approach |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TURNING MOVEMENT | QLen | QLenmax | VEHS(ALL) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { VEHDELAYY } \\ \text { ALL) } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Frank Loyd Wright } \\ & \text { \& Loop } 101 \end{aligned}$ | NB | NBL | 126.95 | 437 | 778 | 51.05 | 1,598 | 49.3 | - |
|  |  | NBT | 92.08 | 371.95 | 725 | 52.51 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 10.12 | 94.89 | 95 | 10.18 |  |  |  |
|  | sB | SBL | 69.92 | 320.18 | 607 | 36.94 | 1.514 | 37.5 | D |
|  |  | SBT | 61.82 | 256.12 | 509 | 51.41 |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 43.36 | 287.95 | 398 | 20.74 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 299.33 | 916.31 | ${ }_{641}$ | 94.81 | 2,183 | 56.8 | E |
|  |  | EBT | 193.71 68.23 | 895.58 558.15 | 1050 492 | 52.68 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 77.55 | 222.42 | 334 | 81.56 | 2,433 | 64.8 | E |
|  |  | WBT | 505.3 | 1271.56 122508 | 1029 | 74 |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{0}^{\text {WBR }}$ | $0^{388.6}$ | $0^{1285.08}$ | 1070 | 50.79 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overa | Illitersection | 7,728 | 54.0 | D |
| Raintree and Loop 101 | NB | NBL | 896.61 | 1232.73 | 673 | 116.52 | 1,149 | 81.6 | F |
|  |  | NBU | $\begin{array}{r}896.61 \\ 6.06 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}1232.73 \\ 60.88 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 80 66 | $\begin{array}{r}116.02 \\ 28.04 \\ \hline 18\end{array}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NBT } \\ & \hline \text { NBR } \end{aligned}$ | 6.06 15.33 | 60.88 179.12 | 66 330 | $\begin{aligned} & 28.04 \\ & 12.61 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 74.37 | 291.82 | 294 | 52.66 | 1,308 | 45.7 | D |
|  |  | SBU | 74.37 5813 | ${ }^{291.82}$ | 127 | 57.18 |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBT SBR | 58.13 87.29 | 333.8 332.72 | 274 612 | 42.93 41.18 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 38.53 | 203.62 | 257 | 44.97 | 713 | 44.0 | - |
|  |  | EBT | 52.65 | 159 | 217 | 75.98 |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBR | 27.34 | 221.88 | 239 | 14.02 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 2259.57 | 1019.01 | 722 | 74.29 | 1,566 | 49.5 | D |
|  |  | WBT | 99.06 | 693.72 | 457 | 42.18 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 127.54 | 224.34 | 387 | 12.09 |  |  |  |
| Raintree and 87th St |  |  |  |  | Overa | Illntersection | 4.736 | 55.4 | D |
|  | nB | NBL | 3.26 | 54.12 | 18 | 41.92 | 102 | 21.7 | c |
|  |  | NBT NBR | 2.75 3.68 | 50.97 88.24 | 15 69 | 39.55 <br> 12.56 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 13.9 | 126.96 | 60 | 47.41 | 219 | 37.5 | D |
|  |  | SBT | 27.38 | 216.6 | 70 | 45.23 |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 43.47 | 248.16 | 89 | 24.77 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 70.54 70.54 | 317.1 <br> 317.1 | 21 586 | 21.96 34.88 | 701 | 30.8 | c |
|  |  | EBR | 70.54 | 317.1 | 94 | 7.61 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 73.24 | 436.21 | 335 | 11.26 | 1,862 | 9.5 | A |
|  |  | WBT | 199.26 | 499.9 | 1335 | 10.15 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 3.12 | 128.31 | 192 | 1.82 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overa | 1 Intersection | 2.884 | 17.2 | B |
| Shea and Loop 101 | NB | NBL | 44.77 | 211.16 | 432 | 31.64 | ${ }^{869}$ | 17.8 | B |
|  |  | NBR | 3.5 | 84.19 | 437 | 4.19 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 129.22 | 489.9 | 939 | 40.5 | 1,366 | 31.9 | c |
|  |  | SBT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 4.6 | 176.82 | 427 | 12.86 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 68.72 | 230.46 | 384 | 57.56 | 1,887 | 39.5 | D |
|  |  | EBT | 96.69 | 423 3206 | 1082 | 40.77 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 339.4 | 1035.84 | 848 | 63.7 | 2,562 | 37.7 | D |
|  |  | WBT | 52.87 | 321.62 | 865 | 26.63 |  |  |  |
| Overall intersccion |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6,684 | 34.4 | c |


| Intersection | Approach | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Turning } \\ \text { Movement } \end{array}$ | QLEN | QLENMAX | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Volume } \\ & \text { (Vehicles) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (veh/sec) } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Volume | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Approach } \\ & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (sec/veh) } \end{aligned}$ | Approach |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | turning MOVEMENT | QLeN | QLENMAX | VEHS(ALL) | vehdelayl ALL) |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Frank Lloyd Wright } \\ & \text { \& Loop } 101 \end{aligned}$ | NB | NBL | 240.91 | 594.16 | 752 | 93.58 | 1,444 | 68.7 | E |
|  |  | NBT | 58.38 | ${ }^{321.36}$ | 478 | 45.89 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 47.16 | ${ }^{261.02}$ | ${ }^{214}$ | 30.07 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 162.85 | ${ }^{667.31}$ | 692 | 73.04 | 1,751 | 60.1 | E |
|  |  | SBT | 156.94 | 624.44 | 710 | 67.39 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | SBR | 30.59 | 278.32 5876 | 349 | 19.64 |  |  | D |
|  |  | EBT | 163.17 | 707.96 | 1586 | 37.58 | 2,776 | 38.9 |  |
|  |  | EBR | 143.78 | 806.11 | 727 | 22.53 |  |  |  |
|  | ws | WBL | 88.46 | 291.32 | 379 | 74.65 | 2,042 | 35.7 | D |
|  |  | WBT | 74.41 | 372.84 15817 | 916 | 40.01 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 29.32 | 168.17 | 747 | 10.73 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overall | Intersection | 8,013 | 48.1 | D |
| Raintree and Loop101 | NB | NBL | 76.03 | 288.12 | 420 | 49.95 | 1,109 | 35.8 | D |
|  |  | NBU | 76.03 | 282.12 | 15 | 46.3 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBT | 7.43 | 52.73 | 45 | 40.91 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 118.83 | 474.02 | ${ }^{629}$ | 25.73 |  |  |  |
|  | sB | SBL | 73.8 | 292.21 | ${ }^{371}$ | 45.23 | 1,138 | 36.6 | D |
|  |  | SBT | 39.74 | 1884.23 | 308 | 40.72 |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 13.89 | 130.63 | 320 | 18.32 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 105.88 | 224.17 | 535 | 53.14 | 1,683 | 37.6 | D |
|  |  | EBT | 89.45 | 392.78 | 415 | 46.4 |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBR | 202.74 | 425.98 | 733 | 21.26 |  |  |  |
|  | ws | WBL | 92.32 | 518.73 | 564 | 51.02 | 1,257 | 42.6 | D |
|  |  | WBT | 78.93 | 379.49 | 429 | 51.45 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 80.42 | 858.06 | 264 | 10.06 |  |  |  |
| Raintree and 874h St |  |  |  |  | Overall | Intersection | 5,187 | 38.2 | D |
|  | NB | NBL | 155.47 | 359.96 | 135 | 83.31 | 604 | 131.4 | F |
|  |  | NBT | 17.84 | 128.19 | 68 | 65.17 |  |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 1023.41 | 1533.47 | 401 | 158.84 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 74.81 | ${ }^{303.51}$ | 126 | 93.25 | ${ }^{238}$ | 63.1 | E |
|  |  | SBT SBR | 30.39 3 | 269.06 | 42 | 46.72 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | ${ }^{\text {935.8.7 }}$ | 30062 1056.7 | ${ }^{70}$ | 18.7 76.83 |  | 65.4 | E |
|  |  | EBT | 955.7 | 1056.7 | 1122 | 65.18 | 1,158 |  |  |
|  |  | EBR | 955.7 | 1056.7 | 8 | 51.74 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 0.81 | 44.8 | 29 | 24.23 | 1,370 | 10.9 | B |
|  |  | WBT | 61.02 | ${ }^{330.37}$ | 1140 | 12.02 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 4.56 | 150.31 | 201 | 2.63 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overall | intersection | 3,370 | 54.9 | D |
| Shea and Loop 101 | NB | NBL | 66.29 | 310.46 | 656 | 31.82 | 1,256 | 19.1 | B |
|  |  | NBT | 7.07 | 136.3 | 600 | 5.18 |  |  |  |
|  | sB | SBL | 93.35 | 370.75 | 825 | 35.03 | 1,156 | 27.8 | c |
|  |  | SBT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | ${ }^{0.37}$ | 58.61 275 | ${ }^{331}$ | 9.84 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 63 | 257.5 | 428 | 52.45 | 1,941 | 34.8 | c |
|  |  | EBT | 89.72 | ${ }^{424.06}$ | 1140 | 35.99 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 59.04 | 308.15 | 410 | 45.99 | 2,366 | 46.8 | D |
|  |  | WBT | 59.13 | 321 | 816 | 33.46 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 1611.14 | 1673.89 | 1140 | 56.72 |  |  |  |

2040 AM Improved/Build TDI Alternative T/Intersection Peak Hour Results

| Intersection | Approach | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Turning } \\ \text { Movement } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | QLen | QLenMAX | $\begin{gathered} \text { Volume } \\ \text { (Vehicles) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (vehsec) } \end{gathered}$ | Approach | Approach Delay (sec/veh | Approach |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TURNING MOVEMENT | QLen | QLENMAX | VEHS(ALL) | vehdelay(al <br> L) |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\text { F Loop } 101}{\text { Frank Lloyd Wright }}$ | NB | NBL | 76.34 | 348.52 | 779 | 64.33 |  |  | c |
|  |  | NBT | 50.92 | 289.9 | 729 | 29.96 | 1,603 | 45.3 |  |
|  |  | NBR | 13.49 | 73.72 | 95 | 7.34 |  |  |  |
|  | SE | ${ }_{\text {SBL }}^{\text {SBT }}$ | 66.09 | 272.64 | 606 511 | 62.96 |  |  | c |
|  |  | SBR | 82.88 42.91 | 267.42 236.52 | 511 400 | 42.93 8.59 | 1,517 | 41.9 |  |
|  | ${ }^{\text {EB }}$ | EBL | 105.48 | 444.68 | 646 | 116.24 |  |  | D |
|  |  | EBT | 105.48 | 444.68 | 1048 | 38.74 | 2,187 | 56.2 |  |
|  |  | EBR | 55.77 | 304.64 | 493 | 14.59 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 110.64 | 589.44 | 337 | 116.42 |  |  | c |
|  |  | WBT WBR | 110.64 71.2 | 589.44 777.18 | 1037 1127 | 45.41 19.16 | 2,501 | 43.1 |  |
|  |  | 0 | 0 | 7718 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Ove | all Intersection | 7,808 | 47.0 | c |
| Raintree \& Loop 101 | NB | NBL | 844.92 | 1222.33 | 714 | 129.72 |  |  | E |
|  |  | NBT | 8.28 | 73.04 | 70 | 37.23 | 1,135 | 89.8 |  |
|  |  | NBR | ${ }^{29.28}$ | 242.38 | ${ }^{351}$ | 18.92 |  |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 50.21 | 282.84 | 294 | 68.77 |  |  | c |
|  |  | SBT | 52.61 | 282.37 | 273 | 30.03 | 1,188 | 39.8 |  |
|  |  | SBR | 62.99 | 292.52 | 621 | 30.37 |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{\text {EB }}$ | EBL | 42.08 | 210.64 | 255 | 81.12 |  |  | c |
|  |  | EBT | 42.08 | 210.64 | ${ }^{216}$ | 39.97 | 725 | 46.2 |  |
|  |  | EBR | 21.1 | 197 | 254 | 16.57 |  |  |  |
|  | WB | WBL | 116.65 | 420.47 | 722 | 53.33 |  |  | c |
|  |  | WBT | 116.65 | 420.47 | 464 | ${ }^{63.66}$ | 1,576 | 47.2 |  |
|  |  | WBR | 25.22 | 279.7 | 390 | 16.22 |  |  |  |
| Raintree and 874, St | NB | NBL | 3.21 | 54.11 | ${ }_{18}$ | (1) | 4,624 | 55.6 | D |
|  |  | NBT | 2.76 | 50.96 | 15 | 39.88 | 102 | 43.0 | D |
|  |  | NBR | 16.06 | 121.6 | 69 | 44.15 |  |  |  |
|  | sB | SBL | 13.93 | 126.96 | 60 | 47.27 |  |  | D |
|  |  | SBT | 27.04 | 216.6 | 70 | 44.56 | 219 | 37.2 |  |
|  | EB | SER | 42.94 67.29 | ${ }_{2}^{248.16}$ | ${ }_{29}^{89}$ | 24.55 17.33 |  |  |  |
|  |  | EBT | 67.29 | 296.43 | 585 | 34.95 | 700 | 30.6 | c |
|  |  | EBR | 67.29 | 296.43 | 94 | 6.44 |  |  |  |
|  | ws | WBL | 100.32 | 752.04 | 361 | 11.28 |  |  | B |
|  |  | WBT | 175.53 | 756.69 | 1434 | 11.1 | 1,993 | 10.3 |  |
|  |  | WBR |  |  | Overall Intersection |  | 3,014 | 18.1 | в |

2040 PM Improved/Build TDI Alternative TI/Intersection Peak Hour Results

| Intersection | Approach | $\begin{gathered} \text { Turning } \\ \text { Movement } \end{gathered}$ | QLEN | QLENMAX | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Volume } \\ & \text { Vehicles) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (vehisec) } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Volume | $\begin{array}{c\|} \text { Approach } \\ \text { Delay (sec/veh) } \end{array}$ | Approach LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TURNING MOVEMENT | QLen | QLENMAX | VEHS(ALL) | VEHDELAYY |  |  |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright$\&$ Loop 101 | NB | NBL | 86.38 | 358.17 | 761 | 64.17 |  | 46.6 | c |
|  |  | NBT | 37.64 | 173.32 | 478 | 31.81 | 1,452 |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 21.6 | 183.51 | 213 | 17.05 |  |  |  |
|  | ss | SBL | 79.46 | 381.44 | 688 | 52.04 |  | 42.0 | c |
|  |  | SBT | 77.24 | 359.56 | 709 | 38.56 | 1,745 |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 85.48 | 377.82 | ${ }^{348}$ | 9.26 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | EBL | 750.97 750.97 | 1374.79 1374.79 | 454 1566 | 78.93 68.28 | 2,741 | 65.9 | D |
|  |  | EBR | ${ }_{987.99}$ | 1438.84 | 721 | 52.56 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 76.09 | 308.46 | 380 | 69.72 | 2,045 | 34.1 | c |
|  |  | WBT | 76.09 | 308.46 | 919 | 38.29 |  |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 26.33 | 138.49 | 746 | 10.79 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 0 | 0 | Overal | Intersection | 7,983 | 49.0 | c |
| Raintree \& Loop 101 | NB | NBL | 60.21 | 272.65 | 420 | 62.94 |  | 40.7 | c |
|  |  | NBT | 5.38 | 48.99 | 45 | 29.54 | 1,094 |  |  |
|  |  | NBR | 111.99 | 430.4 | 629 | 26.65 |  |  |  |
|  | sB | SBL | 68.37 | 350.44 | 368 | 60.98 |  | 38.2 | c |
|  |  | SBT | 63.84 | 343.59 | 314 | 34.36 | 1,002 |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 14.99 | 140.23 | 320 | 15.65 |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | EBL | 134.05 | 408.91 | 522 | 65.99 40.59 |  | 40.6 | c |
|  |  | EBR | 134.05 210.4 | ${ }_{4}^{408.91}$ | ${ }^{404}$ | 40.59 21.79 | 1,633 |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 106.04 | 404.39 | 557 | 73.95 |  | 56.9 | D |
|  |  | WBT | 106.04 | 404.39 | 430 | 61.04 | 1,253 |  |  |
|  |  | WBR | 33.2 | 796.69 | 266 | 14.68 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overal | Intersection | 4,982 | 44.2 | c |
| Raintree and 874, St | NB | NBL | ${ }^{48.43}$ | 212.47 | 142 | ${ }^{61.52}$ |  | 42.4 | D |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NBT } \\ & \text { NBR } \end{aligned}$ | 15.36 96.76 | 126.75 572.85 | 73 462 | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 1.17 \\ 3666 \end{array} . \end{aligned}$ | 677 |  |  |
|  | SB | SBL | 217.46 | 331.83 | 104 | 117.07 |  | 71.5 | E |
|  |  | SBT | 82.36 | ${ }^{320.82}$ | 42 | 46.72 | 216 |  |  |
|  |  | SBR | 97.28 | 352.38 105783 | 70 | 18.7 |  |  |  |
|  | EB | ${ }_{\text {EBL }}^{\text {EBL }}$ | ${ }_{969.55}^{9695}$ | 1057.83 105783 | 27 1047 | 50.93 103.61 | 1,081 | 102.1 | F |
|  |  | EBR | 969.55 | 1057.83 | 7 | 75.01 |  |  |  |
|  | wB | WBL | 0.94 | 50.84 | 28 | 23.87 |  | 8.4 | A |
|  |  | WBT | 53.37 3.21 | 666.21 137.34 | 1139 | ${ }^{9.11}$ | 1,367 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overallintersection |  | 3,341 | 49.7 | D |

RODEL Analysis Results

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Flare <br> Length <br> $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> $\mathbf{R}$ | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 100.00 | 120.00 | 20.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 102.00 | 125.00 | 27.00 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 180 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 48.00 | 118.00 | 33.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 26.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 106.00 | 135.00 | 30.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 39.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { +or- } \end{aligned}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{\mathrm{v}}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 14.00 | 2091 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 14.00 | 2091 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 26.00 | 3883 | 0 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 |

2040 AM Peak

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | Turning Flows |  |  |  |  | Flow Modifiers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Trucks } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Flow Factor | Peak Hour Factor |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 272 | 515 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1011 | 82 | 0 | 405 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 1232 | 0 | 355 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

2040 AM Peak

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 688 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 846 |  | 0 |  | 2388 | 2470 |  | 0.3426 |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 1127 | 418 | 846 | 554 | 0 | 1811 | 1145 | 0.6220 | 0.3686 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 1369 | 394 | 1418 | 0 | 971 | 1414 | 1326 | 0.9682 | 0.2975 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | $A$ |  | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 3.07 |  | 3.07 | 1.93 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 4.85 | 4.80 | 4.84 | 4.01 | 1.48 | A | A | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 19.32 | 0.00 | 14.99 | 20.88 | 0.00 | C | A | B |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Flare <br> Length <br> $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> $\mathbf{R}$ | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 100.00 | 120.00 | 20.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 102.00 | 125.00 | 27.00 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 180 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 48.00 | 118.00 | 33.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 26.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 106.00 | 135.00 | 30.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 39.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or | xWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} v \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{v} \\ \text { (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 14.00 | 2091 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 14.00 | 2091 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 26.00 | 3883 | 0 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 |

2040 AM Peak

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | Turning Flows |  |  |  |  | Flow Modifiers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Trucks } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Flow Factor | Peak Hour Factor |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 272 | 515 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1011 | 82 | 0 | 405 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 1232 | 0 | 355 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

2040 AM Peak

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 688 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 846 |  | 0 |  | 2205 | 2279 |  | 0.3714 |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 1127 | 418 | 846 | 553 | 0 | 1620 | 946 | 0.6955 | 0.4478 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 1369 | 394 | 1418 | 0 | 971 | 1165 | 780 | 1.1754 | 0.5059 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 3.46 |  | 3.46 | 2.18 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 6.45 | 6.55 | 6.48 | 5.31 | 2.02 | A | A | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 84.44 | 0.00 | 65.55 | 102.86 | 0.00 | F | A | F |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Flare <br> Length <br> $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> $\mathbf{R}$ | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 100.00 | 120.00 | 20.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 102.00 | 125.00 | 27.00 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 180 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 48.00 | 118.00 | 33.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 26.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 106.00 | 135.00 | 30.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 39.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | XWalk <br> Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{v} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \quad v \\ & \text { (ft) } \end{aligned}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 14.00 | 2091 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 14.00 | 2091 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 26.00 | 3883 | 0 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB

2040 PM Peak
50\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

$\left.$| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\%$ | Flow Modifiers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Peak Hour |
| :---: |
| Factor | \right\rvert\,

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040

2040 PM Peak
50\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: Raintree-L101 NB

## 2040 PM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exit } \\ & \text { Flow } \end{aligned}$ | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 937 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 1828 |  | 0 |  | 1715 | 2470 |  | 0.7399 |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 585 | 669 | 1821 | 1033 | 0 | 1045 | 891 | 0.5598 | 0.7713 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 1184 | 278 | 1371 | 0 | 1698 | 1448 | 1326 | 0.8180 | 0.2095 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 7.34 |  | 7.34 | 9.96 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 6.80 | 13.61 | 10.43 | 3.18 | 6.93 | A | B | B |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 8.96 | 0.00 | 7.26 | 8.43 | 0.00 | A | A | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Flare <br> Length <br> $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> $\mathbf{R}$ | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 100.00 | 120.00 | 20.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 102.00 | 125.00 | 27.00 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 180 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 48.00 | 118.00 | 33.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 26.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 106.00 | 135.00 | 30.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 39.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | XWalk <br> Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{V}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{V}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 14.00 | 2091 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 14.00 | 2091 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 26.00 | 3883 | 0 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 |

2040 PM Peak

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

$\left.$| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\%$ | Flow Modifiers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Peak Hour |
| :---: |
| Factor | \right\rvert\,

2040 PM Peak

## 2040 PM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | rival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exit } \\ & \text { Flow } \end{aligned}$ | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 937 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 1828 |  | 0 |  | 1697 | 2279 |  | 0.8021 |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 585 | 669 | 1817 | 1031 | 0 | 763 | 558 | 0.7672 | 1.5511 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 1184 | 278 | 1365 | 0 | 1586 | 1261 | 1127 | 0.9392 | 0.2465 |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 9.61 |  | 9.61 | 12.96 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 14.39 | 202.24 | 114.61 | 7.02 | 89.64 | B | F | F |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 17.15 | 0.00 | 13.89 | 16.74 | 0.00 | C | A | B |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> n | Flare <br> Length <br> L' $^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> R | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 55.00 | 125.00 | 48.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 30.00 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 180 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 20.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 0.00 | 155.00 | 25.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} v \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} v \\ \text { (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 294 | 274 | 0 | 691 | 4.0 | 1.00 | Flow <br> Factor |
| Peak Hour <br> Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 240 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 820 | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 AM Peak

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 592 | 720 | 2438 | 2438 | 0 | 568 | 255 | 1.0411 | 9.2781 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 530 | 258 | 1430 | 0 | 1802 | 1410 | 1492 | 0.3759 | 0.1730 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1302 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2492 |  | 0 |  | 808 | 2498 |  | 0.9975 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 67.63 | 2423.31 | 1360.54 | 35.35 | 569.17 | F | F | F |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 3.62 | 0.00 | 2.44 | 1.47 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 22.38 |  | 22.38 | 41.67 |  | C |  | C |

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> n | Flare <br> Length <br> L' $^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> R | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 55.00 | 125.00 | 48.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 30.00 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 180 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 20.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 0.00 | 155.00 | 25.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { +or- } \end{aligned}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{\mathrm{v}}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Trucks } \\ \%\end{array}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Flow Modifiers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Peak Hour <br>

Factor\end{array}\right]\)

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 592 | 720 | 2307 | 2307 | 0 | 463 | 99 | 1.2777 | 34.2784 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 530 | 258 | 1306 | 0 | 1563 | 1308 | 1292 | 0.4053 | 0.1997 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1295 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2492 |  | 0 |  | 769 | 2307 |  | 1.0803 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 180.81 | 6513.98 | 3656.76 | 86.37 | 881.03 | F | F | F |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 4.15 | 0.00 | 2.79 | 1.65 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 45.26 |  | 45.26 | 93.76 |  | E |  | E |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB
Alternative A

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> n | Flare <br> Length <br> L' $^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> R | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 55.00 | 125.00 | 48.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 30.00 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 180 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 20.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 0.00 | 155.00 | 25.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} v \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity | $\begin{gathered} \quad v \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{gathered} \text { Calib } \\ \text { Capacity } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 PM Peak

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

$\left.$| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\%$ | Flow Modifiers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Peak Hour |
| :---: |
| Factor | \right\rvert\,

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 PM Peak
$50 \%$ Confidence Level
Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## 2040 PM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 727 | 410 | 1744 | 1744 | 0 | 1111 | 562 | 0.6542 | 0.7550 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 1401 | 1028 | 1364 | 0 | 1507 | 1458 | 1492 | 0.9611 | 0.6889 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1712 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1748 |  | 0 |  | 1766 | 2498 |  | 0.6995 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 13.14 | 18.85 | 15.20 | 7.29 | 6.11 | B | C | C |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 17.27 | 0.00 | 9.96 | 19.91 | 0.00 | C | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 5.99 |  | 5.99 | 7.71 |  | A |  | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB
Alternative A

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> n | Flare <br> Length <br> L' $^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> R | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 55.00 | 125.00 | 48.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 30.00 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 180 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 20.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 0.00 | 155.00 | 25.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { +or- } \end{aligned}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{\mathrm{v}}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 PM Peak
Alternative A

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Turning Flows |  | Flow Modifiers |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0 | 371 | 312 | 0 | 385 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Flow <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |  |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 1219 | 0 | 894 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.870 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 579 | 994 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

## 2040 PM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 727 | 410 | 1742 | 1742 | 0 | 863 | 256 | 0.8416 | 2.6900 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 1401 | 1028 | 1354 | 0 | 1356 | 1188 | 1095 | 1.1790 | 0.9384 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1713 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1748 |  | 0 |  | 1575 | 2307 |  | 0.7576 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 26.53 | 565.34 | 220.77 | 14.96 | 124.25 | D | F | F |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 73.29 | 0.00 | 42.28 | 99.05 | 0.00 | F | A | E |  |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 7.61 |  | 7.61 | 9.73 |  | A |  | A |  |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 294 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | Flow <br> Factor |
| Peak Hour <br> Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 240 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 820 | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { +or- } \end{aligned}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{\mathrm{v}}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

## Operational Results

## 2040 AM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 568 |  | 2239 |  | 0 | 774 |  | 0.7336 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 493 | 240 | 1384 | 0 | 1420 | 1443 | 1492 | 0.3416 | 0.1609 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1331 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2243 |  | 0 |  | 786 | 2498 |  | 0.8978 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 31.60 |  | 31.60 | 22.02 |  | D |  | D |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 3.54 | 0.00 | 2.38 | 1.50 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 16.56 |  | 16.56 | 41.67 |  | C | C |  |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 AM Peak

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Flow Modifiers <br> Flow <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 294 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 240 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 820 | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry
Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { +or- } \end{aligned}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{\mathrm{v}}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

2040 AM Peak

## Operational Results

## 2040 AM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |
| Eypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |$|$

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 96.72 |  | 96.72 | 51.78 |  | F |  | F |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 4.28 | 0.00 | 2.88 | 1.76 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 34.08 |  | 34.08 | 93.76 |  | D |  |  |

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 592 |  | 2307 |  | 0 | 536 |  | 1.1028 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 530 | 258 | 1373 | 0 | 1464 | 1260 | 1292 | 0.4207 | 0.1997 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1324 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2492 |  | 0 |  | 804 | 2307 |  | 1.0803 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br>  |  | Average Delay (sec) |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 98.35 |  | 98.35 | 46.46 |  | F |  | F |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 4.36 | 0.00 | 2.93 | 1.76 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 45.26 |  | 45.26 | 93.76 |  | E |  | E |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 PM Peak

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Flare <br> Length <br> $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> $\mathbf{R}$ | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 55.00 | 125.00 | 48.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 30.00 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 180 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 20.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 0.00 | 155.00 | 25.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | XWalk <br> Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{v} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \quad v \\ & \text { (ft) } \end{aligned}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

## Operational Results

## 2040 PM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 683 |  | 1572 |  | 0 | 1227 |  | 0.5566 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 1219 | 894 | 1261 | 0 | 994 | 1532 | 1492 | 0.7956 | 0.5994 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1784 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1573 |  | 0 |  | 1588 | 2498 |  | 0.6296 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 11.17 |  | 11.17 | 7.29 |  | B |  | B |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 11.54 | 0.00 | 6.66 | 19.91 | 0.00 | B | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 5.51 |  | 5.51 | 7.71 |  | A |  | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 PM Peak

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Flare <br> Length <br> $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> $\mathbf{R}$ | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 55.00 | 125.00 | 48.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 30.00 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 180 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 20.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 0.00 | 155.00 | 25.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | XWalk <br> Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{v} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \quad v \\ & \text { (ft) } \end{aligned}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

## Operational Results

## 2040 PM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 683 |  | 1572 |  | 0 | 1036 |  | 0.6593 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 1219 | 894 | 1261 | 0 | 993 | 1254 | 1095 | 0.9722 | 0.8164 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1784 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1573 |  | 0 |  | 1569 | 2307 |  | 0.6818 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 17.07 |  | 17.07 | 12.09 |  | C |  | C |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 57.82 | 0.00 | 33.36 | 100.30 | 0.00 | F | A | D |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 6.85 |  | 6.85 | 9.73 |  | A |  | A |

## Operational Data

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | Vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 691 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 240 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 13.5 | 1 | 80 | 160 | 170.0007 <br> 779 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 150.0006 <br> 864 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> + or- | Slope <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

## Operational Results

## 2040 AM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 568 | 691 | 1423 | 1423 | 0 | 1234 | 593 | 0.4603 | 1.1659 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 493 | 240 | 568 | 0 | 2013 | 2034 | 1492 | 0.2424 | 0.1609 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 514 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1423 |  | 0 |  | 787 | 2498 |  | 0.5696 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 9.64 | 365.16 | 204.77 | 4.78 | 215.90 | A | F | F |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 2.20 | 0.00 | 1.48 | 0.88 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 3.04 |  | 3.04 | 3.89 |  | A |  | A |

2040 AM Peak

## Operational Data

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 691 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 240 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 13.5 | 1 | 80 | 160 | 170.0007 <br> 834 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 150.0006 <br> 912 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> + or- | Slope <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

## Operational Results

## 2040 AM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exit } \\ & \text { Flow } \end{aligned}$ | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 568 | 691 | 1423 | 1423 | 0 | 1043 | 394 | 0.5447 | 1.7553 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 493 | 240 | 568 | 0 | 1816 | 1843 | 1292 | 0.2675 | 0.1857 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 514 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1423 |  | 0 |  | 787 | 2307 |  | 0.6168 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 13.37 | 1647.69 | 910.37 | 6.92 | 668.69 | B | F | F |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 2.51 | 0.00 | 1.69 | 1.01 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 3.67 |  | 3.67 | 4.77 |  | A |  | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 PM Peak
50\% Confidence Level
Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Operational Data

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | Vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 385 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 894 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 13.5 | 1 | 80 | 160 | 170.0007 <br> 997 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 150.0007 <br> 056 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- - | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk | Intercept <br> (or- | Calibration <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

## Operational Results

## 2040 PM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 683 | 385 | 994 | 994 | 0 | 1620 | 828 | 0.4215 | 0.4652 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 1219 | 894 | 683 | 0 | 1379 | 1951 | 1492 | 0.6249 | 0.5994 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1206 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 994 |  | 0 |  | 1590 | 2498 |  | 0.3978 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 6.54 | 8.05 | 7.08 | 3.78 | 2.71 | A | A | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 4.51 | 0.00 | 2.60 | 5.70 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2.22 |  | 2.22 | 1.90 |  | A |  | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Operational Data

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | Vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 385 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 894 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry | Lb | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 13.5 | 1 | 80 | 160 | 170.0008 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 150.0007 <br> 104 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |  |

## Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or - | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> + or- | Slope <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

## Operational Results

## 2040 PM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 683 | 385 | 994 | 994 | 0 | 1429 | 629 | 0.4780 | 0.6126 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 1219 | 894 | 683 | 0 | 1378 | 1730 | 1234 | 0.7047 | 0.7247 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1206 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 994 |  | 0 |  | 1589 | 2307 |  | 0.4309 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 8.15 | 14.62 | 10.49 | 4.80 | 5.32 | A | B | B |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 6.44 | 0.00 | 3.72 | 8.74 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2.54 |  | 2.54 | 2.19 |  | A |  | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

2040 AM Peak

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | $\mathbf{v}$ | nv | vb | nvb | Vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 405 | 28 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 28 | 2 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 355 | 26 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 26 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 135.0003 <br> 974 | 30 | 4 | Raintree WB | 2 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 150 | 142.0004 <br> 18 | 30 | 1 | L101NB SB | 1 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> +or- - | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> $\boldsymbol{+ o r}-$ | Slope <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

2040 AM Peak

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | Turning Flows |  |  |  |  | Flow Modifiers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | $\begin{gathered} \text { Trucks } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Flow Factor | Peak Hour Factor |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 399 | 515 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1011 | 82 | 0 | 405 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 1232 | 0 | 355 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exit } \\ & \text { Flow } \end{aligned}$ | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 812 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 983 |  | 0 |  | 2320 | 2470 |  | 0.3979 |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 1127 | 418 | 982 | 553 | 0 | 1714 | 1145 | 0.6574 | 0.3685 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 1369 | 394 | 1554 | 0 | 971 | 1280 | 1109 | 1.0692 | 0.3557 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | $A$ |  | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 3.85 |  | 3.85 | 2.80 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 5.54 | 4.80 | 5.34 | 4.58 | 1.48 | A | A | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 41.22 | 0.00 | 32.00 | 48.41 | 0.00 | E | A | D |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | Vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 405 | 28 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 28 | 2 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 355 | 26 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 26 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 135.0004 <br> 018 | 30 | 4 | Raintree WB | 2 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 150 | 142.0004 <br> 226 | 30 | 1 | L101NB SB | 1 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> + or- | Slope <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

2040 AM Peak

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | Turning Flows |  |  |  |  | Flow Modifiers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | $\begin{gathered} \text { Trucks } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Flow Factor | Peak Hour Factor |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 399 | 515 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1011 | 82 | 0 | 405 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 1232 | 0 | 355 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |$|$

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 4.38 |  | 4.38 | 3.18 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 7.72 | 6.55 | 7.40 | 6.36 | 2.02 | A | A | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 148.38 | 0.00 | 115.19 | 173.39 | 0.00 | F | A | F |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | Vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 629 | 28 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 28 | 2 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 250 | 26 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 26 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 135.0004 | 30 | 4 | Raintree WB | 2 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 150 | 142.0004 | 30 | 1 | L101NB SB | 1 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> + or- | Slope <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB

2040 PM Peak
0\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks |  |  | Flow Modifiers <br> Flow <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 827 | 902 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 507 | 43 | 0 | 629 | 4.0 | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 1066 | 0 | 250 | 4.0 | 1.00 |  |  |  |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

2040 PM Peak
50\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040

## 2040 PM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | ExitFlow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1069 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 1987 |  | 0 |  | 1708 | 2470 |  | 0.8046 |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 585 | 669 | 1976 | 1031 | 0 | 937 | 892 | 0.6242 | 0.7707 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 1184 | 278 | 1527 | 0 | 1696 | 1335 | 1326 | 0.8872 | 0.2095 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 9.73 |  | 9.73 | 14.13 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 8.47 | 13.57 | 11.19 | 4.04 | 6.92 | A | B | B |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 12.61 | 0.00 | 10.22 | 12.14 | 0.00 | B | A | B |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

2040 PM Peak

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 629 | 28 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 28 | 2 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 250 | 26 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 26 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 135.0004 <br> 234 | 30 | 4 | Raintree WB | 2 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 150 | 142.0004 <br> 453 | 30 | 1 | L101NB SB | 1 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> + or- | Slope <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB

2040 PM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks |  |  | Flow Modifiers <br> Flow <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 827 | 902 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 507 | 43 | 0 | 629 | 4.0 | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 1066 | 0 | 250 | 4.0 | 1.00 |  |  |  |

2040 PM Peak

## 2040 PM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1069 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 1987 |  | 0 |  | 1651 | 2279 |  | 0.8722 |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 585 | 669 | 1968 | 1027 | 0 | 661 | 559 | 0.8846 | 1.5460 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 1184 | 278 | 1512 | 0 | 1583 | 1141 | 1028 | 1.0377 | 0.2703 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 13.54 |  | 13.54 | 19.57 |  | B |  | B |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 23.17 | 200.78 | 117.93 | 12.01 | 89.05 | C | F | F |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 32.93 | 0.00 | 26.68 | 34.84 | 0.00 | D | A | D |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Flare <br> Length <br> $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> $\mathbf{R}$ | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 55.00 | 125.00 | 48.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 30.00 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 180 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 20.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 0.00 | 155.00 | 25.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { +or- } \end{aligned}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{\mathrm{v}}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | Turning Flows |  |  |  |  | Flow Modifiers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks \% | Flow Factor | Peak Hour Factor |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 421 | 274 | 0 | 691 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 240 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 820 | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 AM Peak

## Global Results

## Performance and Accidents

## 2040 AM Peak Global Performance

| Parameter | Units | Entries | Bypasses | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arrive Flows | veh/hr | 3431 | 931 | 4362 |
| Capacity | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 4504 | 2025 | 6529 |
| Average Delay | $\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 86.75 | 392.93 | 152.10 |
| L.O.S. (Signal) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | F | F | F |
| L.O.S. (Unsig) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | F | F | F |
| Total Delay | veh.hrs | 82.67 | 101.62 | 184.29 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> n | Flare <br> Length <br> L' $^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> R | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 55.00 | 125.00 | 48.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 30.00 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 180 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 20.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 0.00 | 155.00 | 25.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { +or- } \end{aligned}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{\mathrm{v}}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Trucks } \\ \%\end{array}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Flow Modifiers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Peak Hour <br>

Factor\end{array}\right]\)

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 AM Peak

## Global Results

## Performance and Accidents

2040 AM Peak Global Performance

| Parameter | Units | Entries | Bypasses | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arrive Flows | veh/hr | 3431 | 931 | 4362 |
| Capacity | veh/hr | 4077 | 1641 | 5718 |
| Average Delay | sec/veh | 200.80 | 1199.36 | 413.92 |
| L.O.S. (Signal) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | F | F | F |
| L.O.S. (Unsig) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | F | F | F |
| Total Delay | veh.hrs | 191.37 | 310.17 | 501.54 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 818.72 | 1902.23 | 1358.91 | 417.43 | 462.36 | F | F | F |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 3.69 | 0.00 | 2.48 | 1.46 | 0.00 | A | A | A |  |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 45.26 |  | 45.26 | 93.76 |  | E |  | E |  |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Flare <br> Length <br> $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> $\mathbf{R}$ | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 55.00 | 125.00 | 48.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 30.00 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 180 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 20.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 0.00 | 155.00 | 25.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} v \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} v \\ \text { (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 PM Peak

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Trucks } \\ \%\end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Flow Modifiers } \\ \text { Flow }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Peak Hour <br>

Factor\end{array}\right]\)

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 PM Peak

## Global Results

## Performance and Accidents

2040 PM Peak Global Performance

| Parameter | Units | Entries | Bypasses | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arrive Flows | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 3614 | 1279 | 4893 |
| Capacity | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 5083 | 2569 | 7652 |
| Average Delay | $\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 12.10 | 1.55 | 9.34 |
| L.O.S. (Signal) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | B | A | A |
| L.O.S. (Unsig) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | B | A |  |
| Total Delay | veh.hrs | 12.15 | 0.55 | 12.70 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (ft)

Approach and Entry Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach <br> Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade <br> Separation <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Approach <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Entry <br> Width <br> E | Entry <br> Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Flare <br> Length <br> $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ | Entry <br> Radius <br> $\mathbf{R}$ | Entry <br> Angle <br> Phi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 55.00 | 125.00 | 48.00 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 90 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 100.00 | 125.00 | 30.00 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 180 | 0 | 14.00 | 1 | 14.00 | 1 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 20.00 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 270 | 0 | 28.00 | 2 | 28.00 | 2 | 0.00 | 155.00 | 25.00 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { +or- } \end{aligned}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{\mathrm{v}}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 PM Peak

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Trucks } \\ \%\end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Flow Modifiers } \\ \text { Flow }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Peak Hour <br>

Factor\end{array}\right]\)

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 PM Peak

## Global Results

## Performance and Accidents

2040 PM Peak Global Performance

| Parameter | Units | Entries | Bypasses | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arrive Flows | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 3614 | 1279 | 4893 |
| Capacity | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 4305 | 1683 | 5988 |
| Average Delay | $\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 60.27 | 4.33 | 45.65 |
| L.O.S. (Signal) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | E | A | D |
| L.O.S. (Unsig) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | F | A | E |
| Total Delay | veh.hrs | 60.50 | 1.54 | 62.04 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 AM Peak

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 421 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | Flow <br> Factor |
| Peak Hour <br> Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 240 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 820 | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry
Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | xWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope <br> Factor | $\begin{gathered} v \\ \text { (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity | $\begin{gathered} v \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 724 |  | 2307 |  | 0 | 536 |  | 1.3494 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 530 | 258 | 1380 | 0 | 1464 | 1255 | 1292 | 0.4224 | 0.1997 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1278 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2492 |  | 0 |  | 855 | 2307 |  | 1.0803 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type |  | Average Delay (sec) |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 220.13 |  | 220.13 | 127.39 |  | F |  | F |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 4.47 | 0.00 | 3.01 | 1.76 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 45.26 |  | 45.26 | 93.76 |  | E |  | E |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 PM Peak

Project: Raintree-L101 SB
Scheme• 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Flow Modifiers <br> Flowtor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 510 | 312 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 1219 | 0 | 894 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.870 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 579 | 994 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | xWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope <br> Factor | $\begin{gathered} v \\ \text { (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity | $\begin{gathered} v \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

## Operational Results

## 2040 PM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |
| Eypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |$|$

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 24.03 |  | 24.03 | 23.37 |  | C |  | C |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 141.76 | 0.00 | 81.78 | 170.49 | 0.00 | F | A | F |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 6.85 |  | 6.85 | 9.73 |  | A | A |  |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 421 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | Flow <br> Factor |
| Peak Hour <br> Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 240 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 820 | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry
Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { +or- } \end{aligned}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{\mathrm{v}}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 724 |  | 2438 |  | 0 | 639 |  | 1.1337 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 530 | 258 | 1522 | 0 | 1547 | 1343 | 1492 | 0.3947 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1311 | 0 |  | 0.1730 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2492 |  | 0 |  | 912 | 2498 |  | 0.0000 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 82.17 |  | 82.17 | 54.49 |  | F |  | F |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 3.93 | 0.00 | 2.65 | 1.58 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 22.38 |  | 22.38 | 41.67 |  | C |  | C |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 PM Peak

Project: Raintree-L101 SB
Scheme• 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Flow Modifiers <br> Flowtor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 510 | 312 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 1219 | 0 | 894 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.870 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 579 | 994 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry
Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Capacity } \\ + \text { or - } \end{gathered}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or | Slope Factor | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{V}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & v \\ & (\mathrm{ft}) \end{aligned}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## 2040 PM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 874 |  | 1744 |  | 0 | 1111 |  | 0.7873 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 1401 | 1028 | 1508 | 0 | 1102 | 1351 | 1485 | 1.0371 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1713 | 0 |  | 0.6920 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1748 |  | 0 |  | 1873 | 2498 |  | 0.0000 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Average Delay (sec) |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 16.24 |  | 16.24 | 10.88 |  | C |  | C |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 30.00 | 0.00 | 17.31 | 36.94 | 0.00 | D | A | C |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 5.99 |  | 5.99 | 7.71 |  | A |  | A |

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows
2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Flow Modifiers <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 421 | 274 | 0 | 691 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 240 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 27 | 2 | 80 | 160 | 170.0009 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 139 <br> 150.0008 <br> 064 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- - | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk | Intercept <br> (or- | Calibration <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 724 | 720 | 1580 | 1580 | 0 | 1222 | 1242 | 0.5925 | 0.5869 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 530 | 258 | 723 | 0 | 2298 | 1922 | 1492 | 0.2758 | 0.1730 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 504 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1581 |  | 0 |  | 968 | 2498 |  | 0.6328 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 9.71 | 6.23 | 7.98 | 5.29 | 3.44 | A | A | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 2.36 | 0.00 | 1.58 | 0.94 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 3.25 |  | 3.25 | 3.89 |  | A |  | A |

2040 AM Peak

## Operational Data

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 691 | 28 | 2 | 27 | 2 | 28 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 240 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 27 | 2 | 80 | 160 | 170.0009 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 150.0008 <br> 4 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- - | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk | Intercept <br> (or- | Calibration <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows
2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Flow Modifiers <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 421 | 274 | 0 | 691 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 240 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 724 | 720 | 1579 | 1579 | 0 | 901 | 904 | 0.8032 | 0.8187 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 530 | 258 | 716 | 0 | 2292 | 1736 | 1292 | 0.3054 | 0.1997 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 504 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1581 |  | 0 |  | 963 | 2307 |  | 0.6853 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 21.24 | 15.19 | 18.23 | 11.68 | 8.57 | C | C | C |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 2.71 | 0.00 | 1.82 | 1.09 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 3.98 |  | 3.98 | 4.77 |  | A |  | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Flow Modifiers <br> Floctor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 510 | 312 | 0 | 385 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 1219 | 0 | 894 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.870 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 994 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eb | neb | Lb | Lt | Rb | Phib |  |  | nex | Nmx |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 27 | 2 | 80 | 160 | $\begin{gathered} 170.0009 \\ 738 \end{gathered}$ | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | $\begin{gathered} 150.0008 \\ 592 \end{gathered}$ | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- - | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk | Intercept <br> (or- | Calibration <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Operational Results

## 2040 PM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 822 | 385 | 994 | 994 | 0 | 1620 | 1657 | 0.5073 | 0.2323 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 1219 | 894 | 822 | 0 | 1379 | 1850 | 1492 | 0.6588 | 0.5994 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1206 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 994 |  | 0 |  | 1728 | 2498 |  | 0.3978 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 6.66 | 2.81 | 5.43 | 4.73 | 0.91 | A | A | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 5.23 | 0.00 | 3.02 | 6.86 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2.22 |  | 2.22 | 1.90 |  | A |  | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Operational Data

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 385 | 28 | 2 | 27 | 2 | 28 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 894 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry | Lb | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 27 | 2 | 80 | 160 | 170.0009 <br> 792 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 150.0008 <br> 64 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |  |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- - | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk | Intercept <br> (or- | Calibration <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

## Operational Results

## 2040 PM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 822 | 385 | 994 | 994 | 0 | 1429 | 1458 | 0.5752 | 0.2640 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 1219 | 894 | 822 | 0 | 1379 | 1630 | 1234 | 0.7478 | 0.7247 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1206 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 994 |  | 0 |  | 1728 | 2307 |  | 0.4309 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 8.66 | 3.33 | 6.96 | 6.30 | 1.10 | A | A | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 8.07 | 0.00 | 4.66 | 11.66 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2.54 |  | 2.54 | 2.19 |  | A |  | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 405 | 28 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 28 | 2 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 355 | 26 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 26 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 135.0004 <br> 579 | 30 | 4 | Raintree WB | 2 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 150 | 142.0004 <br> 817 | 30 | 1 | L101NB SB | 1 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> +or- | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> + or- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | Slope <br> Factor |

## Operational Results

## 2040 AM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 709 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 787 |  | 0 |  | 2242 | 2470 |  | 0.3186 |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 1093 | 405 | 787 | 515 | 0 | 1854 | 1157 | 0.5897 | 0.3500 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 1232 | 355 | 1365 | 0 | 920 | 1452 | 1326 | 0.8482 | 0.2678 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |  |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 3.06 |  | 3.06 | 1.93 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 4.61 | 4.75 | 4.65 | 4.01 | 1.48 | A | A | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 13.91 | 0.00 | 10.80 | 20.88 | 0.00 | B | A | B |

## Global Results

## Performance and Accidents

## 2040 AM Peak Global Performance

| Parameter | Units | Entries | Bypasses | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arrive Flows | veh/hr | 3112 | 760 | 3872 |
| Capacity | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 5776 | 2483 | 8259 |
| Average Delay | $\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 7.90 | 2.53 | 6.85 |
| L.O.S. (Signal) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | A | A | A |
| L.O.S. (Unsig) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | A | A | A |
| Total Delay | veh. hrs | 6.83 | 0.53 | 7.37 |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 405 | 28 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 28 | 2 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 355 | 26 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 26 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 135.0004 <br> 622 | 30 | 4 | Raintree WB | 2 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 150 | 142.0004 <br> 862 | 30 | 1 | L101NB SB | 1 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> + or- | Slope <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows
2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Turning Flows |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Flow Modifiers <br> Flow <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |  |  |
| 1 | L101NB SB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 272 | 515 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1011 | 82 | 0 | 405 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 1232 | 0 | 355 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

## Global Results

## Performance and Accidents

2040 AM Peak Global Performance

| Parameter | Units | Entries | Bypasses | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arrive Flows | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 3112 | 760 | 3872 |
| Capacity | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr}$ | 5143 | 1738 | 6881 |
| Average Delay | $\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 34.73 | 3.43 | 28.59 |
| L.O.S. (Signal) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | C | A | C |
| L.O.S. (Unsig) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | D | A | D |
| Total Delay | veh.hrs | 30.02 | 0.73 | 30.75 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 3.46 |  | 3.46 | 2.18 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 6.45 | 6.55 | 6.48 | 5.31 | 2.02 | A | A | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 84.44 | 0.00 | 65.55 | 102.86 | 0.00 | F | A | F |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry


## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | Vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 629 | 28 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 28 | 2 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 250 | 26 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 26 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 135.0004 | 30 | 4 | Raintree WB | 2 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 150 | 142.0004 <br> 68 | 30 | 1 | L101NB SB | 1 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> + or- | Slope <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks |  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Flow Modifiers } \\ \text { Flow }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Peak Hour <br>

Factor\end{array}\right]\)

Project: Raintree-L101 NB

2040 PM Peak

## 2040 PM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 937 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 1828 |  | 0 |  | 1715 | 2470 |  | 0.7399 |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 585 | 669 | 1821 | 1033 | 0 | 1045 | 891 | 0.5598 | 0.7713 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 1184 | 278 | 1371 | 0 | 1698 | 1448 | 1326 | 0.8180 | 0.2095 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 7.34 |  | 7.34 | 9.96 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 6.80 | 13.61 | 10.43 | 3.18 | 6.93 | A | B | B |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 8.96 | 0.00 | 7.26 | 8.43 | 0.00 | A | A | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB
Scheme: 2040
Rodel-Win1 - Full Geometry

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | Vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 629 | 28 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 28 | 2 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 250 | 26 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 26 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 135.0004 <br> 406 | 30 | 4 | Raintree WB | 2 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 12 | 1 | 0 | 150 | 142.0004 <br> 635 | 30 | 1 | L101NB SB | 1 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> +or- | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> + or- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | L101NB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | Slope <br> Factor |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB


## Operational Results

## 2040 PM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 980 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 1590 |  | 0 |  | 1571 | 2279 |  | 0.6978 |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 550 | 629 | 1589 | 901 | 0 | 916 | 595 | 0.6007 | 1.0577 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 1066 | 250 | 1237 | 0 | 1484 | 1354 | 1127 | 0.7875 | 0.2219 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 8.23 |  | 8.23 | 12.96 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 10.45 | 187.18 | 104.73 | 7.02 | 99.80 | B | F | F |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 11.91 | 0.00 | 9.64 | 16.74 | 0.00 | B | A | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 NB

2040 PM Peak

## 2040 PM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exit } \\ & \text { Flow } \end{aligned}$ | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 937 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 1828 |  | 0 |  | 1697 | 2279 |  | 0.8021 |  |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 585 | 669 | 1817 | 1031 | 0 | 763 | 558 | 0.7672 | 1.5511 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 1184 | 278 | 1365 | 0 | 1586 | 1261 | 1127 | 0.9392 | 0.2465 |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101NB SB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | None | 9.61 |  | 9.61 | 12.96 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | L101NB NB | Merge | 14.39 | 202.24 | 114.61 | 7.02 | 89.64 | B | F | F |
| 4 | Raintree WB | Free | 17.15 | 0.00 | 13.89 | 16.74 | 0.00 | C | A | B |

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | Vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 691 | 28 | 2 | 27 | 2 | 28 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 240 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry | Lb | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 27 | 2 | 80 | 160 | 170.0009 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 150.0008 <br> 112 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |  |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> +or- | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> + or- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Operational Results

## 2040 AM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exit } \\ & \text { Flow } \end{aligned}$ | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 568 | 691 | 2239 | 2239 | 0 | 526 | 558 | 1.0796 | 1.2386 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 493 | 240 | 1327 | 0 | 1973 | 1484 | 1492 | 0.3321 | 0.1609 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1304 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2243 |  | 0 |  | 756 | 2498 |  | 0.8978 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 212.58 | 442.79 | 338.93 | 118.39 | 276.61 | F | F | F |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 3.37 | 0.00 | 2.27 | 1.33 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 16.56 |  | 16.56 | 41.67 |  | C |  | C |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 AM Peak

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 592 | 720 | 2438 | 2438 | 0 | 406 | 430 | 1.4564 | 2.6352 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 530 | 258 | 1298 | 0 | 1977 | 1506 | 1492 | 0.3520 | 0.1730 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1300 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2492 |  | 0 |  | 740 | 2498 |  | 0.9975 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 211.26 | 523.96 | 382.88 | 111.48 | 207.21 | F | F | F |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 3.36 | 0.00 | 2.26 | 1.33 | 0.00 | A | A | A |  |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 22.38 |  | 22.38 | 41.67 |  | C |  | C |  |

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 691 | 28 | 2 | 27 | 2 | 28 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 240 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes <br> nex |  | Nmx |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 27 | 2 | 80 | 160 | 170.0009 <br> 248 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 150.0008 <br> 16 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> +or- | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> + or- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows
2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Flow Modifiers <br> Flow <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 294 | 274 | 0 | 691 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 240 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 820 | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

2040 AM Peak

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 592 | 720 | 2307 | 2307 | 0 | 294 | 315 | 2.0142 | 5.8677 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 530 | 258 | 1137 | 0 | 1779 | 1431 | 1292 | 0.3705 | 0.1997 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1211 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2492 |  | 0 |  | 682 | 2307 |  | 1.0803 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 634.53 | 1672.78 | 1204.37 | 273.16 | 423.32 | F | F | F |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 3.63 | 0.00 | 2.44 | 1.43 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 45.26 |  | 45.26 | 93.76 |  | E |  | E |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | Vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 385 | 28 | 2 | 27 | 2 | 28 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 894 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |

Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry | Lb | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 27 | 2 | 80 | 160 | 170.0009 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 411 <br> 150.0008 <br> 304 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |  |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> +or- | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> + or- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Operational Results

## 2040 PM Peak - 60 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 683 | 385 | 1572 | 1572 | 0 | 1227 | 1248 | 0.5566 | 0.3086 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 1219 | 894 | 1261 | 0 | 1379 | 1532 | 1492 | 0.7956 | 0.5994 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1784 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1573 |  | 0 |  | 1588 | 2498 |  | 0.6296 |  |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 11.17 | 4.16 | 8.64 | 7.29 | 1.48 | B | A | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 11.54 | 0.00 | 6.66 | 19.91 | 0.00 | B | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 5.51 |  | 5.51 | 7.71 |  | A |  | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Global Results

Performance and Accidents
2040 PM Peak Global Performance

| Parameter | Units | Entries | Bypasses | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arrive Flows | veh/hr | 3475 | 1279 | 4754 |
| Capacity | veh/hr | 5258 | 2739 | 7997 |
| Average Delay | $\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 8.74 | 1.25 | 6.72 |
| L.O.S. (Signal) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | A | A | A |
| L.O.S. (Unsig) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | A | A | A |
| Total Delay | veh.hrs | 8.44 | 0.45 | 8.88 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Bypass Geometry

Bypass Approach Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Bypass <br> Flows | v | nv | vb | nvb | Vt | nvt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 385 | 28 | 2 | 27 | 2 | 28 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 894 | 28 | 2 | 13.5 | 1 | 28 | 2 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 27 | 2 | 80 | 160 | 170.0009 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 1506 <br> 30.0008 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> +or- | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk <br> Factor | Calibration <br> Intercept <br> $\boldsymbol{+ o r}-$ | Slope <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Trucks } \\ \%\end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Flow Modifiers } \\ \text { Flow }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Peak Hour <br>

Factor\end{array}\right]\)

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Global Results

## Performance and Accidents

2040 PM Peak Global Performance

| Parameter | Units | Entries | Bypasses | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arrive Flows | veh/hr | 3475 | 1279 | 4754 |
| Capacity | veh/hr | 4475 | 1912 | 6387 |
| Average Delay | $\mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 28.05 | 2.55 | C |
| L.O.S. (Signal) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | C | C | C |
| L.O.S. (Unsig) | $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ | D | A | C |
| Total Delay | veh.hrs | 27.07 | 0.91 | 27.98 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 294 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | Flow <br> Factor |
| Peak Hour <br> Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 240 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 820 | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Capacity } \\ \text { + or - } \end{gathered}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope <br> Factor | $\begin{gathered} v \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} v \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |
| Eypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |$|$

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Average Delay (sec) |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 43.61 |  | 43.61 | 22.02 |  | E |  | E |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 3.67 | 0.00 | 2.47 | 1.50 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 22.38 |  | 22.38 | 41.67 |  | C |  | C |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Flow Modifiers <br> Flow <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 294 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 240 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 820 | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry
Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { +or- } \end{aligned}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{\mathrm{v}}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 592 |  | 2307 |  | 0 | 536 |  | 1.1028 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 530 | 258 | 1373 | 0 | 1464 | 1260 | 1292 | 0.4207 | 0.1997 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1324 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2492 |  | 0 |  | 804 | 2307 |  | 1.0803 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 98.35 |  | 98.35 | 46.46 |  | F |  | F |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 4.36 | 0.00 | 2.93 | 1.76 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 45.26 |  | 45.26 | 93.76 |  | E |  | E |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Flow Modifiers <br> $\%$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 371 | 312 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | Flow <br> Factor |
| Peak Hour <br> Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 1219 | 0 | 894 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.870 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 579 | 994 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Capacity } \\ + \text { or - } \end{gathered}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or | Slope Factor | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{V}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & v \\ & (\mathrm{ft}) \end{aligned}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## 2040 PM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |$|$

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Average Delay (sec) |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 13.14 |  | 13.14 | 7.29 |  | B |  | B |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 17.27 | 0.00 | 9.96 | 19.91 | 0.00 | C | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 5.99 |  | 5.99 | 7.71 |  | A | A |  |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Flow Modifiers <br> $\%$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 371 | 312 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | Flow <br> Factor |
| Peak Hour <br> Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 1219 | 0 | 894 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.870 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 579 | 994 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

Circulating and Exit Geometry

| Leg | Leg Names | Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> D | Circulating <br> Width <br> C | Circulating <br> Lanes <br> nc | Exit <br> Width <br> Ex | Exit <br> Lanes <br> nex | Exit <br> Half Width <br> Vx | Exit Half <br> Width Lanes <br> nvx |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 185.00 | 32.00 | 2 | 18.00 | 1 | 18.00 | 1 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 185.00 | 16.00 | 1 | 32.00 | 2 | 32.00 | 2 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Capacity } \\ + \text { or - } \end{gathered}$ | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or | Slope Factor | $\underset{(\mathrm{ft})}{V}$ | Default Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calib } \\ & \text { Capacity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & v \\ & (\mathrm{ft}) \end{aligned}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 28.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 2091 | 0 | 18.00 | 2688 | 0 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 20.00 | 4182 | 0 | 32.00 | 4779 | 0 |

## 2040 PM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 727 |  | 1742 |  | 0 | 920 |  | 0.7894 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 1401 | 1028 | 1358 | 0 | 1101 | 1186 | 1095 | 1.1817 | 0.9384 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1713 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1748 |  | 0 |  | 1575 | 2307 |  | 0.7576 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | None | 21.56 |  | 21.56 | 12.09 |  | C |  | C |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 74.27 | 0.00 | 42.85 | 100.30 | 0.00 | F | A | E |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 7.61 |  | 7.61 | 9.73 |  | A | A |  |

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows
2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Flow Modifiers <br> Floctor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 294 | 274 | 0 | 691 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 240 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 27 | 2 | 80 | 160 | 170.0009 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 150.0008 <br> 688 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- - | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk | Intercept <br> (or- | Calibration <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 592 | 720 | 1580 | 1580 | 0 | 1222 | 1242 | 0.4842 | 0.5869 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 530 | 258 | 591 | 0 | 2298 | 2017 | 1492 | 0.2628 | 0.1730 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 504 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1581 |  | 0 |  | 836 | 2498 |  | 0.6328 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 9.34 | 6.23 | 7.63 | 4.16 | 3.44 | A | A | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 2.21 | 0.00 | 1.49 | 0.88 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 3.25 |  | 3.25 | 3.89 |  | A |  | A |

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Flow Modifiers <br> $\%$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1rucks | Flow <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101SB SB | 0 | 294 | 274 | 0 | 691 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.960 |  |
| 3 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 493 | 0 | 240 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.930 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.970 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 27 | 2 | 80 | 160 | 170.0009 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 150.0008 <br> 736 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- - | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk | Intercept <br> (or- | Calibration <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

## 2040 AM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Arrival Flow | Opposing Flow | Exit | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |  |  |  |
| Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Flow | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 592 | 720 | 1579 | 1579 | 0 | 888 | 918 | 0.6661 | 0.8051 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 530 | 258 | 587 | 0 | 2292 | 1829 | 1292 | 0.2899 | 0.1997 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 504 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1581 |  | 0 |  | 834 | 2307 |  | 0.6853 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 17.60 | 14.35 | 15.82 | 7.87 | 8.09 | C | B | C |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 2.52 | 0.00 | 1.70 | 1.01 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 3.98 |  | 3.98 | 4.77 |  | A |  | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Flow Modifiers <br> $\%$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1rucks | Flow <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101SB SB | 0 | 371 | 312 | 0 | 385 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 1219 | 0 | 894 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.870 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 994 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Eb | neb | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lt | Rb | Phib | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |
| nex | Nmx |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 27 | 2 | 80 | 160 | 170.0010 <br> 227 | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 150.0009 <br> 024 | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- - | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk | Intercept <br> (or- | Calibration <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## 2040 PM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 727 | 410 | 1104 | 1104 | 0 | 1545 | 1579 | 0.4702 | 0.2609 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 1401 | 1028 | 726 | 0 | 1513 | 1920 | 1492 | 0.7299 | 0.6889 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1155 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1104 |  | 0 |  | 1793 | 2498 |  | 0.4421 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 6.96 | 2.93 | 5.50 | 3.78 | 0.91 | A | A | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 5.22 | 0.00 | 3.01 | 5.70 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2.27 |  | 2.27 | 1.90 |  | A |  | A |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2040 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Flow Modifiers <br> $\%$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1rucks | Flow <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L101SB SB | 0 | 371 | 312 | 0 | 385 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |  |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 0 | 1219 | 0 | 894 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.870 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.940 |
| 4 | Raintree WB | 0 | 0 | 994 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

## Bypass Entry and Exit Geometry (ft)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Geometry |  |  |  |  |  | Leg | Leg Names | Exit Lanes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eb | neb | Lb | Lt | Rb | Phib |  |  | nex | Nmx |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 27 | 2 | 80 | 160 | $\begin{gathered} 170.0010 \\ 173 \end{gathered}$ | 43 | 2 | Raintree EB | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 13.5 | 1 | 0 | 100 | $\begin{gathered} 150.0008 \\ 976 \end{gathered}$ | 30 | 3 | L101SB NB | 1 | 2 |

Bypass Entry Capacity Modifiers and Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Capacity <br> + or- - | Entry Capacity <br> Cross Walk | Intercept <br> (or- | Calibration <br> Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | L101SB SB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 |

Project: Raintree-L101 SB

## 2040 PM Peak - 15 minutes

## Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bypass } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 727 | 410 | 1104 | 1104 | 0 | 1354 | 1381 | 0.5365 | 0.2989 |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 1401 | 1028 | 725 | 0 | 1513 | 1700 | 1234 | 0.8244 | 0.8330 |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1155 | 0 |  | 0.0000 |  |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 1104 |  | 0 |  | 1788 | 2307 |  | 0.4787 |  |

## Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | $95 \%$ Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |  |
| 1 | L101SB SB | Yield | 8.83 | 3.50 | 6.91 | 4.80 | 1.10 | A | A | A |
| 2 | Raintree EB | Free | 7.96 | 0.00 | 4.59 | 8.74 | 0.00 | A | A | A |
| 3 | L101SB NB | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | Raintree WB | None | 2.61 |  | 2.61 | 2.19 |  | A |  | A |
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## INTRODUCTION

Project No. F0123 01D Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Drive to Shea Blvd, is a Design Concept Report which is described as the development, evaluation and recommendation to provide additional general-purpose lanes on the Pima Freeway (SR 101L). It is located on SR 101L in Maricopa County, in the ADOT Central District. The proposed project limits begin at milepost (MP) 36.5, and end at MP 41.2.

The ADOT Feature Inventory System (FIS) indicates that there are 296 ADA features within the project limits. Of those features, 200 are not in compliance with current ADA standards. A summary of the non-compliant locations and locations which need to be evaluated for compliance is included in this listing. The table below provides a summary of all the ADA features listed within the ADA Transition Plan for Public Rights of Way.

Table 1: FIS List of Total ADA Features

| Feature Type | Compliant | NonCompliant | Total in FIS | Not in FIS | No Longer Existent | Existing ADA Total | Total Proposed Improvements |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalk | 31 | 6 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 6 |
| Curb Ramps (\& Curb Ramp Needs) | 2 | 48 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 48 |
| Driveways | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) | 0 | 72 | 50 | 22 | 0 | 72 | 72 |
| Railing | 23 | 4 | 24 | 3 | 0 | 27 | 1 |
| Pedestrian Island Crossings | 0 | 35 | 28 | 7 | 0 | 35 | 35 |
| Pedestrian Overpass/Underpass | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Obstructions \& ADA Features Needed | 5 | 33 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 38 | 33 |
| Crosswalks* | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Total | 96 | 200 | 209 | 85 | 0 | 296 | 197 |

*Crosswalks are not recorded as assets in FIS.
In conjunction with any work done on existing ADA features, work zone traffic control plans should follow ADA requirements, where applicable.

| Proposed Action Item- Sidewalk |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Reconstruct Sidewalk to Repair Cross Slope, Update FIS | 6 |
| Compliant (No Action) | 31 |
| Proposed Action Item- Curb Ramps |  |
| Reconstruct Curb Ramp with this Project, Update FIS | 44 |
| Add Truncated Domes, Update FIS | 4 |
| Compliant (No Action) | 2 |
| Proposed Action Item- Driveways |  |
| Driveway will be reconstructed with this Project, Update FIS | 2 |
| Proposed Action Item- Accessible Pedestrian Signals |  |
| Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access | 24 |
| Pedestrian Activated Signal Removed Prior to this Project, Update FIS Status to Removed | 1 |
| Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS | 47 |
| Proposed Action Item- Railing |  |
| Evaluate as Safety Rail | 21 |
| Duplicate FIS Entry OR Feature No Longer Exists, Update FIS (No Action) | 3 |
| Replace Railing | 1 |
| To Remain (No Action) | 2 |
| Proposed Action Item- Pedestrian Island Crossings |  |
| Add Truncated Domes, Update FIS | 21 |
| Pedestrian Island Cross will be reconstructed with this project, Update FIS | 14 |
| Proposed Action Item- Pedestrian Overpass/Underpass |  |
| To Remain, No Action | 1 |
| Proposed Action Item- Obstructions \& ADA Features Needed |  |
| Repair Cracked/Uneven Concrete | 12 |
| Adjust Utility Box to be Flush with Sidewalk \& Repair Sidewalk | 5 |


| Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS | 16 |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| To Remain (No Action) | 5 |  |
| Proposed Action Item- Crosswalks |  |  |
| To Remain, Add to FIS | Subtotal Proposed Improvements | 197 |
|  | Subtotal (No Action) | 99 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 9 6}$ |  |

## 1. SIDEWALK

A total of 37 sidewalk locations with an overall length of 4,973 feet of sidewalk are located throughout the project limits. ADOT FIS listed 37 locations, and all were included in ADOT FIS. There are 6 locations with non-compliant sidewalks totaling 782 feet. The remaining 31 locations include 4,191 feet of ADA compliant sidewalk. The following table summarizes the proposed action items for sidewalk.


The following tables summarize sidewalk locations throughout the project limits. The first table lists ADA non-compliant sidewalk.
Table 4: ADA Non-Compliant Sidewalk

| Asset <br> ID | Location | Beginning <br> MP | Approx. Length (Ft) | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Princess Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1025220 | NW Princess Drive | 36.57 (Rt) | 144' | $\begin{aligned} & \text {-Cross Slope > 2.0\% } \\ & \text {-Exst }=\sim 2.4 \% \end{aligned}$ | Reconstruct Sidewalk to Repair Cross Slope |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Approx. Length (Ft) | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1025208 | SW Princess Drive | 36.60 (Rt) | 146' | $\begin{aligned} & \text {-Cross Slope > 2.0\% } \\ & \text {-Exst }=3.1 \% \end{aligned}$ | Reconstruct Sidewalk to Repair Cross Slope |  |  |
| Bell Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1025232 | NW Bell Road | 37.06 (Rt) | 111' | $\begin{aligned} & \text {-Cross Slope > 2.0\% } \\ & \text {-Exst }=\sim 2.8 \% \end{aligned}$ | Reconstruct Sidewalk to Repair Cross Slope |  |  |
| 1025224 | South Bell Road | 37.09 (Rt) | 341' | -Cross Slope > 2.0\% <br> -Exst $=\sim 2.3 \%$ | Reconstruct Sidewalk to Repair Cross Slope |  |  |
| Thunderbird Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1025310 | North Thunderbird Road | 39.05 (Rt) | $20^{\prime}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text {-Cross Slope > 2.0\% } \\ & \text {-Exst }=\sim 2.5 \% \end{aligned}$ | Reconstruct Sidewalk to Repair Cross Slope |  |  |
| 1025303 | South <br> Thunderbird Road | 39.06 (Rt) | 20' | -Cross Slope > 2.0\% <br> -Exst $=\sim 2.5 \%$ | Reconstruct Sidewalk to Repair Cross Slope |  |  |

The table below contains a listing of all ADA compliant sidewalk.

Table 5: ADA Compliant Sidewalk

| Asset ID | Location | Direction | Beginning MP | Approx. <br> Length ( Ft ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Princess Drive |  |  |  |  |
| 1025217 | North Princess Drive | East/West | 36.57 (Rt) | 386' |
| 1025215 | NE Princess Drive | East/West | 36.57 (Rt) | $30^{\prime}$ |
| 1025212 | SE Princess Drive | East/West | 36.59 (Rt) | 35' |
| 1025210 | South Princess Drive | East/West | 36.59 (Rt) | 120' |
| 1026220 | SW Princess Drive | East/West | 36.63 (Rt) | 146' |
| 1026222 | SW Princess Drive | East/West | 36.72 (Rt) | $30^{\prime}$ |


| Asset ID | Location | Direction | Beginning MP | Approx. Length (Ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bell Road |  |  |  |  |
| 1025230 | North Bell Road | East/West | 37.08 (Rt) | 353' |
| 1025228 | NE Bell Road | East/West | 37.08 (Rt) | 144' |
| 1025226 | SE Bell Road | East/West | 37.11 (Rt) | 126' |
| 1025222 | SW Bell Road | East/West | 37.09 (Rt) | 168' |
| Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard |  |  |  |  |
| 1025238 | NW Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | East/West | 37.38 (Rt) | 144' |
| 1390793 | North Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | East/West | 37.79 (Rt) | 143' |
| 1025236 | NE Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | East/West | 37.78 (Rt) | 120' |
| 1025240 | SE Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | East/West | 37.81 (Rt) | 152' |
| 1390778 | South Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | East/West | 37.81 (Rt) | 142' |
| 1025234 | SW Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd | East/West | 37.81 (Rt) | 163' |
| Raintree Drive |  |  |  |  |
| 1025242 | NW Raintree Drive | East/West | 38.58 (Rt) | 177' |
| 1025312 | NE Raintree Drive | East/West | 38.58 (Rt) | 129' |
| 1025314 | SE Raintree Drive | East/West | 38.60 (Rt) | 158' |
| 1025244 | SW Raintree Drive | East/West | 38.61 (Rt) | 154' |
| Thunderbird Road |  |  |  |  |
| 1025307 | NE Thunderbird Road | East/West | 39.05 (Rt) | 107' |
| 1025305 | SE Thunderbird Road | East/West | 39.06 (Rt) | 110' |
| Cactus Road |  |  |  |  |
| 1025273 | NW Cactus Road | East/West | 40.08 (Rt) | 128' |
| 1025271 | NE Cactus Road | East/West | 40.08 (Rt) | $53^{\prime}$ |
| 1025277 | SE Cactus Road | East/West | 40.10 (Rt) | 124' |
| 1025275 | SW Cactus Road | East/West | 40.10 (Rt) | 151' |
| Shea Boulevard |  |  |  |  |
| 1025285 | NW Shea Road | East/West | 41.05 (Rt) | 103' |
| 1025283 | NE Shea Road | East/West | 41.05 (Rt) | $110^{\prime}$ |
| 1025281 | SE Shea Road | East/West | 41.08 (Rt) | $90^{\prime}$ |
| 1394667 | SW Shea Road | North/South | 41.08 (Rt) | $77^{\prime}$ |
| 1025279 | SW Shea Road | East/West | 41.08 (Rt) | 118' |
|  |  |  | Total | 4,191' |

## 2. CURB RAMPS

There are a total of 50 curb ramp locations throughout the project limits. ADOT FIS listed 50 locations, and no new locations were identified. Two of the curb ramps meet current ADA standards. The remaining 48 locations do not comply with ADA standards. The following table summarizes the recommended action for each feature to become compliant. Detailed survey will be necessary at all locations where a new curb ramp will be required.

Table 6: Summary of Proposed Curb Ramp Action Items

| Proposed Action Item- Curb Ramps |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{8}{2} \\ & \frac{1}{0} \\ & \frac{3}{4} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reconstruct Curb Ramp | 8 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 44 |
| Add Truncated Domes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Add Truncated Domes \& Stripe/Re-Stripe Crosswalk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reconstruct Gutter | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Compliant (No Action) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 10 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 50 |

The following table gives a detailed summary of the non-compliant curb ramp locations:

Table 7: ADA Non-Compliant Curb Ramps

| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Princess Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390753 | NW Princess Dr-West of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.57 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | $\begin{gathered} \text { Beginning } \\ M P \end{gathered}$ | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1390751 | NW Princess Dr-East of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.57 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning -Cross Slope is > 2\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390749 | NE Princess Dr-West of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.57 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390748 | NE Princess Dr-East of NB on ramp. | 36.57 (Rt) | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390745 | SE Princess Dr-East of NB off ramp. | $\begin{gathered} 36.60 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390744 | SE Princess Dr-West of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.60 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390738 | SW Princess Dr-East of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.60 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390736 | SW Princess Dr-West of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.60 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| Bell Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390768 | NW Bell Rd-West of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.06 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390767 | NW Bell Rd-East of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.07 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390764 | NE Bell Rd-West of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390763 | NE Bell Rd-East of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.08 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390760 | SE Bell Rd-East of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.10 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390758 | SE Bell Rd-West of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.10 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390757 | SW Bell Rd-East of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning -Cross Slope is > 2\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390756 | SW Bell Rd-West of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.08 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space <br> -Gutter Slope is > 5\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390798 | NW FLW-West of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.78 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning | Install detectable warning surface |  |  |
| 1390794 | NW FLW-East of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.78 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -Gutter Slope is > 5\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390792 | NE FLW-West of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.78 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning | Install detectable warning surface |  |  |
| 1390785 | NE FLW-East of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.78 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390783 | SE FLW-East of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.81 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390779 | SE FLW-West of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.81 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Gutter Slope is > 5\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390777 | SW FLW-East of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.81 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Gutter Slope is > 5\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390772 | SW FLW-West of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.81 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Gutter Slope is > 5\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| Raintree Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390831 | NW Raintree-West of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 38.58 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -Turning Space Running Slope is > 2\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390827 | NW Raintree-East of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 38.58 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space <br> -Cross Slope > 2\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390825 | NE Raintree-West of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 38.58 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390819 | NE Raintree-East of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 38.58 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning -Gutter Slope > 5\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1390816 | SE Raintree-East of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 38.60 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -Turning Space Running Slope $>2 \%$ <br> -Gutter Slope > 5\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390810 | SE Raintree-West of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 38.61 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space <br> -Cross Slope > 2\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390809 | SW Raintree-East of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 38.61 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space <br> -Cross Slope >2\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390802 | SW Raintree-West of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 38.61 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -Gutter Slope > 5\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| Thunderbird Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390836 | NW Thunderbird-West of SB frontage | $\begin{gathered} 39.04 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space <br> -Gutter Slope > 5\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390835 | NW Thunderbird-East of SB frontage rd | $\begin{gathered} 39.05 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390834 | NE Thunderbird-East of bridge | $\begin{gathered} 39.05 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -Gutter Slope > 5\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1390832 | SE Thunderbird-East of Bridge | $\begin{gathered} 39.06 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning | Install detectable warning surface |  |  |
| Cactus Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1394664 | NW Cactus Rd-West of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 40.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning | Install detectable warning surface |  |  |
| 1394661 | NW Cactus Rd-East of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 40.08 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1394658 | NE Cactus Rd-West of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 40.08 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1394655 | NE Cactus Rd-East of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 40.08 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No 4'x4' Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1394652 | SE Cactus Rd-East of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} \hline 40.11 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No 4'x4' Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1394648 | SE Cactus Rd-West of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 40.10 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1394646 | SW Cactus Rd-West of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 40.10 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1394642 | SW Cactus Rd-West of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 40.10 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -Gutter Slope > 5\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| Shea Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1394685 | NW Shea Blvd-West of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 41.05 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning | Install detectable warning surface |  |  |
| 1394678 | NE Shea Blvd-East of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 41.05 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning -Obstructions in the ramp path. | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1394675 | SE Shea Blvd-East on NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 41.08 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |
| 1394666 | SW Shea Blvd-West of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 41.08 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -No Detectable Warning <br> -No Turning Space <br> -Cross Slope > 2\% | Reconstruct curb ramp |  |  |

The following are locations with curb ramps which are compliant with ADA Standards.
Table 8: ADA Compliant Curb Ramps

| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Princess Drive |  |  |
| 1396375 | SW Princess Drive. SB on ramp. | $36.71(\mathrm{Rt})$ |
| 1396376 | SW Princess Drive. SB on ramp. | $36.72(\mathrm{Rt})$ |

## 3. DRIVEWAYS

A total of 2 driveway locations are located within the project limits. ADOT FIS listed 2 locations, and 0 locations were not included in ADOT FIS. Of these locations, 2 driveway locations ( 2 Single, 0 Multiple) are not compliant with ADA standards. A table summarizing the proposed action items for these ADA features is listed below:

## Table 9: Summary of Proposed Driveway Action Items

| Proposed Action Item- Driveways |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{8}{2} \\ & \frac{3}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reconstruct Driveway |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |

The following are detailed descriptions of the driveway locations which need to be addressed for compliance with ADA Standards:

| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Single or Multiple (\#) | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cactus Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1394653 | SE Cactus Road- East of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 40.10 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | Single | -Cross Slope > 2\% | Reconstruct Driveway |  |  |
| 1394654 | NE Cactus Road- East of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 40.08 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | Single | -Cross Slope > 2\% | Reconstruct Driveway |  |  |

As mentioned above, there are no ADA compliant driveways within the project limits.

## 4. ACCESSIBLE PEDESTRIAN SIGNALS

There are a total of 72 locations with accessible pedestrian signals within the project limits. Of these locations, All 72 APS locations are not compliant with ADA standards. ADOT FIS did not include 22 locations. These locations have been evaluated for compliance. A table summarizing the proposed action items for these ADA features is listed below:

Table 11: Summary of Proposed APS Action Items

| Proposed Action Item- Accessible Pedestrian Signals |  |  | \% |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access | 4 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 24 |
| Pedestrian Activated signal Removed Prior to this Project, Update FIS Status to Removed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS | 5 | 3 | 16 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 47 |
| Total | 9 | 10 | 18 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 72 |

The following are existing APS locations which do not comply with ADA standards:
Table 12: ADA Non-Compliant APS Locations

| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for NonCompliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Princess Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390754 | NW Princess DriveWest of SB off ramp | 36.57 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| XXPB01 | NW Princess DriveEast of SB off ramp | 36.57 (Rt) | -Located > 5' from Crosswalk | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXPB02 | NE Princess DriveWest of NB on ramp | 36.57 (Rt) | -Located > 5' from Crosswalk | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | $\begin{gathered} \text { Beginning } \\ \text { MP } \end{gathered}$ | Reason for NonCompliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| XXPB03 | NE Princess Drive- East of NB on ramp | 36.57 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1390746 | SE Princess Drive- East of NB off ramp | 36.60 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1390743 | SE Princess DriveWest of NB off ramp | 36.60 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390741 | SW Princess DriveWest of SB on ramp | 36.60 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390737 | SW Princess DriveWest of SB on ramp | 36.60 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| XXPB04 | West Princess DrivePedestrian Island | 36.60 (Med) | -Located > 5' from Crosswalk | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| Bell Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390769 | NW Bell Road- West of SB off ramp | 37.06 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| XXPB05 | NW Bell Road- East of SB off ramp | 37.06 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1390765 | NE Bell Road- West of NB on ramp | 37.06 (Rt) | - -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| XXPB06 | NE Bell Road- East of NB on ramp | 37.06 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| XXPB07 | East Bell Road | 37.08 (Med) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390761 | SE Bell Road- East of NB off ramp | 37.10 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1390759 | SE Bell Road- West of NB off ramp | 37.10 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| XXPB08 | SW Bell Road- East of SB on ramp | 37.10 (Rt) | -Located > 5' from Crosswalk | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXPB09 | SW Bell Road- West of SB on ramp | 37.10 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | $\begin{gathered} \text { Beginning } \\ \text { MP } \end{gathered}$ | Reason for NonCompliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1390771 | West Bell RoadPedestrian Island | 37.08 (Med) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| XXPB10 | NW FLW- West of SB off ramp | 37.79 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1390797 | NW FLW- West side of Pedestrian Island | 37.79 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390796 | NW FLW- East side of Pedestrian Island | 37.79 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXPB11 | NW FLW- East of SB off ramp | 37.79 (Rt) | -Located > 5' from Crosswalk | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXPB12 | NE FLW-West of NB on ramp | 37.79 (Rt) | -Located > 5' from Crosswalk | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390791 | NE FLW- West side of Pedestrian Island | 37.79 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390790 | NE FLW-East side of Pedestrian Island | 37.79 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390787 | NE FLW- West side of smaller Pedestrian Island | 37.79 (Rt) | - -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXPB13 | NE FLW- West side of smaller Pedestrian Island. Crossing to the South | 37.79 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXPB14 | SE FLW- East of NB off ramp | 37.81 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1390782 | SE FLW- East side of Pedestrian Island | 37.81 (Rt) | -Reach > 10"' | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390781 | SE FLW- West side of Pedestrian Island | 37.81 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for NonCompliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| XXPB15 | SE FLW- West of NB off ramp | 37.81 (Rt) | -Located > 5' from Crosswalk | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXPB16 | SW FLW- East of SB on ramp | 37.81 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390776 | SW FLW- East side of Pedestrian Island | 37.81 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390744 | SW FLW- West side of Pedestrian Island | 37.81 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXPB17 | SW FLW- West Pedestrian Island | 37.81 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXPB18 | SW FLW- West of SB on ramp | 37.81 (Rt) | - Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| Raintree Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| XXPB19 | NW Raintree- West of SB off ramp | 38.59 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1390830 | West RaintreePedestrian Island | 38.59 (Med) | -No pushbutton | Pedestrian Activated signal Removed Prior to this Project, Update FIS Status to Removed |  |  |
| XXPB20 | NW Raintree- West side of Pedestrian Island | 38.59 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390829 | NW Raintree- East side of Pedestrian Island | 38.59 (Rt) | - -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXPB21 | NW Raintree- East of SB off ramp | 38.59 (Rt) | -Located > 5' from Crosswalk | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390824 | NE Raintree- West side of Pedestrian Island | 38.59 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390823 | NE Raintree- East side of Pedestrian Island | 38.59 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390826 | NE Raintree- West of NB on ramp | 38.59 (Rt) | - Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for NonCompliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1390821 | NE RaintreePedestrian Island | 38.59 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXPB22 | SE Raintree- East of NB off ramp | 38.60 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1390815 | SE Raintree- East side of Pedestrian Island | 38.60 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390814 | SE Raintree- West side of Pedestrian Island | 38.60 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390811 | SE Raintree- West of NB off ramp | 38.61 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1390812 | SW Raintree- East of SB on ramp | 38.61 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1390808 | SW Raintree- East side of Pedestrian Island | 38.60 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390807 | SW Raintree- West side of Pedestrian Island | 38.60 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390805 | SW Raintree- Western Pedestrian Island | 38.60 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| Cactus Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1394663 | NW Cactus- East side of Pedestrian Island | 40.08 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1394660 | NW Cactus- East of SB off ramp | 40.08 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1394659 | NE Cactus- West of NB on ramp | 40.08 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1394657 | NE Cactus- West side of Pedestrian Island | 40.08 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1394651 | SE Cactus- West side of Pedestrian Island | 40.10 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for NonCompliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1394649 | SE Cactus- West of NB off ramp | 40.10 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1394647 | SW Cactus- East of SB on ramp | 40.10 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1394644 | SW Cactus- East side of Pedestrian Island | 40.10 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| Shea Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1394683 | NW Shea- East side of Pedestrian Island | 41.05 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1394682 | NW Shea- East of SB off ramp | 41.05 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1394681 | NE Shea- West of NB on ramp | 41.06 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1394680 | NE Shea- West side of Pedestrian Island | 41.06 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1394676 | SE Shea- East of NHB off ramp | 41.08 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Reconstructing Curb Ramp with this Project to Provide Push Button Access |  |  |
| 1394674 | SE Shea- East side of Pedestrian Island | 41.08 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1394673 | SE Shea- West side of Pedestrian Island | 41.08 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1394671 | SE Shea- West of NB off ramp | 41.07 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1394670 | SW Shea- East of SB on ramp | 41.08 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1394669 | SW Shea- East side of Pedestrian Island | 41.08 (Rt) | -Reach > 10" | Constructing New PB-Pole, Update FIS |  |  |

APS locations which are compliant with ADA standards are typically not included in the ADOT FIS system. A summary of existing APS locations which are not currently listed in the ADOT FIS system are as follows:

Table 13: Existing APS locations not currently listed in ADOT FIS

| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Pole No. | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Princess Drive |  |  |  |  |
| ХХРB01 | NW Princess Drive - East of SB off ramp | 36.57 (Rt) |  |  |
| ХХРВО2 | NE Princess Drive - West of NB on ramp | 36.57 (Rt) |  |  |
| ХХРВО3 | NE Princess Drive - East of NB on ramp | 36.57 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB04 | West Princess Drive - Pedestrian Island | 36.60 (Med) |  |  |
| Bell Road |  |  |  |  |
| XXPB05 | NW Bell Road - East of SB off ramp | 37.06 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB06 | NE Bell Road - East of NB on ramp | 37.06 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB07 | East Bell Road | 37.08 (Med) |  |  |
| XXPB08 | SW Bell Road - East of SB on ramp | 37.10 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB09 | SW Bell Road - West of SB on ramp | 37.10 (Rt) |  |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard |  |  |  |  |
| XXPB10 | NW FLW - West of SB off ramp | 37.79 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB11 | NW FLW - East of SB off ramp | 37.79 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB12 | NE FLW - West of NB on ramp | 37.79 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB13 | NE FLW - West side of smaller Pedestrian Island, Crossing to the South | 37.79 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB14 | SE FLW - East of NB off ramp | 37.81 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB15 | SE FLW - West of NB off ramp | 37.81 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB16 | SW FLW - East of SB on ramp | 37.81 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB17 | SW FLW - West Pedestrian Island | 37.81 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB18 | SW FLW - West of SB on ramp | 37.81 (Rt) |  |  |
| Raintree Drive |  |  |  |  |
| XXPB18 | SW FLW - West of SB on ramp | 37.81 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB19 | NW Raintree - West of SB off ramp | 38.59 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB20 | NW Raintree - West side of Pedestrian Island | 38.59 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB21 | NW Raintree - East of SB off ramp | 38.59 (Rt) |  |  |
| XXPB22 | SE Raintree - East of NB off ramp | 38.60 (Rt) |  |  |

## 5. RAILING

The ADOT FIS lists a total of 25 locations with railing. Of these locations, 2 are handrail locations, 25 are safety rail locations (not part of a continuous pedestrian pathway) and 0 are detectable rail locations (beside a sidewalk, not used as a gripping surface). Railing is evaluated according to applicable ADA requirements (PROWAG \& ADAAG) and/or OSHA requirements depending on the function of the railing. A table summarizing the proposed action items for these ADA features is listed below:

Table 14: Summary of Proposed Railing Action Items

| Proposed Action Item- Railing |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 운 } \\ & \frac{1}{0} \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Evaluate as Safety Rail | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 21 |
| Duplicate FIS Entry OR Feature No Longer Exists Update FIS (No Action) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Replace Railing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| To Remain (No Action) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 27 |

The following are detailed descriptions of the railing locations which need to be addressed for compliance with applicable standards:

Table 15: ADA Non-Compliant Railing

| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bell Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010935 | NE Bell Rd | $\begin{gathered} 37.07 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Duplicate | Duplicate FIS Entry OR Feature No Longer Exists, Update FIS (No Action) |  |  |
| Cactus Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1024684 | West Cactus Rd NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 38.87 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Duplicate | Duplicate FIS Entry OR Feature No Longer Exists, Update FIS (No Action) |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1024889 | NW Cactus Rd- In front of Sidewalk | $\begin{gathered} \hline 40.08 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ | -Damaged by collision. | Replace safety rail. |  |  |
| Shea Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1024678 | East of Shea Blvd NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 41.00 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Duplicate | Duplicate FIS Entry OR Feature No Longer Exists, Update FIS (No Action) |  |  |

The following table describes railing which is compliant with respective standards:

| Asset ID | Direction | Beginning MP | Location |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Princess Drive |  |  |  |
| 1024825 | North/South | 36.57 (Med) | North Princess Drive - Top of slope paving |
| 1025679 | North/South | 36.59 (Med) | South Princess Drive - Top of slope paving |
| Bell Road |  |  |  |
| 1024829 | East/West | 37.08 (Rt) | NE Bell Road - Behind sidewalk |
| 2011274 | East/West | 37.11 (Rt) | SE Bell Road - Behind sidewalk |
| Raintree Drive |  |  |  |
| 2017832 | North/South | 38.75 (Rt) | East of NB SR 101L - Between Raintree Drive and Thunderbird Road TI's |
| 2017760 | North/South | 38.76 (Rt) | East of NB SR 101L - Between Raintree Drive and Thunderbird Road TI's |
| Thunderbird Road |  |  |  |
| 2017829 | North/South | 39.04 (Rt) | NE Thunderbird Road - Behind sidewalk |
| 2017828 | North/South | 39.04 (Rt) | NE Thunderbird Road - Behind sidewalk |
| XXHR01 | North/South | 39.06 (Rt) | SE Thunderbird Road - Behind sidewalk and fence |
| 1022554 | North/South | 39.06 (Rt) | SW Thunderbird Road - On top of wall |
| Pedestrian Bridge |  |  |  |
| 2017821 | North/South | 39.55 (Rt) | NE Pedestrian Bridge - Around Culvert Headwall |
| 2017818 | North/South | 39.06 (Rt) | SE Pedestrian Bridge - Around Culvert Headwall |
| XXHRO2 | East/West | 39.55 (Rt) | North Pedestrian Bridge |
| XXHR03 | East/West | 39.57 (Rt) | South Pedestrian Bridge |
| Cactus Road |  |  |  |
| 2017646 | North/South | 40.01 (Rt) | East Cactus Road - NB on ramp |


| Asset ID | Direction | Beginning MP | Location |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017816 | North/South | 40.01 (Rt) | East Cactus Road - NB on ramp |
| 2017647 | North/South | 40.01 (Rt) | East Cactus Road - NB on ramp |
| 1022564 | North/South | 38.87 (Rt) | West Cactus Road - SB on ramp |
| 2017644 | North/South | 40.11 (Rt) | SE Cactus Road - Behind sidewalk |
| 2017645 | North/South | 40.13 (Rt) | East of Cactus Road - NB on ramp |
|  |  |  | Shea Boulevard |
| 2017814 | North/South | 40.63 (Rt) | East of NB SR 101L between Cactus Road and Shea Blvd TI's |
| 2017811 | North/South | 40.81 (Rt) | East of NB SR 101L between Cactus Road and Shea Blvd TI's |
| 2013362 | North/South | 41.00 (Rt) | East of Shea Boulevard NB on ramp |

## 6. PEDESTRIAN ISLAND CROSSING

There are 35 locations throughout the project limits which have pedestrian crossing at islands. All 35 are ADA non-compliant locations. The following table summarizes the recommended action for each feature to become compliant.

Table 17: Summary of Proposed Pedestrian Island Crossing Action Items

| Proposed Action Item- Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{8}{8} \\ & \frac{3}{0} \\ & \frac{3}{1} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Add Truncated Domes | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 21 |
| Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 |
| Total | 2 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 35 |

A detailed description of each of the ADA non-compliant pedestrian crossings at islands are as follows:

Table 18: ADA Non-Compliant Pedestrian Island Crossings

| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Princess Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390747 | East Princess Dr | 36.58 (Med) | -Not accessible. No crossing sign posted. | Pedestrian Island Crossing will be removed with this project, update FIS Status to Removed |  |  |
| 1390755 | West Princess Dr | 36.58 (Med) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| Bell Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390762 | East Bell Rd | 37.09 (Med) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| 1390770 | West Bell Rd | 37.08 (Med) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390795 | NW FLW Blvd | 37.79 (Rt) | -Textured Surface/Pavers | Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  |
| 1390789 | NE FLW Blvd | 37.79 (Rt) | -Textured Surface/Pavers | Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  |
| 1390786 | NE FLW Blvd | 37.79 (Rt) | -Textured Surface/Pavers | Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  |
| 1390788 | East FLW Blvd | 37.80 (Med) | -Length < 6' | Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  |
| 1390780 | SE FLW Blvd | 37.81 (Lt) | -Textured Surface/Pavers | Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  |
| 1390775 | SW FLW Blvd | 37.81 (Rt) | -Textured Surface/Pavers | Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  |
| 1390773 | SW FLW Blvd | 37.81 (Rt) | -Textured Surface/Pavers | Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  |
| 1390799 | West FLW Blvd | 37.80 (Med) | -Length < 6' | Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  |
| Raintree Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390801 | West Raintree Dr | 38.59 (Med) | -Length < 6' | Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  |
| 1390828 | NW Raintree Dr | 38.58 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes. |  |  |
| 1390822 | NE Raintree Dr | 38.58 (Lt) | -Cross Slope > 2\% | Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  |
| 1390820 | NE Raintree Dr | 38.58 (Lt) | -Not 4' wide | Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  |
| 1390818 | East Raintree Dr | 38.60 (Lt) | -Length < 6' | Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  |
| 1390813 | SE Raintree Dr | 38.60 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| 1390806 | SW Raintree Dr | 38.61 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| 1390804 | SW Raintree Dr | 38.60 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| XXPED01 | N Raintree Dr | 38.58 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| XXPED02 | S Raintree Dr | 38.60 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| Thunderbird Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390833 | E Thunderbird Rd | 39.05 (Med) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cactus Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1394662 | NW Cactus Rd | 40.08 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| XXPED03 | NE Cactus Rd | 40.08 (Rt) | - No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| XXPED04 | N Cactus Rd | 40.08 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| XXPED05 | S Cactus Rd | 40.10 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| 1394650 | SE Cactus Rd | 40.10 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| 1394643 | SW Cactus Rd | 40.10 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| Shea Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1394684 | NW Shea Blvd | 41.05 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| 1394679 | NE Shea Blvd | 41.05 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| 1394672 | SE Shea Blvd | 41.08 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| 1394668 | SW Shea Blvd | 41.08 (Rt) | -No truncated domes -Cross Slope > 2\% | Reconstruct Pedestrian Island Crossing |  |  |
| XXPED06 | North Shea Blvd | 41.05 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |
| XXPED07 | South Shea Blvd | 41.08 (Rt) | -No truncated domes | Add truncated domes |  |  |

As mentioned above, there are no ADA compliant pedestrian island crossings within the project limits.

## 7. PEDESTRIAN OVERPASS/UNDERPASS CROSSING

There is 1 location throughout the project limits which has a pedestrian overpass or underpass, which is an overpass and is found to be ADA compliant.

The following table describes compliant pedestrian overpass and underpass locations:

Table 19: ADA Compliant Pedestrian Overpass/Underpass

| Asset ID | Direction | Beginning <br> MP | Overpass or <br> Underpass | Location |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Pedestrian Bridge |  |  |  |  |
| 1434217 | East/West | 39.56 | Overpass | Pedestrian Bridge is located over the SR 101L between <br> Thunderbird Road and Cactus Road |

## 8. OBSTRUCTIONS \& ADA FEATURES NEEDED

There are 38 areas containing obstructions and 16 locations which require new ADA features for the area to become compliant. The proposed action items for these areas are summarized in the table below:

| Proposed Action Item- Obstructions |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 운 } \\ & \frac{1}{\infty} \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ※ }}{\stackrel{y}{*}}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { o } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & n \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Repair Cracked/Uneven Concrete | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 12 |
| Adjust Utility Box to be Flush with Sidewalk \& Repair Sidewalk | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 16 |
| To Remain, Update FIS Status to Compliant | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| Total | 8 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 38 |

A listing of all locations containing obstructions is detailed in the table below:

Table 21: Locations with ADA Obstructions \& ADA Features Needed

| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Princess Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390752 | NW Princess Dr- East of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.57 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked concrete in ADA path | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390750 | NE Princess Dr-West of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.57 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked concrete in ADA path | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390742 | SE Princess Dr-West of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.60 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked concrete in ADA path | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | $\begin{gathered} \text { Beginning } \\ \text { MP } \end{gathered}$ | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1390839 | SE Princess Dr- West of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.60 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ | -Broken curb at curb ramp | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390739 | SW Princess Dr-East of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.60 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete in ADA path | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390740 | SW Princess Dr-East of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.60 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Sunken Concrete Panel | Repair Cracked/Uneven Concrete |  |  |
| 1390734 | SW Princess Dr-West of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.60 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Sunken Traffic Signal Box | Adjust Utility Box to be Flush with Sidewalk \& Repair Sidewalk |  |  |
| 1390735 | SW Princess Dr- West of SB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 36.60 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete in ADA Crosswalk path | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| Bell Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390766 | North Bell Rd SidewalkEastern side | $\begin{gathered} 37.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Separated Concrete panels | To Remain, Update FIS Status to Compliant |  |  |
| XXOB01 | NE Bell Rd-Curb Ramp West of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete in ADA Crosswalk path | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXOB02 | NE Bell Rd-Curb Ramp East of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Sunken Utility box in Curb Ramp | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXOB03 | SW Bell Rd-Sidewalk | $\begin{gathered} 37.09 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete in ADA path | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| XXOB04 | NW FLW Blvd-Curb Ramp West of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.79 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete Panel | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390842 | NE FLW Blvd-Eastern Island | $\begin{gathered} 37.79 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Sediment build up in ADA path | To Remain, Update FIS Status to Compliant |  |  |
| 1390800 | NE FLW Blvd-Eastern Island | $\begin{gathered} 37.79 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Sunken Utility box in ADA path | Adjust Utility Box to be Flush with Sidewalk \& Repair Sidewalk |  |  |
| XXOB05 | NE FLW Blvd-Curb Ramp East of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 37.79 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Sunken Concrete Panel | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| 1390784 | NE FLW Blvd- Sidewalk in front of overhead sign structure | $\begin{gathered} 37.79 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete panel | To Remain, Update FIS Status to Compliant |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| XXOB06 | SE FLW Blvd Sidewalk | $\begin{gathered} 37.81 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked concrete panels | Repair Cracked/Uneven Concrete |  |  |
| XXOB07 | SW FLW Blvd Sidewalk | $\begin{gathered} 37.81 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked concrete panel | Repair Cracked/Uneven Concrete |  |  |
| Raintree Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1390817 | SE Raintree Dr- Curb Ramp East of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 38.60 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete panel | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXOB08 | SE Raintree Dr-Cross walk in front of East Curb Ramp | $\begin{gathered} 38.60 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked concrete in Crosswalk path | Reconstruct Crosswalk with this Project, Update FIS |  |  |
| Thunderbird Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| XXOB09 | NW Thunderbird Rd-Curb Ramp West of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 39.04 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Extruded Utility box in ADA path | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| Cactus Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| XXOB10 | NW Cactus Rd- Curb Ramp West of SB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 40.08 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete panel | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXOB11 | NW Cactus Rd Pedestrian Island | $\begin{gathered} 40.08 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete panel | Repair Cracked/Uneven Concrete |  |  |
| XXOB12 | NW Cactus Rd Pedestrian Island | $\begin{gathered} 40.08 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete panel | Repair Cracked/Uneven Concrete |  |  |
| XXOB13 | NE Cactus Rd Pedestrian Island | $\begin{gathered} 40.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete panel | Repair Cracked/Uneven Concrete |  |  |
| XXOB14 | SE Cactus Rd- Sidewalk | $\begin{gathered} 40.10 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Sunken Utility cap in ADA path | Adjust Utility Box to be Flush with Sidewalk \& Repair Sidewalk |  |  |
| XXOB15 | SE Cactus Road- Curb Ramp East of NB off ramp | $\begin{gathered} 40.10 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete panel | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXOB16 | SE Cactus Rd- Pedestrian Island | $\begin{gathered} 40.10 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete panel | Repair Cracked/Uneven Concrete |  |  |
| 1394645 | South Cactus Rd Pedestrian Island | $\begin{gathered} 40.10 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Sunken Concrete panel | To Remain, Update FIS Status to Compliant |  |  |
| 1395167 | South Cactus RdPedestrian Island | $\begin{gathered} 40.10 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete panel | To Remain, Update FIS Status to Compliant |  |  |


| Asset ID | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| XXOB17 | SW Cactus Rd-Sidewalk | $\begin{gathered} 40.10 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ | -Sunken Utility cap in ADA path | Adjust Utility Box to be Flush with Sidewalk \& Repair Sidewalk |  |  |
| Shea Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1394677 | NE Shea Blvd-Curb Ramp East of NB on ramp | $\begin{gathered} 41.05 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Utility cap in the ADA path | Reconstruct Curb Ramp, Update FIS |  |  |
| XXOB18 | NE Shea Blvd -Sidewalk | $\begin{gathered} 41.05 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete panel | Repair Cracked/Uneven Concrete |  |  |
| XXOB19 | SE Shea Blvd Pedestrian Island | $\begin{gathered} 41.08 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete panel | Repair Cracked/Uneven Concrete |  |  |
| XXOB20 | SE Shea Blvd Pedestrian Island | $\begin{gathered} 41.08 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Sunken Concrete panels | Repair Cracked/Uneven Concrete |  |  |
| XXOB21 | SW Shea Blvd Pedestrian Island | $\begin{gathered} 41.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ | -Cracked Concrete panel | Repair Cracked/Uneven Concrete |  |  |
| 1394665 | SW Shea Blvd-Sidewalk | $\begin{gathered} 41.08 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ | -Utility cap in the ADA path | Adjust Utility Box to be Flush with Sidewalk \& Repair Sidewalk |  |  |

## 9. CROSSWALKS

There are 34 crosswalks located within the project limits. These were evaluated for a maximum cross slope of $2.0 \%$ for a continuous pedestrian pathway in a stop controlled or yield situation, and a maximum cross slope of $5.0 \%$ in a non-yield situation. Mid-block crossings are permitted to equal the street or highway grade. (Refer to PROWAG R302.6 Cross Slope).

The type of crosswalk (Yield, Non-Yield, Mid-Block) is indicated in the table below along with the cross slope of each crosswalk and the two curb ramps (Asset ID) which are connected by the crosswalk. The crosswalk cross slope shall be measured at various points in the crosswalk (wherever it appears there may be a grade change), and the crosswalk's compliancy determined. Any proposed action items for non-compliant crosswalks are summarized in the table below:

Table 22: Summary of Crosswalk Action Items

| Proposed Action Item- Crosswalks |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathscr{W} \\ & \frac{0}{3} \\ & \frac{2}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | ס 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| To Remain, Add to FIS |  | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 34 |
|  | Total | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 34 |

Field data for locations containing crosswalks was gathered and is detailed in the table below:
Table 23: Locations with Crosswalks

| Connecting Curb Ramps | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Princess Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390753 \\ & 1390751 \end{aligned}$ | NW Princess Dr | $\begin{gathered} 36.57 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390749 \\ & 1390748 \end{aligned}$ | NE Princess Dr | $\begin{gathered} 36.57 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390736 \\ & 1390753 \end{aligned}$ | East Princess Dr | $\begin{aligned} & 36.58 \\ & \text { (Med) } \end{aligned}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390748 \\ & 1390745 \end{aligned}$ | West Princess Dr | $\begin{aligned} & 36.58 \\ & \text { (Med) } \end{aligned}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390745 \\ & 1390744 \end{aligned}$ | SE Princess Dr | $\begin{gathered} 36.59 \\ (R \mathrm{t}) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390736 \\ & 1390738 \end{aligned}$ | SW Princess Dr | $\begin{gathered} 36.59 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| Bell Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390768 \\ & 1390767 \end{aligned}$ | NW Bell Rd | $\begin{gathered} 37.06 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |


| Connecting Curb Ramps | Location | Beginning MP | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1390764 \\ & 1390763 \end{aligned}$ | NE Bell Rd | $\begin{gathered} 37.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390763 \\ & 1390760 \end{aligned}$ | East Bell Rd | $\begin{gathered} 37.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390758 \\ & 1390760 \end{aligned}$ | SE Bell Rd | $\begin{gathered} 37.11 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390757 \\ & 1390756 \end{aligned}$ | SW Bell Rd | $\begin{gathered} 37.10 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390768 \\ & 1390756 \end{aligned}$ | West Bell Rd | $\begin{gathered} 37.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390798 \\ & 1390794 \end{aligned}$ | NW FLW Blvd | $\begin{gathered} 37.79 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390792 \\ & 1390785 \end{aligned}$ | NE FLW Blvd | $\begin{gathered} 37.79 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390785 \\ & 1390783 \end{aligned}$ | East FLW Blvd | $\begin{gathered} 37.80 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390783 \\ & 1390779 \end{aligned}$ | SE FLW Blvd | $\begin{gathered} 37.81 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390777 \\ & 1390772 \end{aligned}$ | SW FLW Blvd | $\begin{gathered} 37.81 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390798 \\ & 1390772 \end{aligned}$ | West FLW Blvd | $\begin{gathered} 37.80 \\ (\mathrm{Rt}) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| Raintree Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390831 \\ & 1390827 \end{aligned}$ | NW Raintree Dr | $\begin{gathered} 38.59 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390825 \\ & 1390819 \end{aligned}$ | NE Raintree Dr | $\begin{gathered} 38.59 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390819 \\ & 1390816 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | East Raintree Dr | $\begin{gathered} 38.59 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |


| Connecting <br> Curb <br> Ramps | Location | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Beginning } \\ & \mathrm{MP} \end{aligned}$ | Reason for Non-Compliance | Proposed Action | Final Design | Constructed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1390810 \\ & 1390816 \end{aligned}$ | SE Raintree Dr | $\begin{gathered} 38.60 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390802 \\ & 1390809 \end{aligned}$ | SW Raintree Dr | $\begin{gathered} 38.60 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390831 \\ & 1390802 \end{aligned}$ | West Raintree Dr | $\begin{gathered} 38.59 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| Thunderbird Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390836 \\ & 1390835 \end{aligned}$ | NW Thunderbird Rd | $\begin{gathered} 39.04 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1390834 \\ & 1390832 \end{aligned}$ | East Thunderbird Rd | $\begin{gathered} 39.05 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| Cactus Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1394664 \\ & 1394661 \end{aligned}$ | NW Cactus Rd | $\begin{gathered} 40.08 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1394658 \\ & 1394655 \end{aligned}$ | NE Cactus Rd | $\begin{gathered} 40.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1394648 \\ & 1394652 \end{aligned}$ | SE Cactus Rd | $\begin{gathered} 40.10 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1394642 \\ & 1394646 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | SW Cactus Rd | $\begin{gathered} 40.10 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| Shea Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 1394685 \\ \text { XXPEDO6 } \end{array}$ | NW Shea Blvd | $\begin{gathered} 41.05 \\ \text { (Rt) } \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { XXPED06 } \\ 1394678 \end{array}$ | NE Shea Blvd | $\begin{gathered} 41.05 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 1394675 \\ \text { XXPED07 } \end{array}$ | SE Shea Blvd | $\begin{gathered} 41.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { XXPEDO7 } \\ & 1394666 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | SW Shea Blvd | $\begin{gathered} 41.08 \\ (R t) \end{gathered}$ |  | To Remain, Add to FIS |  |  |

## APPENDIX

ADA Feature Location Map (Non-Compliant Only) Appendix A
ADA Feature Photos (Non-Compliant Only) Appendix B
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101 Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd
101 Final DCR Uodate

APPENDIX G: Irrigation System Component Replacements

101 Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd
Final DCR Update

| CONTROLLER DESCRIPTION | ADOT A1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| LOCATION | SW Corner of SR 101L/Bell Road |
| WATER METER | 8749 E . Bell Rd. |
| POWER METER | 16700 N. Pima Rd. |
| SALVAGE EXISTING AND replace with new of the FOLLOWING: | IRRInet ACE3600, 32-Station Controller Unit |
|  | Controller Cabinet |
|  | Data Industrial 250 In-Line Flow Sensor with 1-1/2" Brass Tee |
|  | Data Industrial Series 5000 Flow Monitor |
|  | Morrill Industries 2" Stainless Steel Screen Filter with Flush Valve |
|  | Pressure Transducer |
|  | ACR Antenna 800 MHz YAGI |
| ADDITIONAL WORK ITEMS | 2" Full Port Brass Ball Valve before Master Valve |
|  | Provide fiber connection from the ADOT FMS trunk line to irrigation controller cabinet. This work will include a new $2^{\prime \prime}$ conduit, which will run from the ADOT FMS trunk to a No. 7 pull box directly adjacent to the enclosure. All work will be completed per ADOT ITS standards for fiber optic cable installations. |
|  | Add shade fabric on all sides of enclosure (excluding gate side/wall side) from top rail to $30^{\prime \prime}$ above concrete slab |
|  | Repaint fence enclosure ADOT Tan |
| NOTES | Protect existing hose bib in place |
|  | No replacement needed for roof fabric |


| CONTROLLER DESCRIPTION | ADOT A2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| LOCATION | SW Corner of SR 101L/Frank Lloyd Wright |
| WATER METER | 15648 N. Pima Rd. |
| POWER METER | 15658 N. Pima Rd. |
| SALVAGE EXISTING AND replace with new of the FOLLOWING: | IRRInet ACE3600, 32-Station Controller Unit |
|  | Controller Cabinet |
|  | Data Industrial 250 In-Line Flow Sensor with 1-1/2" Brass Tee |
|  | Data Industrial Series 5000 Flow Monitor |
|  | Morrill Industries 2" Stainless Steel Screen Filter with Flush Valve |
|  | Pressure Transducer |
|  | ACR Antenna 800 MHz YAGI |
| ADDITIONAL WORK ITEMS | 2" Full Port Brass Ball Valve before Master Valve |
|  | Provide fiber connection from the ADOT FMS trunk line to irrigation controller cabinet. This work will include a new $2^{\prime \prime}$ conduit, which will run from the ADOT FMS trunk to a No. 7 pull box directly adjacent to the enclosure. All work will be completed per ADOT ITS standards for fiber optic cable installations. |
|  | Add shade fabric on all sides of enclosure (excluding gate side/wall side) from top rail to $30^{\prime \prime}$ above concrete slab |
|  | Repaint fence enclosure brown to match existing Repaint half block wall ADOT Tan |
| NOTES | Protect existing hose bib in place |
|  | No replacement needed for roof fabric |


| CONTROLLER DESCRIPTION | ADOT A3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| LOCATION | NE Corner of SR 101L/Thunderbird Rd. |
| WATER METER | 8802 E. Thunderbird Rd. |
| POWER METER | 8808 E. Thunderbird Rd. |
| SALVAGE EXISTING AND replace with new of the FOLLOWING: | IRRInet ACE3600, 32-Station Controller Unit |
|  | Controller Cabinet |
|  | Data Industrial 250 In-Line Flow Sensor with 1-1/2" Brass Tee |
|  | Data Industrial Series 5000 Flow Monitor |
|  | Morrill Industries 2" Stainless Steel Screen Filter with Flush Valve |
|  | Pressure Transducer |
|  | ACR Antenna 800 MHz YAGI |
| ADDITIONAL WORK ITEMS | 2" Full Port Brass Ball Valve before Master Valve |
|  | Provide fiber connection from the ADOT FMS trunk line to irrigation controller cabinet. This work will include a new $2^{\prime \prime}$ conduit, which will run from the ADOT FMS trunk to a No. 7 pull box directly adjacent to the enclosure. All work will be completed per ADOT ITS standards for fiber optic cable installations. |
|  | Replace existing roof fabric and cable |
|  | Add shade fabric on all sides of enclosure (excluding gate side/wall side) from top rail to $30^{\prime \prime}$ above concrete slab |
|  | Repaint fence enclosure ADOT Tan |
| NOTES | Protect existing hose bib in place |


| CONTROLLER DESCRIPTION | ADOT A4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Location | NE Corner of SR 101L/Cactus Rd. |
| WATER METER | 8808 E. Cactus Rd. |
| POWER METER | 12235 N. Pima Rd. |
| SALVAGE EXISTING AND | IRRInet ACE3600, 32-Station Controller Unit |
|  | Controller Cabinet |
|  | Data Industrial 250 In-Line Flow Sensor with 1-1/2" Brass Tee |
|  | Morrill Industries 2" Stainless Steel Screen Filter with Flush Valve |
|  | Pressure Transducer |
|  | ACR Antenna 800 MHz YAGI |
| ADDITIONAL WORK ITEMS | 2" Full Port Brass Ball Valve before Master Valve |
|  | Provide fiber connection from the ADOT FMS trunk line to irrigation controller cabinet. This work will include a new $2^{\prime \prime}$ conduit, which will run from the ADOT FMS trunk to a No. 7 pull box directly adjacent to the enclosure. All work will be completed per ADOT ITS standards for fiber optic cable installations. |
|  | Shade fabric on all sides of enclosure (excluding gate side/wall side) from top rail to $30^{\prime \prime}$ above concrete slab |
|  | Repaint fence enclosure ADOT Tan |
| NOTES | Protect existing hose bib in place |
|  | No replacement needed for roof fabric |

## AロロT

101 Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea Blvd
Final DCR Update

| CONTROLLER DESCRIPTION | ADOT A5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| LOCATION | NW Corner of SR 101L/Shea Blvd. |
| WATER METER | 8790 E. Shea Blvd. |
| POWER METER | 8782 E. Shea Blvd. |
| SALVAGE EXISTING AND | IRRInet-M, 16-Station Controller Unit |
|  | Controller Cabinet |
|  | Data Industrial 250 In-Line Flow Sensor with 1-1/2" Brass Tee |
|  | Morrill Industries 2" Stainless Steel Screen Filter with Flush Valve |
|  | Pressure Transducer |
|  | SR Antenna $400 \mathrm{MHz} \mathrm{YAGI} \mathrm{with} 18{ }^{\prime \prime}$-36" mast |
| ADDITIONAL WORK ITEMS | 2" Full Port Brass Ball Valve before Master Valve |
|  | Provide fiber connection from the ADOT FMS trunk line to irrigation controller cabinet. This work will include a new $2^{\prime \prime}$ conduit, which will run from the ADOT FMS trunk to a No. 7 pull box directly adjacent to the enclosure. All work will be completed per ADOT ITS standards for fiber optic cable installations. |
|  | Replace existing roof fabric and cable |
|  | Add shade fabric on all sides of enclosure (excluding gate side/wall side) from top rail to $30^{\prime \prime}$ above concrete slab |
|  | Repaint fence enclosure ADOT Tan |
| NOTES | Protect existing hose bib in place |

101 Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Dr to Shea BIvd

Infrastructure Delivery \& Operations Division

# CERTIFICATION FOR PROPRIETARY-MATERIAL USE, ESSENTIAL FOR SYNCHRONIZATION 

TO: Mr. Michael DenBleyker, PE, Assistant State Engineer
FROM: Mr. E. Leroy Brady, PLA, FASLA, Manager and Chief Landscape Architect


CC: Tafwachi Katapa, Project Manager
DATE: September 25,2020
Project No.: $\quad 101$ MA 036 F0123 01D
Federal Aid No.: $\quad$ 101-B(210)T
Pima Freeway (SR 101L): Princess Drive to Shea Boulevard
General Purpose Lanes

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This project is located in ADOT's Central District within the City of Scottsdale, in Maricopa County, Arizona. The work will consist of adding one general-purpose lane in both the northbound and southbound directions through outside widening on the SR 101L Pima Freeway from Princess Drive (Milepost 36.50 ) to the Shea Boulevard (Milepost 41.20). Additional construction would include:

- Widening the Pima Road TI Overpass (Structure No. 1459 \& 2656, MP 36.59);
- Widening the Bell Road Tl Overpass (Structure No. 2510 \& 2511, MP 37.06);
- Widening the CAP Canal Bridge (Structure No. 2506 \& 2507, MP 37.66);
- Widening the Frank Lloyd Wright TI Overpass (Structure No. 2505 \& 2512, MP. 37.78);
- Reconstructing the existing TI at Frank Lloyd Wright Boulevard to a Tight Diamond Interchange;
- Constructing right turns lanes at the Raintree Drive TI;
- Extending the right turn lane at Shea Blvd for the WB to NB traffic movement;
- Installing retaining walls;
- Expanding the existing storm drain pipe and inlet system;
- Removing and replacing existing guardrail, barrier, and chain link fence, as needed;
- Installing and/or upgrading Freeway Management System (FMS) facilities within the project limits, including dynamic message signs (DMS) and structures;
- Converting existing high pressure sodium (HPS) fixtures with new light-emitting diode (LED) fixtures in the SR 101L median and relocating existing light poles, as needed;
- Removing and replacing existing traffic signals throughout the project limits, as needed;
- Removing and replacing existing signs, object markers, and milepost markers;
- Painting existing infrastructure as needed and applying aesthetic treatments to new infrastructure to complement existing;
- Relocating utilities;
- Clearing and grubbing vegetation within the existing right-of-way;
- Landscaping areas disturbed by construction and controlling noxious weeds within the project limits, as needed.


## FHWA OVERSIGHT: $\square$ YES $\boxtimes$ NO

## PROPRIETARY MATERIAL:

As specified in the H4083 01C, SR 101L, Pima Rd. to Shea Blvd. project plans, completed in 2001, the original granite mulch specified for the project corridor was San Tan, 1-1/4" minus. This granite mulch material is no longer available. Alternative granite mulch materials samples have been evaluated and it is determined that Cheyenne, $1-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ minus, by Pioneer Landscape Centers, is the best match for use in replacing/installing granite mulch as a part of the scope of work described above.

Approval is requested for the use of this proprietary item in order to create uniformity and consistency in the ground plane of the landscape areas throughout the corridor. Additionally, a uniform and consistent granite mulch palette will be easier to maintain.

Approved:


Date: $9 / 30 / 20$
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[^4]:    Figure 3.4A - Raintree Drive Tight Diamond Interchange
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[^16]:    Figure 1.1 - Project Location

[^17]:    Figure 3.6-2040 Build Shea Boulevard TI Lane Geometry and Traffic Volumes

[^18]:    Figure 4.3 - SR 101L Mainline Crash Heat Map, 2015-2019

[^19]:    Figure 4.4 - SR 101L Mainline Crash Severity, Princess Drive to Thunderbird Road, 2015-2019

