

Mr. David R. Consigli Chairman Milford Zoning Board of Appeals Town of Milford 52 Main Street Milford, MA 01757 November 23, 2020

Ref. T0718.02

Re: The Residences at Stone Ridge Phase II Response to Traffic Comments

Dear Mr. Consigli:

TEC offers this letter as a formal response to technical transportation related comments provided by the Town's peer reviewer, BSC Group in their letter to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) dated July 8, 2020.

The following is a summary of our responses to the traffic comments listed within each memorandum.

Transportation Peer Review, BSC Comments (July 8, 2020)

Trip Generation

1. BSC verified the trip generation for the apartment component of Phase I and concurs with the methodology and estimates. BSC also concurs that the mitigation implemented as part of Phase I will address the traffic impacts of the full build-out of Phase I. No additional mitigation is required as part of Phase I of the project

TEC Response: Agreed.

2. BSC verified the trip generation for Phase II and concurs with the methodology and estimates. However, peak hour trip generation for office developments and residential uses have different directional characteristics. The current Phase II development program is estimated to generate 162 exiting trips during the weekday morning peak hour and 168 entering trips during the weekday evening peak hour. The directional peak hour trips exceed the Phase II threshold estimates by 102 exiting trips during the weekday morning peak hour and by 90 entering trips during the weekday evening peak hour. Based on these variations in peak hour directional flow, BSC recommends further evaluation of the impacts of the Phase II development. Our specific recommendations are presented in the following section.

TEC Response: TEC's responses are presented below.

Engineering Tomorrow's Solutions Today.

T:\T0718\T0718.02\Docs\Memos & Trans\11-2020 Response to Comments\T0718.02_Response Letter 11-23-2020.docx

Stone Ridge Development Response to Comments November 23, 2020 Page 2 of 7



Phase II Improvements and Recommendations

- 3. The nature of the Phase I and Phase II land uses have significantly changed since the issuance of the Section 61 findings. Although the total peak hour trip generation estimates are expected to be reduced under the current proposal when compared to the 2009 approved program, the directional peak hour trip generation estimates exhibit major differences that may have a material impact on traffic operations along the site driveway, at the intersection with Cedar Street, and at the I-495/Cedar Street interchange. The mitigation measures defined in the Section 61 Findings should be re-evaluated for their appropriateness. BSC recommends that the Proponent provide an updated traffic operations analysis, in accordance with MassDOT guidelines, based on the updated Phase II traffic volumes at the following intersections:
 - Cedar Street/Deer Street
 - Cedar Street/I-495 Northbound Ramps
 - Cedar Street/I-495 Southbound Ramps

TEC Response: TEC acknowledges that the peak hour trip distribution characteristics of the previously approved office building and the proposed residential development are different. However, the overall peak hour trip generation for the residential development continues to be significantly lower than the office buildings projected in Phase II. Further, the residential distribution of traffic allows for a better balance of traffic flow to and from Deer Street with the other commercial uses.

TEC has prepared traffic operations analysis for the three intersections above. Traffic counts conducted at Cedar Street / Deer Street in 2019 to obtain the current trip generation of the site were used as well as 2018 counts conducted at the intersections of Cedar Street with the Route 495 Ramps. The seasonal adjustment and background growth rates used within TEC's Phase I Technical Memorandum, dated March 12, 2018 were used to project the traffic volumes to a design year of 2027. The projected trips from Phase I were added to provide the No Build volumes. The distribution of the Phase II site generated traffic volumes was calculated based upon 2000 Census Journey-to-Work data to provide the Build volumes. This distribution was previously reviewed and approved. Figures 1 through 3 detail the No Build, Site Generated, and Build volumes calculated.

Capacity analyses were prepared for the No Build and Build conditions at the three intersections. The worksheets are attached. The results are summarized as follows:

• Cedar Street / Deer Street

The intersection does operate with a projected level of service F on the left turns exiting the site in the unsignalized condition during the weekday evening peak period with the Phase II residential development traffic. The projected queue length on this approach is one vehicle, which can be accommodated without restricting on-site circulation or restricting right turn exiting vehicles. Stone Ridge Development Response to Comments November 23, 2020 Page 3 of 7



This level of service is common for unsignalized intersections. TEC notes that the capacity analysis model does not account for the gaps in traffic flow northbound along Cedar Street caused by the signalized I-495 northbound ramp intersection less than 1000 feet to the south, which will allow left turning vehicles to exit with reduced delays over those projected. Further, the site traffic generation and the background traffic growth rates are both conservative, indicating that the intersection may operate with better levels of service in the future should these volumes not be realized.

The installation of a traffic signal at the intersection was considered. The primary movements entering and exiting the site are to the south along Cedar Street toward I-495. The existing exclusive right turn lane along Deer Street and minimal delay would suggest removing these volumes from the traffic signal warrant analysis would be appropriate, per the *MUTCD*¹. The left turn movement volumes exiting the site do not meet signal warrant requirements.

• Cedar Street / I-495 NB Ramps

The intersection continues to operate with acceptable levels of service during the weekday morning and weekday evening peak periods with the Phase II residential traffic.

• Cedar Street / I-495 SB Ramps

This intersection operates with levels of service F on the eastbound Route I-495 Ramp approach movements during both peak hours in the No Build condition. The approach volumes exceed capacity. In this condition, the capacity analysis model typically will project unrealistic delays and queue lengths that are not actually observed or experienced at the intersection. Further, TEC notes that the capacity analysis model does not account for the gaps in traffic flow along Cedar Street caused by traffic signals located approximately 1000 feet to both the north and the south of this intersection, which will allow turning vehicles to exit the ramp with reduced delays over those projected. The levels of service F will continue with the addition of Phase II residential traffic volumes. The residential project has no identifiable impact on the operation of the intersection. TEC notes that the overall Phase II traffic volumes increase the volume of traffic through this intersection by 1.7% during the morning peak hour and 2.0% during the evening peak hour, which will not be noticeable as it is approximately one additional vehicle through the intersection each minute of the peak hour.

The installation of a traffic signal at the intersection was considered. The primary movement exiting the I-495 SB Ramp is the right turn movement, toward the south, with less than 10% of the vehicles using the ramp turning left during the peak hours. The existing channelized right turn lane along the

¹ Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices, 2009 Edition; Federal Highway Administration; 2009

Stone Ridge Development Response to Comments November 23, 2020 Page 4 of 7



SB Ramp approach would suggest that removing most if not all of these volumes from the traffic signal warrant analysis would be appropriate, per the *MUTCD*. Considering the left turn volumes exiting the ramp only, the intersection would not meet signal warrant requirements in the existing or future conditions.

4. BSC recommends that the Proponent review the operations analysis and determine if additional or alternative mitigation is necessary at the above locations. The mitigation measures defined in the Section 61 Findings are currently over ten years old. Due to the change of the development program and potential changes in traffic patterns over the past ten years, the overall needs of the surrounding transportation network may have changed.

TEC Response: Agreed. The Project will require a Notice of Project Change (NPC) with the MEPA office. Within that submission, the Applicant and TEC will discuss any changes necessary to the Section 61 Findings with MassDOT and the MEPA office.

5. The intersection of Cedar Street/Dilla Street/Fortune Boulevard is listed as a Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) high crash cluster. BSC recommends that the Proponent conduct a detailed crash analysis at this intersection using available crash records from the Milford Police Department. The crash analysis should identify any correctable safety issues and provide recommendations for improvement.

TEC Response: Crash data for this intersection was compiled and analyzed for the most recent approximate three-year period (2017-present) on file with MassDOT, which were obtained from MassDOT Interactive Mapping Portal for Analysis and Crash Tracking (IMPACT) online database. The motor vehicle crash data was reviewed to determine crash trends at the intersection.

In addition to examining the number of crashes at the intersection, a crash rate was calculated to compare the occurrence of crashes to the volume of traffic passing through the intersection. The crash rate per million entering vehicles (MEV) was calculated using the weekday evening peak hour volumes from 2017 turning movement counts, a calculated K-factor obtained from 2017 ATR counts, and the total years of analyzed crash data. The crash rates at the study area intersections were compared to the statewide and district- wide averages published by MassDOT in June 2018 to determine the significance of the crash occurrence. The statewide average for signalized intersections is 0.78, and the District 3 average for signalized intersections is 0.89. This intersection has a crash rate of 2.02, well above the District 3 and statewide average.

A summary of the vehicle crash data and rates is provided in the following table. There is an average of 23 crashes per year recorded at the intersection. A total of 33% of the crashes are rear-end crashes, 30% are angled crashes, and 29% are sideswipe crashes. The number of rear-end crashes and angled crashes may indicate that the traffic signal clearance intervals, signal timings and/or signal phasing need to be revisited to meet the current demands at the intersection. The intersection should be studied in detail and a Road Safety Audit performed to identify recommendations for improvement. TEC notes that the Phase II residential project adds 31 vehicles through the intersection during the morning peak hour and 42 vehicles during the



Stone Ridge Development Response to Comments November 23, 2020 Page 5 of 7

evening peak hour, which will not be noticeable or measurably impact the operations of this intersection.

Crash Data Summary

Ē	Parameter	Dilla Street / Fortune Boulevard / Cedar Street
Year	2017	18
	2018	29
	2019	<u>22</u>
	TOTAL	69
Average	Annual Crashes	23
C	crash Rate	2.02
Manner of	Angle	21
Crash	Rear-end	23
	Single Vehicle	3
	Sideswipe	20
	Head-on	0
	Pedestrian / Cvclist	0
	Other / Not Reported	<u>2</u>
	TOTAL	69
Road	Dry	54
Surface	Wet	9
Conditions	Snow / Ice	4
	Other / Unknown	<u>2</u>
	TOTAL	69
Injury	Property Damage	56
Status (Crash	Non-Fatal Injury	10
Severity)	Not Reported	<u>3</u>
	TOTAL	69
Day of	Monday-Friday	52
Week	Saturday-Sunday	<u>17</u>
	TOTAL	69
Time of Day	6:00AM-9:00AM	10
	9:00AM-3:00PM	31
	3:00PM-6:00PM	13
	6:00PM-6:00AM	<u>15</u>
	TOTAL	69

Stone Ridge Development Response to Comments November 23, 2020 Page 6 of 7



- 6. BSC recommends that the Proponent conduct a traffic monitoring study upon 85 percent occupancy of the Phase I residential units. The monitoring study should include 48-hour automatic traffic recorder (ATR) counts along Deer Street and weekday morning and evening peak hour turning movement counts (TMCs) at the following locations:
 - Cedar Street/Deer Street
 - Cedar Street/I-495 Northbound Ramps
 - Cedar Street/I-495 Southbound Ramps
 - Cedar Street/Dilla Street/Fortune Boulevard
 - Cedar Street/East Main Street
 - Dilla Street/Purchase Street

TEC Response: The Applicant will commit to performing a monitoring study at the intersection of Cedar Street / Deer Street to confirm the trip generation projections for the residential units upon 85 percent occupancy of the Phase II units. This monitoring will include a 72-hour Automatic Traffic Recorded along Deer Street recorded mid-week as well as 12-hour manual turning movement counts at the intersection of Deer Street / Cedar Street on a typical weekday when school is in session to determine peak hour and daily traffic generated by Stone Ridge. Should the traffic volume generated by the site be lower than projected, further study of the remaining intersections would be unnecessary as these intersections were analyzed for the original Section 61 Finding under higher traffic generation conditions.

7. BSC recommends that the Proponent use the results of the traffic monitoring study to determine the need for traffic signal timing, phasing, or geometric modifications at the signalized intersections and the need for traffic signal installation or other geometric modifications at the unsignalized intersections.

TEC Response: Should the counted site generated trip generation be more than projected within the Phase II traffic analyses, prepared by TEC, dated March 16, 2020, a traffic signal warrant analysis at the intersection of Cedar Street and Deer Street will be performed.

Site Access

8. Access to the project site is via Deer Street off Cedar Street. The provision of a singular access/egress to the proposed residential development is a concern. The Proponent should explore additional access options for emergency purposes.

TEC Response: TEC acknowledges that access to the site is via Deer Street from Cedar Street. The Applicant has explored additional means of access. Given that the site is bounded by I-495 to the southwest and restricted conservation land to the northwest and east, there is no other means to provide alternative vehicular access. It should be noted that the Deer Street bridge crossing across the Charles River was built to the highest level of bridge design designated by FEMA. It should also be noted that the site has reserved a cleared area that can accommodate

Stone Ridge Development Response to Comments November 23, 2020 Page 7 of 7



an emergency helicopter landing. Each project located along the site has a dedicated driveway onto Deer Street and all buildings are provided 360-degree fire vehicle access. The site design provides sufficient emergency access to the site while remaining environmentally responsible. The Applicant will continue to ensure that Deer Street will remain accessible at all times.

We trust that the above information adequately addresses the comments regarding traffic for the Stone Ridge residential development in Milford. Please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (978) 794-1792 if you have any additional questions. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, TEC, Inc. *"The Engineering Corporation"*

Elizabeth Ollman

Elizabeth Oltman, PE Transportation Planning Services Director

Attachments

296 UNITS

L	Ceuar Street (Koule 85) / Deer Street												
		2027	No Build		2027 Build								
Intersection / Lane Group	V/C ^a	Delay ^b	LOS ^c	Queued	V/C	Delay	LOS	Queue					
Cedar Street (Route 85) / Deer S Weekday Morning Peak Period	Street												
Cedar Street NBL	0.003	8.1	А	<25	0.07	8.3	Α	<25					
Deer Street EBL	0.19	30.8	D	25	0.27	42.3	Е	25					
Deer Street EBR	0.16	11.5	В	<25	0.25	12.3	В	25					
Weekday Evening Peak Period													
Cedar Street NBL	0.14	9.7	А	<25	0.22	10.2	В	<25					
Deer Street EBL	0.17	37.6	E	<25	0.25	53.9	F	25					
Deer Street EBR	0.18	14.6	В	<25	0.27	15.8	С	25					

Intersection Capacity and Queue Analysis Summary Cedar Street (Route 85) / Deer Street

^a Volume-to-capacity ratio

^b Delay expressed in seconds per vehicle (average)

^c Level of service

^d 50th/95th Percentile Queue for signalized intersections

Intersection Capacity and Queue Analysis Summary Cedar Street (Route 85) / I-495 NB Ramps

		2027	No Build		2027 Build					
Intersection / Lane Group	V/C ^a	Delay ^b	LOS ^c	Queued	V/C	Delay	LOS	Queue		
Cedar Street (Route 85) / I-49										
Weekday Morning Peak Period										
I-495 NB Off-ramp WBL	0.60	22.6	С	107/160	0.60	23.1	С	110/164		
I-495 NB Off-ramp WBR	0.01	0.1	Α	<25/<25	0.01	0.1	А	<25/<25		
Cedar Street NBL	0.89	14.3	В	278/638	0.90	15.2	В	249/551		
Cedar Street NBT	0.45	7.0	А	201/719	0.47	7.0	А	119/214		
Cedar Street SB Approach	0.67	22.9	С	133/214	0.68	23.0	С	141/212		
Overall Intersection	-	16.0	В	-	-	16.5	В	-		
Weekday Evening Peak Period										
I-495 NB Off-ramp WBL	0.72	41.6	D	142/191	0.73	42.5	D	142/194		
I-495 NB Off-ramp WBR	0.01	0.1	Α	51/174	0.01	0.1	А	<25/<25		
Cedar Street NBL	0.97	45.7	D	602/906	0.98	47.9	D	545/805		
Cedar Street NBT	0.33	5.7	Α	124/219	0.37	6.0	А	123/203		
Cedar Street SB Approach	0.88	42.8	D	308/498	0.89	45.0	D	305/474		
Overall Intersection	-	37.0	D	-	-	37.9	D	-		

^a Volume-to-capacity ratio

^b Delay expressed in seconds per vehicle (average)

^c Level of service

^d 50th/95th Percentile Queue for signalized intersections

Ce	Cedar Street (Route 85) / 1-495 SB Ramps												
		2027	No Build			2027 Build							
Intersection / Lane Group	V/C ^a	V/C ^a Delay ^b LOS ^c Queue ^d		V/C	Delay	LOS	Queue						
Cedar Street (Route 85) / I-49 Weekday Morning Peak Period	5 SB Ram	ps											
Cedar Street SBL	0.29	13.4	В	25	0.32	13.8	В	50					
I-495 SB Off-ramp EBL	1.29	exceed	F	100	>1.5	exceed	F	150					
I-495 SB Off-ramp EBR	1.26	147.9	F	775	1.3	149.5	F	775					
Weekday Evening Peak Period													
Cedar Street SBL	0.55	18.1	С	75	0.56	19.2	С	100					
I-495 SB Off-ramp EBL	>1.5	exceed	F	exceed	>1.5	exceed	F	exceed					
I-495 SB Off-ramp EBR	1.37	200.7	F	850	1.39	207.4	F	850					

Intersection Capacity and Queue Analysis Summary Cedar Street (Poute 85) / I-495 SB Pamps

^a Volume-to-capacity ratio ^b Delay expressed in seconds per vehicle (average)

^c Level of service ^d 95th Percentile Queue for unsignalized intersections

Attachments

Traffic Volume Figures Capacity Analyses Worksheets (296 Units) Crash Data







C:\Users\kantunes\appdata\loca\\temp\AcPublish_12020\T0718.20_Traffic Networks.dwg 11/19/2020 3:52:55 PM

The Engineering Corp

	٦	\mathbf{r}	1	1	Ŧ	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	٦	1	۲.	•	ef 👘	
Traffic Volume (vph)	31	96	3	860	309	7
Future Volume (vph)	31	96	3	860	309	7
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	0	0	300			0
Storage Lanes	1	1	1			0
Taper Length (ft)	25		25			
Link Speed (mph)	30			30	30	
Link Distance (ft)	322			469	467	
Travel Time (s)	7.3			10.7	10.6	
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.88	0.88	0.91	0.91
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	23%	9%	2%	4%	0%
Shared Lane Traffic (%)						
Sign Control	Stop			Free	Free	
Intersection Summary						
Area Type:	Other					

Area Type: Control Type: Unsignalized

Intersection							
Int Delay, s/veh	1.5						
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations	٦	1	1	•	ef -		
Traffic Vol, veh/h	31	96	3	860	309	7	
Future Vol, veh/h	31	96	3	860	309	7	
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None	
Storage Length	0	0	300	-	-	-	
Veh in Median Storage,	# 0	-	-	0	0	-	
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-	
Peak Hour Factor	94	94	88	88	91	91	
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	23	9	2	4	0	
Mvmt Flow	33	102	3	977	340	8	
Maior/Minor N	1inor2	I	Maior1	I	Maior2		
Conflicting Flow All	1327	344	348	0		0	
Stage 1	344	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	983	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy	64	6 43	4 19	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.4	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.4	-	-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.507	2,281	-	-	-	
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	173	654	1173	-	-	-	
Stage 1	722		-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	366	-	-	-	-	-	
Platoon blocked. %				-	-	-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	172	654	1173	-	-	-	
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	172	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	720	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	366	-	-	-	-	-	
J. S. J.							
Approach	EB		NB		SB		
HCM Control Delay. s	16.2		0		0		
HCM LOS	С		-				
	2						
Minor Lane/Maior Mymt		NRI	NBT	FBI n1	FBI n2	SBT	SBR
Canacity (veh/h)		1172		172	65/		
HCM Lane V/C Datio		0 003	-	0 102	0.156	-	
HCM Control Delay (c)		0.003 Q 1	-	30.172	11 5	-	_
HCM Lane LOS		Δ	-	30.0 П	R	-	
HCM 95th %tile O(veh)		0	_	07	0.6	_	
HCM Control Delay, s HCM LOS Minor Lane/Major Mvmt Capacity (veh/h) HCM Lane V/C Ratio HCM Control Delay (s) HCM Lane LOS HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	16.2 C	NBL 1173 0.003 8.1 A 0	0 NBT - - - -	EBLn1 172 0.192 30.8 D 0.7	0 654 0.156 11.5 B 0.6	SBT - - -	SBR - - - - -

Lanes, Volumes, Timings 2: Cedar Street (Route 85) & I-495 Northbound Ramps

	≯	→	\mathbf{r}	1	+	•	1	1	1	1	Ŧ	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations				ሻሻ		1	1	•			≜1 ≽	
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	0	380	0	463	612	442	0	0	389	52
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	0	380	0	463	612	442	0	0	389	52
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	0		0	0		0	350		0	0		0
Storage Lanes	0		0	2		1	1		0	0		0
Taper Length (ft)	25			25			25			25		
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		300			300			799			486	
Travel Time (s)		6.8			6.8			18.2			11.0	
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)			2									
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)			3									
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.91	0.91	0.91
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	2%	7%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Turn Type				Prot		Perm	pm+pt	NA			NA	
Protected Phases				4			1	6			2	
Permitted Phases						4	6					
Detector Phase				4		4	1	6			2	
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)				6.0		6.0	6.0	10.0			10.0	
Minimum Split (s)				12.0		12.0	9.0	16.0			16.0	
Total Split (s)				41.0		41.0	38.0	79.0			41.0	
Total Split (%)				34.2%		34.2%	31.7%	65.8%			34.2%	
Maximum Green (s)				35.0		35.0	35.0	73.0			35.0	
Yellow Time (s)				3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0			3.0	
All-Red Time (s)				3.0		3.0	0.0	3.0			3.0	
Lost Time Adjust (s)				0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0	
Total Lost Time (s)				6.0		6.0	3.0	6.0			6.0	
Lead/Lag							Lead				Lag	
Lead-Lag Optimize?							Yes				Yes	
Vehicle Extension (s)				5.0		5.0	2.0	2.0			2.0	
Recall Mode				None		None	None	Min			Min	
Intersection Summary												

Area Type:OtherCycle Length: 120Actuated Cycle Length: 91.5Natural Cycle: 65Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated

Splits and Phases: 2: Cedar Street (Route 85) & I-495 Northbound Ramps

↑ ø1	Ø2	√ Ø4
38 s	41s	41 s
₫ ø6		
79 s		

Traffic Impact Memorandum 11/19/2020

Synchro 10 Report Timing Plan: Weekday AM

	1	•	1	1	Ŧ
Lane Group	WBL	WBR	NBL	NBT	SBT
Lane Group Flow (vph)	437	532	695	502	484
v/c Ratio	0.48	0.77	0.91	0.44	0.73
Control Delay	30.5	17.6	36.0	12.2	41.9
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	30.5	17.6	36.0	12.2	41.9
Queue Length 50th (ft)	108	76	278	138	133
Queue Length 95th (ft)	161	199	#638	267	214
Internal Link Dist (ft)				719	406
Turn Bay Length (ft)			350		
Base Capacity (vph)	1348	844	770	1541	1374
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.32	0.63	0.90	0.33	0.35
Interesting Commences					

Intersection Summary

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

	≯	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	1	1	1	1	ţ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations				ሻሻ		1	ľ	•			∱ ⊅	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	0	0	0	380	0	463	612	442	0	0	389	52
Future Volume (veh/h)	0	0	0	380	0	463	612	442	0	0	389	52
Number				7	4	14	1	6	16	5	2	12
Initial Q (Qb), veh				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)				1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj				1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Adi Sat Flow, veh/h/ln				1881	0	1863	1776	1900	0	0	1883	1900
Adi Flow Rate, veh/h				437	0	0	695	502	0	0	427	0
Adi No. of Lanes				2	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	0
Peak Hour Factor				0.87	0.87	0.87	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.91	0.91	0.91
Percent Heavy Veh %				0.07	0.07	2.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.71	0.71	1
Can veh/h				722	0	222	785	1111	0	0	630	0
Arrive On Green				0.21	0 00	0.00	0.36	0.58	0 00	0 00	0.18	0 00
Sat Flow, yob/b				2/76	0.00	1502	1601	1000	0.00	0.00	2767	0.00
				127	0	1303	405	E00	0	0	107	0
GIP VOIUME(V), VEN/M				437	0	1500	090 1701	1000	0	0	427	0
GIP Sat Flow(s), ven/n/in				1/38	0	1583	1091	1900	0	0	1/89	0
U Serve(g_s), s				6.7	0.0	0.0	1/./	8.7	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.0
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s				6.7	0.0	0.0	1/./	8.7	0.0	0.0	6.5	0.0
Prop In Lane				1.00		1.00	1.00		0.00	0.00		0.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h				732	0	333	785	1111	0	0	639	0
V/C Ratio(X)				0.60	0.00	0.00	0.89	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.67	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h				2076	0	946	1194	2367	0	0	2137	0
HCM Platoon Ratio				1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)				1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh				20.9	0.0	0.0	10.4	6.9	0.0	0.0	22.5	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh				1.7	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh				0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln				3.3	0.0	0.0	8.7	4.5	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0
LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh				22.6	0.0	0.0	14.3	7.0	0.0	0.0	22.9	0.0
LnGrp LOS				С			В	А			С	
Approach Vol veh/h					437			1197			427	
Approach Delay s/veh					22.6			11.2			22.9	
Approach LOS					22.0 C			B			22.7 C	
Timor	1	ე	2	1	5	6	7	0			Ŭ	
	1	2	J	4	5	0	Ι	0				
Assigned Pils	1 22.0	2 1/г		4		40.2						
Physical Duration (G+Y+RC), S	23.8	10.5		18.3		40.3						
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	3.0	0.0		6.0		6.0						
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	35.0	35.0		35.0		/3.0						
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	19.7	8.5		8.7		10.7						
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	1.1	1.9		3.7		2.2						
Intersection Summary												
HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay			16.0									
HCM 2010 LOS			В									

Lanes, Volumes, Timings 8: Cedar Street (Route 85) & I-495 SB Ramp /I-495 SB Ramp

2027 No-Build Conditions Timing Plan: Weekday AM

	≯	-	\mathbf{r}	4	-	•	•	t	~	1	Ļ	4
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	1		1					•	1			
Traffic Volume (vph)	25	0	668	0	0	0	0	1077	384	156	586	0
Future Volume (vph)	25	0	668	0	0	0	0	1077	384	156	586	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		297			406			324			799	
Travel Time (s)		6.8			9.2			7.4			18.2	
Peak Hour Factor	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.87	0.87	0.87
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	2%	1%	2%	0%
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Sign Control		Stop			Free			Free			Free	
Intersection Summary												

Area Type: Other

Control Type: Unsignalized

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh	43.3												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations	1		1					1	1		-41		
Traffic Vol, veh/h	25	0	668	0	0	0	0	1077	384	156	586	0	
Future Vol, veh/h	25	0	668	0	0	0	0	1077	384	156	586	0	
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	
RT Channelized	-	-	Yield	-	-	Yield	-	-	Yield	-	-	None	
Storage Length	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	
Veh in Median Storage	e,# -	0	-	-	16979	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	
Peak Hour Factor	81	81	81	94	94	94	93	93	93	87	87	87	
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	2	0	
Mvmt Flow	31	0	825	0	0	0	0	1158	413	179	674	0	
Major/Minor	Minor2					N	/lajor1		[Major2			
Conflicting Flow All	2190	-	337				-	0	0	1158	0	0	
Stage 1	1032	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	1158	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy	6.6	-	6.945				-	-	-	4.115	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.4	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5		3.3285				-	-	- 2	2.2095	-	-	
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	45	0	~ 657				0	-	-	606	-	0	
Stage 1	309	0	-				0	-	-	-	-	0	
Stage 2	302	0	-				0	-	-	-	-	0	
Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-		
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	~ 24	0	~ 657				-	-	-	606	-	-	
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	~ 24	0	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	309	0	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	159	0	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Approach	EB						NB			SB			
HCM Control Delay, s	161.4						0			4.5			
HCM LOS	F												
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	nt	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	EBLn2	SBL	SBT						
Capacity (veh/h)		-	-	24	657	606	-						
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		-	-	1.286	1.255	0.296	-						
HCM Control Delav (s)		-	-\$	520.9	147.9	13.4	2.1						
HCM Lane LOS		-	-	F	F	В	A						
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	-	3.9	31	1.2	-						
Notes	,												
		¢ ¬			00-	0.000		Net D	- fin - 1	* ^!!			la alstern

-: Volume exceeds capacity \$: Delay exceeds 300s +: Computation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon

	٭	\mathbf{r}	1	1	Ŧ	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۲	1	٦	•	el 🕴	
Traffic Volume (vph)	21	79	108	436	612	30
Future Volume (vph)	21	79	108	436	612	30
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	0	0	300			0
Storage Lanes	1	1	1			0
Taper Length (ft)	25		25			
Link Speed (mph)	30			30	30	
Link Distance (ft)	322			469	467	
Travel Time (s)	7.3			10.7	10.6	
Peak Hour Factor	0.96	0.96	0.87	0.87	0.94	0.94
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	3%	5%	1%	1%	0%
Shared Lane Traffic (%)						
Sign Control	Stop			Free	Free	
Intersection Summary						
Area Type:	Other					

Area Type:

Control Type: Unsignalized

Intersection							
Int Delay, s/veh	2.3						
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations	ሻ	1	۲	•	f,		
Traffic Vol, veh/h	21	79	108	436	612	30	
Future Vol, veh/h	21	79	108	436	612	30	
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None	
Storage Length	0	0	300	-	-	-	
Veh in Median Storage	,# 0	-	-	0	0	-	
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-	
Peak Hour Factor	96	96	87	87	94	94	
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	3	5	1	1	0	
Mvmt Flow	22	82	124	501	651	32	
Major/Minor	/linor2		Major1	Ν	Najor2		
Conflicting Flow All	1416	667	683	0	-	0	
Stage 1	667	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	749	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy	6.4	6.23	4.15	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.4	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.4	-	-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.327	2.245	-	-	-	
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	153	457	896	-	-	-	
Stage 1	514	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	471	-	-	-	-	-	
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	132	457	896	-	-	-	
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	132	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	443	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	471	-	-	-	-	-	
U U							
Approach	EB		NB		SB		
HCM Control Delay, s	19.4		1.9		0		
HCM LOS	С						
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	t	NBL	NBT	EBLn1 E	EBLn2	SBT	SBR
Capacity (yeh/h)		896	-	132	457	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.139	-	0.166	0.18	-	
HCM Control Delay (s)		9.7	-	37.6	14.6	-	
HCM Lane I OS		A	-	F	B	-	
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)		0.5	-	0.6	0.7	-	-

Lanes, Volumes, Timings 2: Cedar Street (Route 85) & I-495 Northbound Ramps

28.3%

28.0

3.0

3.0

0.0

6.0

Lag

Yes

2.0

Min

ute 85)	& I-49	5 Nort	hboun	d Ram	nps			1	iming Pla	Plan: Weekday PM					
≯	+	*	4	Ļ	*	•	Ť	*	*	Ļ	~				
EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR				
			ሻሻ		1	ľ	•			A					
0	0	0	415	0	487	709	381	0	0	737	59				
0	0	0	415	0	487	709	381	0	0	737	59				
1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900				
0		0	0		0	350		0	0		0				
0		0	2		1	1		0	0		0				
25			25			25			25						
		Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes				
	30			30			30			30					
	300			300			799			486					
	6.8			6.8			18.2			11.0					
		2 3													
0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.94	0.94	0.94				
0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	2%	3%	1%	0%	0%	2%	0%				
			Prot		Perm	pm+pt	NA			NA					
			4			1	6			2					
					4	6									
			4		4	1	6			2					
			6.0		6.0	6.0	10.0			10.0					
			12.0		12.0	9.0	16.0			16.0					
			41.0		41.0	45.0	79.0			34.0					

34.2%

35.0

3.0

3.0

0.0

6.0

5.0

None

37.5%

42.0

3.0

0.0

0.0

3.0

Lead

Yes

2.0

None

65.8%

73.0

3.0

3.0

0.0

6.0

2.0

Min

Intersection Summary

Lane Group Lane Configurations Traffic Volume (vph) Future Volume (vph) Ideal Flow (vphpl) Storage Length (ft) Storage Lanes Taper Length (ft) Right Turn on Red Link Speed (mph) Link Distance (ft) Travel Time (s) Confl. Peds. (#/hr) Confl. Bikes (#/hr) Peak Hour Factor Heavy Vehicles (%) Shared Lane Traffic (%)

Turn Type Protected Phases Permitted Phases Detector Phase Switch Phase Minimum Initial (s) Minimum Split (s) Total Split (s)

Total Split (%)

Yellow Time (s)

All-Red Time (s)

Lead/Lag

Recall Mode

Maximum Green (s)

Lost Time Adjust (s)

Total Lost Time (s)

Lead-Lag Optimize?

Vehicle Extension (s)

Area Type: Other Cycle Length: 120 Actuated Cycle Length: 110.5 Natural Cycle: 80 Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated

Splits and Phases: 2: Cedar Street (Route 85) & I-495 Northbound Ramps

N Ø1	▼ Ø2	✓ Ø4
45 s 3	34 s	41 s
≪ ¶ø ₆		
79 s		

34.2%

35.0

3.0

3.0

0.0

6.0

5.0

None

Synchro 10 Report T:\T0718\T0718.02\Tech\Capacity and Queue Analysis\2027 No-Build Conditions Weekday PM.syn

4	•	1	1	Ŧ
WBL	WBR	NBL	NBT	SBT
441	518	815	438	847
0.56	0.75	1.10	0.35	0.95
40.2	14.5	91.6	10.0	60.8
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
40.2	14.5	91.6	10.0	60.8
142	51	~602	124	308
191	174	#906	219	#498
			719	406
		350		
1101	797	741	1246	895
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0.40	0.65	1.10	0.35	0.95
	WBL 441 0.56 40.2 0.0 40.2 142 191 1101 0 0 0 0 0 0.40	WBL WBR 441 518 0.56 0.75 40.2 14.5 0.0 0.0 40.2 14.5 142 51 191 174 1101 797 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	WBL WBR NBL 441 518 815 0.56 0.75 1.10 40.2 14.5 91.6 0.0 0.0 0.0 40.2 14.5 91.6 142 51 ~602 191 174 #906 350 1101 797 741 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	WBL WBR NBL NBT 441 518 815 438 0.56 0.75 1.10 0.35 40.2 14.5 91.6 10.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 40.2 14.5 91.6 10.0 40.2 14.5 91.6 10.0 142 51 ~602 124 191 174 #906 219 719 350 711 1246 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Intersection Summary

Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

	≯	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	1	1	1	1	ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	0	0	0	ካካ 415	0	107	700	†	0	0	†]	
France Volume (ven/n)	0	0	0	415	0	487	709	38 I 201	0	0	/3/	59
Future volume (ven/n)	0	0	0	415	0	487	/09	381	0	0	/3/	59
				/	4	14	1	0	10	5	2	12
				1 00	0	1 00	1 00	0	1 00	1 00	0	1 00
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)				1.00	1 00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1 00	1.00
Parking Bus, Adj				1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln				1881	0	1863	1845	1881	0	0	1865	1900
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h				441	0	0	815	438	0	0	/84	0
Adj No. of Lanes				2	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	0
Peak Hour Factor				0.94	0.94	0.94	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.94	0.94	0.94
Percent Heavy Veh, %				1	0	2	3	1	0	0	2	2
Cap, veh/h				611	0	278	837	1320	0	0	892	0
Arrive On Green				0.18	0.00	0.00	0.42	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.00
Sat Flow, veh/h				3476	0	1583	1757	1881	0	0	3731	0
Grp Volume(v), veh/h				441	0	0	815	438	0	0	784	0
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln				1738	0	1583	1757	1881	0	0	1772	0
Q Serve(a s), s				11.7	0.0	0.0	38.8	8.9	0.0	0.0	20.8	0.0
Cycle O Clear(q, c), s				11.7	0.0	0.0	38.8	8.9	0.0	0.0	20.8	0.0
Prop In Lane				1.00		1.00	1.00		0.00	0.00		0.00
Lane Grp Cap(c) veh/h				611	0	278	837	1320	0	0	892	0
V/C Ratio(X)				0.72	0 00	0.00	0.97	033	0 00	0.00	0.88	0 00
Avail $Can(c, a)$ veh/h				1242	0.00	566	853	1402	0.00	0.00	1013	0.00
HCM Platoon Ratio				1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00
Linstream Filter(I)				1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Uniform Dolay (d) s/yoh				20 1	0.00	0.00	21.6	5.7	0.00	0.00	25.2	0.00
Incr Dolay (d2), shiph				2 /	0.0	0.0	21.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	33.Z 7 5	0.0
Incl Delay (uz), siven $lastic Delay (uz), siven$				0.4	0.0	0.0	24.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	7.5	0.0
$\frac{1}{100}$				0.0 E 0	0.0	0.0	26.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
				0.9 41.4	0.0	0.0	20.9 4E 7	4.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0
LIGIP Delay(u), s/veli				41.0	0.0	0.0	45.7	D.7	0.0	0.0	42.8	0.0
LIIGIP LOS				D	4.4.1		D	A			U	
Approach vol, ven/n					441			1253			/84	
Approach Delay, s/ven					41.6			31.7			42.8	
Approach LOS					D			С			D	
Timer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Assigned Phs	1	2		4		6						
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	44.1	30.6		23.2		74.7						
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	3.0	6.0		6.0		6.0						
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	42.0	28.0		35.0		73.0						
Max Q Clear Time ($q c+11$), s	40.8	22.8		13.7		10.9						
Green Ext Time (p. c), s	0.3	1.8		3.5		1.9						
Intersection Summary	010			0.0		,						
			27.0									
HCIVI 2010 CITI Delay			37.0									
			D									

Synchro 10 Report T:\T0718\T0718.02\Tech\Capacity and Queue Analysis\2027 No-Build Conditions Weekday PM.syn

Lanes, Volumes, Timings 8: Cedar Street (Route 85) & I-495 SB Ramp /I-495 SB Ramp

2027 No-Build Conditions Timing Plan: Weekday PM

	۶	-	\mathbf{r}	1	-	•	1	1	1	1	Ļ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	٦		1					•	1		-4 †	
Traffic Volume (vph)	59	0	703	0	0	0	0	990	442	303	849	0
Future Volume (vph)	59	0	703	0	0	0	0	990	442	303	849	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		297			406			324			799	
Travel Time (s)		6.8			9.2			7.4			18.2	
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.92	0.92	0.92
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	3%	1%	0%
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Sign Control		Stop			Free			Free			Free	
Intersection Summary												

Area Type: Other

Control Type: Unsignalized

Int Delay, siveh 2.9 Movement EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT NBL NBT NBR SBL SBT SBR Lane Configurations 1	Intersection														
Movement EBL EBL EBL WBL WBL WBL NBL NBL NBL SBL SBL SBR Lane Configurations 703 0 0 0 0 0 0 442 303 849 0 Conflicting Peds, #/hr 0	Int Delay, s/veh	2.9													
Lane Configurations T T T T T T T Traffic Vol, veh/n 59 0 703 0 0 0 990 442 303 849 0 Conflicting Peds, #/hr 0	Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR		
Traffic Vol, veh/h 59 0 703 0 0 0 990 442 303 849 0 Future Vol, veh/h 59 0 703 0 0 0 990 442 303 849 0 Conflicting Peets, #hr 0 <	Lane Configurations	۲		1					1	1		-4†			
Future Vol, veh/h 59 0 703 0	Traffic Vol, veh/h	59	0	703	0	0	0	0	990	442	303	849	0		
Conflicting Pecks, #/hr 0	Future Vol, veh/h	59	0	703	0	0	0	0	990	442	303	849	0		
Sign Control Stop Stop Stop Free Free <td>Conflicting Peds, #/hr</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
RT Channelized - Yield - Yield - None Storage Length 0 - 0 - - 0 - - Grade, % - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - Grade, % - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - - Peak Hour Factor 94 </td <td>Sign Control</td> <td>Stop</td> <td>Stop</td> <td>Stop</td> <td>Free</td> <td>Free</td> <td>Free</td> <td>Free</td> <td>Free</td> <td>Free</td> <td>Free</td> <td>Free</td> <td>Free</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free		
Storage Length 0 - 0 - - 0 - - 0 Veh in Median Storage, # - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 151 329 923 0 0 0 0 151 514 329 923 0 0 0 151 0 0 151 151 1 0 0 151 151 1 0 1 153 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	RT Channelized		-	Yield	-	-	Yield	-	-	Yield	-	-	None		
Veh in Median Storage, # 0 - - 16979 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 0 - - 0 0 1 0 0 - - 0 0 1151 514 329 923 0 0 0 1511 0 0 - <td>Storage Length</td> <td>0</td> <td>-</td> <td>0</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>0</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Storage Length	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-		
Grade, % · 0 · · · 0 0 1 1 0 0 ·<	Veh in Median Storage	e,# -	0	-	-	16979	-	-	0	-	-	0	-		
Peak Hour Factor 94 94 94 94 94 94 86 86 86 92 92 92 Heavy Vehicles, % 0 0 748 0 0 0 0 2 2 3 1 0 Mimit Flow 63 0 748 0 0 0 1151 514 329 923 0 Major/Minor Mino2 Major Major Major Major Major Major Conflicting Flow All 2732 - 462 - 0 0 1151 0 0 Stage 1 1581 - - - - - - - Critical Hdwy 6.6 - 6.945 -	Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-		
Heavy Vehicles, % 0 0 3 0 0 0 2 2 3 1 0 Mymt Flow 63 0 748 0 0 0 1 151 514 329 923 0 Major/Minor Minor Minor Major/ Major/ Major/ Major/ Conflicting Flow All 2732 - 462 - 0 0 1151 0 0 Stage 1 1581 -	Peak Hour Factor	94	94	94	94	94	94	86	86	86	92	92	92		
Mmit Flow 63 0 748 0 0 0 1151 514 329 923 0 Major/Minor Minor2 Major1 Major2 Conflicting Flow All 2732 - 462 - 0 0 1151 0 0 Stage 1 1581 - - - - - - - Critical Hdwy 6.6 - 6.945 - - - - - Critical Hdwy Stg 1 5.8 - - - - - - Follow-up Hdwy 3.5 - 3.3285 - - - - Follow-up Hdwy 3.5 - 3.3285 - - - 0 Stage 1 158 0 - 0 - - 0 Stage 2 304 0 - 0 - - 0 Stage 1 158 0 - - - - 0 Not Cap-1 Maneuver 0 0 - 545 0 - - Mov Cap-1 Maneuver 0 0 - - - - - Mov Cap-	Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	1	0		
Major/Minor Minor 2 Major 1 Major 2 Conflicting Flow All 2732 - 462 - 0 0 1151 0 0 Stage 1 1581 - 1151 0 0 - <td< td=""><td>Mvmt Flow</td><td>63</td><td>0</td><td>748</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1151</td><td>514</td><td>329</td><td>923</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Mvmt Flow	63	0	748	0	0	0	0	1151	514	329	923	0		
Major/Minor Minor2 Major1 Major2 Conflicting Flow All 2732 - 462 - 0 0 1151 0 0 Stage 1 1581 - <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td>			-		-	-	-	-					-		
Conflicting Flow All 2732 - 462 - 0 0 1151 0 0 Stage 1 1581 - <td>Major/Minor</td> <td>Minor2</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>Major1</td> <td></td> <td>N</td> <td>Major2</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Major/Minor	Minor2					1	Major1		N	Major2				
Stage 1 1581 - <th< td=""><td>Conflicting Flow All</td><td>2732</td><td>-</td><td>462</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1151</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td></th<>	Conflicting Flow All	2732	-	462				-	0	0	1151	0	0		
Stage 2 1151 -	Stage 1	1581	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-		
Critical Hdwy 6.6 - 6.945 - - - 4.145 - - Critical Hdwy Stg 1 5.8 - - - - - - - Critical Hdwy Stg 2 5.4 - - - - - - - Follow-up Hdwy 3.5 -3.3285 - - - - - Pol Cap-1 Maneuver -20 0 -545 0 - - 0 Stage 1 158 0 - 0 - - 0 Stage 2 304 0 - 0 - - 0 Vox Cap-1 Maneuver 0 - 545 - - - 0 Mov Cap-1 Maneuver 0 - - - - - - - - Mov Cap-1 Maneuver 0 -<	Stage 2	1151	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-		
Critical Hdwy Stg 1 5.8 -	Critical Hdwy	6.6	-	6.945				-	-	-	4.145	-	-		
Critical Hdwy Stg 2 5.4 -	Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-		
Follow-up Hdwy 3.5 - 3.3285 - - - 2.2285 - - Pot Cap-1 Maneuver - 20 0 - 545 0 - 600 0 Stage 1 158 0 - 0 - - 0 Platoon blocked, % - 0 - - 0 Mov Cap-1 Maneuver 0 0 - - - 0 Nov Cap-2 Maneuver 0 0 - - - - Mov Cap-1 Maneuver 0 0 - - - - - Stage 1 158 0 - - - - - - Stage 2 0 0 - - - - - - - Stage 2 0 0 -	Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.4	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-		
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver - 20 0 - 545 0 - - 600 - 0 Stage 1 158 0 - 0 - - 0 - - 0 Stage 2 304 0 - 0 - - 0 - - 0 Platoon blocked, % - - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 Mov Cap-2 Maneuver 0 0 -545 -	Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	- 1	3.3285				-	-	- 2	2.2285	-	-		
Stage 1 158 0 - 0 - - - 0 Stage 2 304 0 - 0 - - 0 - 0 Platoon blocked, % - - 0 - - 0 - - 0 Mov Cap-1 Maneuver 0 0 - - - - - - Mov Cap-2 Maneuver 0 0 - - - - - - - Stage 1 158 0 -	Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	~ 20	0	~ 545				0	-	-	600	-	0		
Stage 2 304 0 - 0 - - 0 Platoon blocked, % - - 600 - - - Mov Cap-1 Maneuver 0 0 - - - 600 - Mov Cap-2 Maneuver 0 0 - - - - - - Stage 1 158 0 - - - - - - - Stage 2 0 0 - - - - - - - Approach EB NB SB - - - - - Minor Lane/Major Mvmt NBT NBR EBLn1 EBLn2 SBL SBT - - - - Capacity (veh/h) - - 545 600 -	Stage 1	158	0	-				0	-	-	-	-	0		
Platoon blocked, % -	Stage 2	304	0	-				0	-	-	-	-	0		
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver 0 0 - 545 - - 600 - - Mov Cap-2 Maneuver 0 0 -	Platoon blocked, %								-	-		-			
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver 0 0 -	Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	0	0	~ 545				-	-	-	600	-	-		
Stage 1 158 0 -	Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	0	0	-				-	-	-	-	-	-		
Stage 2 0 0 - </td <td>Stage 1</td> <td>158</td> <td>0</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Stage 1	158	0	-				-	-	-	-	-	-		
Approach EB NB SB HCM Control Delay, s 0 8.7 HCM LOS - - 8.7 Minor Lane/Major Mvmt NBT NBR EBLn1 EBLn2 SBL SBT Capacity (veh/h) - - 545 600 - HCM Lane V/C Ratio - - 1.372 0.549 - HCM Control Delay (s) - - 200.7 18.1 5.3 HCM Lane LOS - - 33.7 3.3 - Notes - - - 300 +: Computation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon	Stage 2	0	0	-				-	-	-	-	-	-		
ApproachEBNBSBHCM Control Delay, s08.7HCM LOSMinor Lane/Major MvmtNBTNBR EBLn1 EBLn2SBLSBTCapacity (veh/h)545600-HCM Lane V/C Ratio545600-HCM Control Delay (s)200.718.15.3HCM Lane LOSFCAHCM 95th %tile Q(veh)33.73.3-Notes~: Volume exceeds capacity\$: Delay exceeds 300s+: Computation Not Defined*: All maior volume in platoon															
HCM Control Delay, s 0 8.7 HCM LOS - - 8.7 Minor Lane/Major Mvmt NBT NBR EBLn1 EBLn2 SBL SBT Capacity (veh/h) - - 545 600 - HCM Lane V/C Ratio - - 545 600 - HCM Lane V/C Ratio - - 1.372 0.549 - HCM Control Delay (s) - - 200.7 18.1 5.3 HCM Lane LOS - - F C A HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) - - 33.7 3.3 - Notes - - 300s +: Computation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon	Approach	EB						NB			SB				
HCM LOS - Minor Lane/Major Mvmt NBT NBR EBLn1 EBLn2 SBL SBT Capacity (veh/h) - - 545 600 - HCM Lane V/C Ratio - - 1.372 0.549 - HCM Control Delay (s) - - 200.7 18.1 5.3 HCM Lane LOS - - F C A HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) - - 33.7 3.3 - Notes - - 300s +: Computation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon	HCM Control Delay, s							0			8.7				
Minor Lane/Major MvmtNBTNBR EBLn1 EBLn2SBLSBTCapacity (veh/h)545600-HCM Lane V/C Ratio1.3720.549-HCM Control Delay (s)200.718.15.3HCM Lane LOSFCAHCM 95th %tile Q(veh)33.73.3-Notes~: Volume exceeds capacity\$: Delay exceeds 300s+: Computation Not Defined*: All major volume in platoon	HCM LOS	-													
Minor Lane/Major Mvmt NBT NBR EBLn1 EBLn2 SBL SBT Capacity (veh/h) - - 545 600 - HCM Lane V/C Ratio - - 1.372 0.549 - HCM Control Delay (s) - - 200.7 18.1 5.3 HCM Lane LOS - - F C A HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) - - 33.7 3.3 - Notes - - - Stopputation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon															
Capacity (veh/h) - - 545 600 - HCM Lane V/C Ratio - - 1.372 0.549 - HCM Control Delay (s) - - 200.7 18.1 5.3 HCM Lane LOS - - F C A HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) - - 33.7 3.3 - Notes - - Stopputation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon	Minor Lane/Major Mvn	nt	NBT	NBR	EBLn1	EBLn2	SBL	SBT							
HCM Lane V/C Ratio - - 1.372 0.549 - HCM Control Delay (s) - - 200.7 18.1 5.3 HCM Lane LOS - - F C A HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) - - 33.7 3.3 - Notes - - State of the state of	Capacity (veh/h)		-	-	-	545	600	-							
HCM Control Delay (s) 200.7 18.1 5.3 HCM Lane LOS F C A HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) 33.7 3.3 - Notes ~: Volume exceeds capacity \$: Delay exceeds 300s +: Computation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon	HCM Lane V/C Ratio		-	-	-	1.372	0.549	-							
HCM Lane LOS F C A HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) 33.7 3.3 - Notes ~: Volume exceeds capacity \$: Delay exceeds 300s +: Computation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon	HCM Control Delay (s))	-	-	-	200.7	18.1	5.3							
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh) - - 33.7 3.3 - Notes - - - 30.8 +: Computation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon	HCM Lane LOS		-	-	-	F	С	А							
Notes: Volume exceeds capacity \$: Delay exceeds 300s +: Computation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon	HCM 95th %tile Q(veh	ı)	-	-	-	33.7	3.3	-							
~: Volume exceeds capacity \$: Delay exceeds 300s +: Computation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon	Notes														
	~: Volume exceeds ca	pacity	\$: De	elav exc	eeds 3	00s	+: Com	putation	Not D	efined	*: All	maior	/olume ir	n platoon	

	٭	\mathbf{i}	1	1	Ŧ	1
Lane Group	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	1	٦	•	el 👘	
Traffic Volume (vph)	33	151	67	860	309	12
Future Volume (vph)	33	151	67	860	309	12
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	0	0	300			0
Storage Lanes	1	1	1			0
Taper Length (ft)	25		25			
Link Speed (mph)	30			30	30	
Link Distance (ft)	322			469	467	
Travel Time (s)	7.3			10.7	10.6	
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.88	0.88	0.91	0.91
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	23%	9%	2%	4%	0%
Shared Lane Traffic (%)						
Sign Control	Stop			Free	Free	
Intersection Summary						
Area Type:	Other					

Area Type:

Control Type: Unsignalized

Intersection											
Int Delay, s/veh	2.6										
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR					
Lane Configurations	۲	1	۲		ef -						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	33	151	67	860	309	12					
Future Vol, veh/h	33	151	67	860	309	12					
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free					
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None					
Storage Length	0	0	300	-	-	-					
Veh in Median Storage	,# 0	-	-	0	0	-					
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-					
Peak Hour Factor	94	94	88	88	91	91					
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	23	9	2	4	0					
Mvmt Flow	35	161	76	977	340	13					
Major/Minor	Minor2		Major1	ſ	Major2						
Conflicting Flow All	1476	347	353	0	-	0					
Stage 1	347	-	-	-	-	-					
Stage 2	1129	-	-	-	-	-					
Critical Hdwy	6.4	6.43	4.19	-	-	-					
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.4	-	-	-	-	-					
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.4	-	-	-	-	-					
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.507	2.281	-	-	-					
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	140	651	1168	-	-	-					
Stage 1	720	-	-	-	-	-					
Stage 2	312	-	-	-	-	-					
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-					
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	131	651	1168	-	-	-					
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	131	-	-	-	-	-					
Stage 1	673	-	-	-	-	-					
Stage 2	312	-	-	-	-	-					
Approach	EB		NB		SB						
HCM Control Delay, s	17.7		0.6		0					 	
HCM LOS	С										
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	ıt	NBL	NBT	EBLn1	EBLn2	SBT	SBR				
Capacity (veh/h)		1168	-	131	651	-	-				
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.065	-	0.268	0.247	-	-				
HCM Control Delay (s)		8.3	-	42.3	12.3	-	-				
HCM Lane LOS		A	-	Е	В	-	-				
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh))	0.2	-	1	1	-	-				

Lanes, Volumes, Timings 2: Cedar Street (Route 85) & I-495 Northbound Ramps

Timing Plan: Week

	٦	-	\mathbf{r}	4	-	•	1	1	1	1	Ŧ	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations				ሻሻ		1	5	•			4 16	
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	0	380	0	467	612	459	0	0	422	74
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	0	380	0	467	612	459	0	0	422	74
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	0		0	0		0	350		0	0		0
Storage Lanes	0		0	2		1	1		0	0		0
Taper Length (ft)	25			25			25			25		
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		300			300			799			486	
Travel Time (s)		6.8			6.8			18.2			11.0	
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)			2									
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)			3									
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.91	0.91	0.91
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	2%	7%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Turn Type				Prot		Free	pm+pt	NA			NA	
Protected Phases				4			1	6			2	
Permitted Phases						Free	6					
Detector Phase				4			1	6			2	
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)				6.0			6.0	10.0			10.0	
Minimum Split (s)				12.0			9.0	16.0			16.0	
Total Split (s)				41.0			38.0	79.0			41.0	
Total Split (%)				34.2%			31.7%	65.8%			34.2%	
Maximum Green (s)				35.0			35.0	73.0			35.0	
Yellow Time (s)				3.0			3.0	3.0			3.0	
All-Red Time (s)				3.0			0.0	3.0			3.0	
Lost Time Adjust (s)				0.0			0.0	0.0			0.0	
Total Lost Time (s)				6.0			3.0	6.0			6.0	
Lead/Lag							Lead				Lag	
Lead-Lag Optimize?							Yes				Yes	
Vehicle Extension (s)				5.0			2.0	2.0			2.0	
Recall Mode				None			None	Min			Min	
Intersection Summary												
Δrea Tyne [,]	Oth⊖r											

Area Type: Other Cycle Length: 120 Actuated Cycle Length: 86.9 Natural Cycle: 60 Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated

Splits and Phases: 2: Cedar Street (Route 85) & I-495 Northbound Ramps

▲ Ø1	▼ Ø2	√ Ø4
38 s 4	ls la	41 s
™ ø6		
79 s		

	-	•	1	1	Ŧ
Lane Group	WBL	WBR	NBL	NBT	SBT
Lane Group Flow (vph)	437	537	695	522	545
v/c Ratio	0.59	0.34	0.87	0.42	0.74
Control Delay	34.8	0.6	29.5	9.1	38.1
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	34.8	0.6	29.5	9.1	38.1
Queue Length 50th (ft)	110	0	249	119	141
Queue Length 95th (ft)	164	0	#551	214	212
Internal Link Dist (ft)				719	406
Turn Bay Length (ft)			350		
Base Capacity (vph)	1409	1583	800	1611	1433
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.31	0.34	0.87	0.32	0.38
Interception Cummon					

Intersection Summary

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

	≯	+	\mathbf{F}	4	ł	•	•	Ť	1	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations				ሻሻ		1	ሻ	↑			≜ ⊅	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	0	0	0	380	0	467	612	459	0	0	422	74
Future Volume (veh/h)	0	0	0	380	0	467	612	459	0	0	422	74
Number				7	4	14	1	6	16	5	2	12
Initial Q (Qb), veh				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)				1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj				1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln				1881	0	1863	1776	1900	0	0	1884	1900
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h				437	0	0	695	522	0	0	464	0
Adj No. of Lanes				2	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	0
Peak Hour Factor				0.87	0.87	0.87	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.91	0.91	0.91
Percent Heavy Veh, %				1	0	2	7	0	0	0	1	1
Cap, veh/h				726	0	331	774	1121	0	0	679	0
Arrive On Green				0.21	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.59	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.00
Sat Flow, veh/h				3476	0	1583	1691	1900	0	0	3768	0
Grp Volume(v), veh/h				437	0	0	695	522	0	0	464	0
Grp Sat Flow(s) veh/h/ln				1738	0 0	1583	1691	1900	Ő	0	1790	0
O Serve(a, s) s				6.8	0.0	0.0	17.8	93	0.0	00	72	0.0
$Cycle \cap Clear(a, c) $ s				6.8	0.0	0.0	17.8	93	0.0	0.0	7.2	0.0
Pron In Lane				1 00	0.0	1 00	1 00	7.0	0.0	0.0	7.2	0.0
Lane Grn Can(c) veh/h				726	0	221	77/	1121	0.00	0.00	679	0.00
V/C Ratio(X)				0.60	0 00	0.00	0 90	0.47	0 00	0 00	0.68	0 00
Avail $Can(c, a)$ veh/h				2038	0.00	0.00	1172	2221	0.00	0.00	2000	0.00
HCM Platoon Patio				1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00
Linstroam Filtor(I)				1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Uniform Dolay (d) s/yoh				1.00 21 /	0.00	0.00	10.5	6.0	0.00	0.00	1.00 22 E	0.00
Incr Doloy (d2) shop				21.4 17	0.0	0.0	10.5	0.9	0.0	0.0	22.0	0.0
Incl Delay (u2), S/Vell Initial O Dalay(d2) alyah				1.7	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
				0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
				3.4	0.0	0.0	0.9 1 C O	4.8	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0
LnGrp Delay(d),s/ven				23.1	0.0	0.0	15.2	7.0	0.0	0.0	23.0	0.0
				C	107		В	A			<u> </u>	
Approach Vol, veh/h					437			1217			464	
Approach Delay, s/veh					23.1			11./			23.0	
Approach LOS					С			В			С	
Timer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Assigned Phs	1	2		4		6						
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	23.9	17.3		18.5		41.2						
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	3.0	6.0		6.0		6.0						
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	35.0	35.0		35.0		73.0						
Max Q Clear Time ($q c+11$), s	19.8	9.2		8.8		11.3						
Green Ext Time (p c), s	1.1	2.1		3.7		2.3						
Intersection Summary												
			14 ⊑									
HOW 2010 CIT Delay			0.01 D									
			D									

Synchro 10 Report T:\T0718\T0718.02\Tech\Capacity and Queue Analysis\2027 Build Conditions Weekday AM.syn

Lanes, Volumes	, Timings					
8: Cedar Street ((Route 85)) & I-495 S	B Ramp	/I-495 \$	SB F	Ramp

	٦	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	1	1	~	1	Ŧ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۲.		1					•	1			
Traffic Volume (vph)	33	0	668	0	0	0	0	1086	384	167	590	0
Future Volume (vph)	33	0	668	0	0	0	0	1086	384	167	590	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		297			406			324			799	
Travel Time (s)		6.8			9.2			7.4			18.2	
Peak Hour Factor	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.87	0.87	0.87
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	2%	1%	2%	0%
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Sign Control		Stop			Free			Free			Free	
Intersection Summary												

Other

Area Type: Control Type: Unsignalized

Intersection

Int Delay, s/veh	49.3												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations	5		1					•	1				
Traffic Vol, veh/h	33	0	668	0	0	0	0	1086	384	167	590	0	
Future Vol, veh/h	33	0	668	0	0	0	0	1086	384	167	590	0	
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	Free	
RT Channelized	-	-	Yield	-	-	Yield	-	-	Yield	-	-	None	
Storage Length	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	
Veh in Median Storage	e,# -	0	-	-	16979	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	
Peak Hour Factor	81	81	81	94	94	94	93	93	93	87	87	87	
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	2	0	
Mvmt Flow	41	0	825	0	0	0	0	1168	413	192	678	0	
Maior/Minor	Minor2					ľ	Maior1		ľ	Maior2			
Conflicting Flow All	2220	-	220			I	-	0	0	1168	٥	Λ	
Stane 1	1062	_	557					0	0	- 1100	0	0	
Stage 7	1168	_	_				_	_	-	_	_	_	
Critical Hdwy	6.6	-	6 945				-	-		4 115	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Sto 1	58	-	- 0.740				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 7	5.0 5.4	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Hdwy	35	_ '	3 3285				-	-		2 2095	-	-	
Pot Can-1 Maneuver	42	0	~ 655				0	-	-	601	-	0	
Stage 1	298	0	-				0	-	-	-	-	0	
Stage 2	298	0	-				0	-	-	-	-	Ő	
Platoon blocked. %	270	Ū					Ū	-	-		-	Ū	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	~ 20	0	~ 655				-	-	-	601	-	-	
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	~ 20	0	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 1	298	0	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	145	0	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Approach	ГD						ND			CD			
Approach	104.0												
HCM LOS	184.2 F						0			4.8			
	-												
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	nt	NBT	NBR	EBLn1 I	EBLn2	SBL	SBT						
Capacity (veh/h)		-	-	20	655	601	-						
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		-	-	2.037	1.259	0.319	-						
HCM Control Delay (s)		-	-\$	886.8	149.5	13.8	2.3						
HCM Lane LOS		-	-	F	F	В	А						
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	-	-	5.4	31.1	1.4	-						
Notes													
~: Volume exceeds ca	pacity	\$: De	elay exc	ceeds 3	00s	+: Com	putatior	n Not D	efined	*: All	major \	/olume	in platoon

Traffic Impact Memorandum 11/19/2020

Synchro 10 Report T:\T0718\T0718.02\Tech\Capacity and Queue Analysis\2027 Build Conditions Weekday AM.syn

	≯	\mathbf{r}	1	1	Ŧ	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	٦	1	۲.	•	eî 👘	
Traffic Volume (vph)	23	116	170	436	612	45
Future Volume (vph)	23	116	170	436	612	45
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	0	0	300			0
Storage Lanes	1	1	1			0
Taper Length (ft)	25		25			
Link Speed (mph)	30			30	30	
Link Distance (ft)	322			469	467	
Travel Time (s)	7.3			10.7	10.6	
Peak Hour Factor	0.96	0.96	0.87	0.87	0.94	0.94
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	3%	5%	1%	1%	0%
Shared Lane Traffic (%)						
Sign Control	Stop			Free	Free	
Intersection Summary						
Area Type:	Other					

Area Type:

Control Type: Unsignalized

Intersection											
Int Delay, s/veh	3.4										
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR					
Lane Configurations	<u> </u>	1	۲	•	f,						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	23	116	170	436	612	45					
Future Vol, veh/h	23	116	170	436	612	45					
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Sign Control	Stop	Stop	Free	Free	Free	Free					
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None					
Storage Length	0	0	300	-	-	-					
Veh in Median Storage,	,# 0	-	-	0	0	-					
Grade, %	0	-	-	0	0	-					
Peak Hour Factor	96	96	87	87	94	94					
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	3	5	1	1	0					
Mvmt Flow	24	121	195	501	651	48					
Major/Minor N	/linor2	1	Major1	I	Major2						
Conflicting Flow All	1566	675	699	0	-	0					
Stage 1	675	-	-	-	-	-					
Stage 2	891	-	-	-	-	-					
Critical Hdwy	6.4	6.23	4.15	-	-	-					
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.4	-	-	-	-	-					
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.4	-	-	-	-	-					
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	3.327	2.245	-	-	-					
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	124	452	884	-	-	-					
Stage 1	510	-	-	-	-	-					
Stage 2	404	-	-	-	-	-					
Platoon blocked, %				-	-	-					
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	97	452	884	-	-	-					
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	97	-	-	-	-	-					
Stage 1	397	-	-	-	-	-					
Stage 2	404	-	-	-	-	-					
-											
Approach	EB		NB		SB			 	 		
HCM Control Delay, s	22.1		2.9		0						
HCM LOS	С										
Minor Lane/Major Mvm	t	NBL	NBT	EBLn1	EBLn2	SBT	SBR				
Capacity (veh/h)		884	-	97	452	-	-				
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		0.221	-	0.247	0.267	-	-				
HCM Control Delay (s)		10.2	-	53.9	15.8	-	-				
HCM Lane LOS		В	-	F	С	-	-				
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)		0.8	-	0.9	1.1	-	-				

Lanes, Volumes, Timings 2: Cedar Street (Route 85) & I-495 Northbound Ramps

Timing Plan: Weekday PM

	٦	-	\mathbf{r}	1	-	•	1	Ť	1	1	Ŧ	~
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations				ሻሻ		1	<u>۲</u>	•			≜ †Ъ	
Traffic Volume (vph)	0	0	0	415	0	199	709	431	0	0	759	74
Future Volume (vph)	0	0	0	415	0	199	709	431	0	0	759	74
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Storage Length (ft)	0		0	0		0	350		0	0		0
Storage Lanes	0		0	2		1	1		0	0		0
Taper Length (ft)	25			25			25			25		
Right Turn on Red			Yes			Yes			Yes			Yes
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		300			300			799			486	
Travel Time (s)		6.8			6.8			18.2			11.0	
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)			2									
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)			3									
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.94	0.94	0.94
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	3%	1%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Turn Type				Prot		Free	pm+pt	NA			NA	
Protected Phases				4			1	6			2	
Permitted Phases						Free	6					
Detector Phase				4			1	6			2	
Switch Phase												
Minimum Initial (s)				6.0			6.0	10.0			10.0	
Minimum Split (s)				12.0			9.0	16.0			16.0	
Total Split (s)				41.0			45.0	79.0			34.0	
Total Split (%)				34.2%			37.5%	65.8%			28.3%	
Maximum Green (s)				35.0			42.0	73.0			28.0	
Yellow Time (s)				3.0			3.0	3.0			3.0	
All-Red Time (s)				3.0			0.0	3.0			3.0	
Lost Time Adjust (s)				0.0			0.0	0.0			0.0	
Total Lost Time (s)				6.0			3.0	6.0			6.0	
Lead/Lag							Lead				Lag	
Lead-Lag Optimize?							Yes				Yes	
Vehicle Extension (s)				5.0			2.0	2.0			2.0	
Recall Mode				None			None	Min			Min	
Intersection Summary												
Area Type:	Other											
Cycle Length: 120												

Actuated Cycle Length: 105.7 Natural Cycle: 80 Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated

Splits and Phases: 2: Cedar Street (Route 85) & I-495 Northbound Ramps

▲ Ø1	↓ Ø2	√ Ø4
45 s	34 s	41 s
≪¶ ø6		
79 s		

-	•	1	1	Ŧ
WBL	WBR	NBL	NBT	SBT
441	212	815	495	886
0.65	0.13	1.05	0.38	0.95
44.0	0.2	74.2	8.3	58.3
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
44.0	0.2	74.2	8.3	58.3
142	0	~545	123	305
194	0	#805	203	#474
			719	406
		350		
1149	1599	773	1300	933
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0.38	0.13	1.05	0.38	0.95
-	WBL 441 0.65 44.0 0.0 44.0 142 194 1149 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 38	WBL WBR 441 212 0.65 0.13 44.0 0.2 0.0 0.0 44.0 0.2 142 0 194 0 1149 1599 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	WBL WBR NBL 441 212 815 0.65 0.13 1.05 44.0 0.2 74.2 0.0 0.0 0.0 44.0 0.2 74.2 142 0 ~545 194 0 #805 1149 1599 773 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	WBL WBR NBL NBT 441 212 815 495 0.65 0.13 1.05 0.38 44.0 0.2 74.2 8.3 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 44.0 0.2 74.2 8.3 142 0 ~545 123 194 0 #805 203 1149 1599 773 1300 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Intersection Summary

Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

	≯	+	\mathbf{F}	4	Ļ	*	•	Ť	1	1	ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations				ካካ		1	<u>۲</u>	↑			≜ ⊅	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	0	0	0	415	0	199	709	431	0	0	759	74
Future Volume (veh/h)	0	0	0	415	0	199	709	431	0	0	759	74
Number				7	4	14	1	6	16	5	2	12
Initial Q (Qb), veh				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)				1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj				1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln				1881	0	1881	1845	1881	0	0	1866	1900
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h				441	0	0	815	495	0	0	807	0
Adi No. of Lanes				2	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	0
Peak Hour Factor				0.94	0.94	0.94	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.94	0.94	0.94
Percent Heavy Veh %				1	0	1	3	1	0	0	2	2
Can veh/h				607	0	279	834	1327	Ő	Ő	904	0
Arrive On Green				0.17	0 00	0.00	0.42	0.71	0 00	0 00	0.26	0 00
Sat Flow, veh/h				3476	0.00	1599	1757	1881	0.00	0.00	3732	0.00
Grn Volumo(v), voh/h				4/1	0	0	Q15	/05	0	0	<u>9732</u> 207	0
G(p) = VO(u) = V(c) + V(c) + V(c)				44 I 1720	0	1500	1757	490	0	0	007 1772	0
				1730	0	1099	1757	1001	0	0	21.0	0
Q Serve(Q _S), S				12.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	10.0 10 г	0.0	0.0	21.9	0.0
Cycle Q Clear (g_c) , s				12.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	10.5	0.0	0.0	21.9	0.0
Prop In Lane				1.00	0	1.00	1.00	1007	0.00	0.00	004	0.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), ven/n				607	0	279	834	1327	0	0	904	0
V/C Ratio(X)				0.73	0.00	0.00	0.98	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.89	0.00
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h				1217	0	560	834	1374	0	0	993	0
HCM Platoon Ratio				1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)				1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh				39.0	0.0	0.0	22.4	5.9	0.0	0.0	35.9	0.0
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh				3.5	0.0	0.0	25.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh				0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/In				6.1	0.0	0.0	27.9	5.4	0.0	0.0	11.9	0.0
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh				42.5	0.0	0.0	47.9	6.0	0.0	0.0	45.0	0.0
LnGrp LOS				D			D	А			D	
Approach Vol, veh/h					441			1310			807	
Approach Delay, s/veh					42.5			32.1			45.0	
Approach LOS					D			С			D	
Timer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Assigned Phs	1	2	0	1	0	6	,	0				
Physical His $(C_+V_+P_C)$ s	15.0	21 5		7 72 5		76 5						
Change Deried $(V \mid Pc)$, s	4J.0 2 0	51.5		23.5		6.0						
May Croop Sotting (Cmay) c	3.0	20.0		25.0								
Max O Clear Time (g. a. 11)	42.0	20.0		30.0 14.0		73.U 13 E						
Wax Q Clear Time (y_{+11}), S	42.0	23.9		14.U 2 E		12.5						
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	1.0		3.5		2.2						
Intersection Summary												
HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay			37.9									
HCM 2010 LOS			D									

Lanes, Volumes	, Timings					
8: Cedar Street ((Route 85)) & I-495 S	B Ramp	/I-495 \$	SB F	Ramp

	≯	-	\mathbf{r}	4	-	•	1	1	1	×	Ļ	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ľ		1					•	1		-4 ↑	
Traffic Volume (vph)	82	0	703	0	0	0	0	1017	442	310	864	0
Future Volume (vph)	82	0	703	0	0	0	0	1017	442	310	864	0
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Link Speed (mph)		30			30			30			30	
Link Distance (ft)		297			406			324			799	
Travel Time (s)		6.8			9.2			7.4			18.2	
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.92	0.92	0.92
Heavy Vehicles (%)	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	3%	1%	0%
Shared Lane Traffic (%)												
Sign Control		Stop			Free			Free			Free	
Intersection Summary												

Other

Area Type: Control Type: Unsignalized

Intersection													
Int Delay, s/veh	3.1												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations	1		1					•	1				
Traffic Vol. veh/h	82	0	703	0	0	0	0	1017	442	310	864	0	
Future Vol. veh/h	82	0	703	0	0	0	0	1017	442	310	864	0	
Conflicting Peds #/hr	0	0	,00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	001	0	
Sign Control	Ston	Stop	Stop	Eroo	Eroo	Eroo	Eroo	Eroo	Eroo	Eroo	Eroo	Eroo	
DT Channelized	Stop	Stop	Viold	TIEE	TIEE	Viold	TIEE	TIEE	Viold	TIEE	TIEE	None	
Ctorogo Longth	-	-	rieiu	-	-	neiu	-	-	rieiu	-	-	None	
Storage Length	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	
ven in Median Storage	2,# -	0	-	-	169/9	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	
Grade, %	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	
Peak Hour Factor	94	94	94	94	94	94	86	86	86	92	92	92	
Heavy Vehicles, %	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	1	0	
Mvmt Flow	87	0	748	0	0	0	0	1183	514	337	939	0	
Major/Minor	Minor2					Ν	Najor1			Major2			
Conflicting Flow All	2796	-	470				-	0	0	1183	0	0	
Stage 1	1613	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Stage 2	1183	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy	6.6	-	6.945				-	-	-	4.145	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	5.8	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	5.4	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Follow-up Hdwy	3.5	- 3	3.3285				-	-	- 2	2.2285	-	-	
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	~ 18	0	~ 539				0	-	-	584	-	0	
Stage 1	152	0	-				0	-	-	-	-	0	
Stage 2	294	0	-				0	-	-	-	-	0	
Platoon blocked. %								-	-		-		
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	0	0	~ 539				-	-	-	584	-	-	
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	0	Ő					-	-	-		-	-	
Stane 1	152	0	_				_	_	_	_	_	_	
Stage 7	132	0	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Slaye 2	0	0	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	
Approach	ED						ND			CD			
Approach	LD									0.2			
HCM LOS							0			9.Z			
	-												
Minor Lano/Major Mym	nt	NRT		ERI n1	E RIn 2	CBI	SBT						
	п	NDI	NDN				301						
		-	-	-	539	584	-						
HCM Lane V/C Ratio		-	-	-	1.388	0.577	-						
HCM Control Delay (s)		-	-	-	207.4	19.2	5.6						
HCM Lane LOS		-	-	-	F	С	A						
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh	-	-	-	34.3	3.7	-							
Notes													
-: Volume exceeds capacity \$: Delay exceeds 300s +: Computation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon										in platoon			

Crash Data Summary Tables

Dilla @ Fortune @ Cedar - Milford, MA 1/1/2017 - 12/31/2019

Collision										
Diagram	Crash Number Cra	ash Date	Crash Time	Ambient Light	Weather Condition	Road Surface	Crash Severity	Manner of Collision	Driver Contributing Codes	Detailed Narrative (from Crash Report)
1	4343958 3/	/12/2017	12:34 PM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	No Improper Driving	
2	4349310 3/	/29/2017	6:52 AM	Daylight	Rain	Wet	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	Inattention / Distracted	
3	4349315 3/	/31/2017	4:55 PM	Daylight	Rain	Wet	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Inattention / Distracted	
4	4349326 3/	/24/2017	5:11 PM	Daylight	Cloudy	Wet	Non-fatal injury	Rear-end	No Improper Driving	
5	4461699 11/	/28/2017	6:57 AM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Angled	Failure to Yield Right-of-Way	
6	4461746 13	.1/4/2017	2:34 PM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	Failure to Yield Right-of-Way	
7	4485391	1/4/2018	2:32 PM	Daylight	Snow	Snow	Non-fatal injury	Rear-end	Followed Too Closely	
8	4485484	1/3/2018	2:51 PM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Angled	Failure to Yield Right-of-Way	
9	4485504 12/	/29/2017	7:21 PM	Dark - Lighted	Cloudy	Dry	Property Damage Only	Angled	No Improper Driving	
10	4485505	1/2/2018	5:39 PM	Dark - Lighted	Clear	Snow	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Inattention / Distracted	
11	4602738 9/	/30/2018	2:11 PM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	No Improper Driving	
12	4692055 3/	/30/2019	11:55 AM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Followed Too Closely	
13	4692397	4/7/2019	12:39 PM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	No Improper Driving	
14	4707955 5/	/28/2019	1:18 PM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Inattention / Distracted	
15	4736667 7/	/24/2019	10:14 PM	Dark - Lighted	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Inattention / Distracted	
16	4797284 12/	/27/2019	10:21 AM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Angled	Disregarded Traffic Controls	
17	4797437 12/	/12/2019	9:17 AM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Angled	Disregarded Traffic Controls	
18	4797444 12/	/16/2019	7:29 AM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Angled	Not Reported	
19	4768654 10/	/28/2019	8:54 PM	Dark - Lighted	Rain	Wet	Non-fatal injury	Angled	Disregarded Traffic Controls	
20	4768626 10	.0/8/2019	9:28 PM	Dark - Lighted	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Angled	Disregarded Traffic Controls	
21	4768625 10	.0/8/2019	10:25 AM	Daylight	Cloudy	Not reported	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	Failure to Keep in Proper Lane	
22	4758081 9/	/24/2019	3:53 PM	Davlight	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	No Improper Driving	
23	4756794 9/	/17/2019	4:29 PM	Davlight	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Angled	Visibility Obstructed	
24	4747025	9/1/2019	6:53 PM	Dusk	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Inattention / Distracted	
25	4723575	7/2/2019	3:43 PM	Davlight	Clear	Not reported	Property Damage Only	Single vehicle	Not Reported	
26	4715349	6/8/2019	11:03 AM	Davlight	Clear	Drv	Non-fatal injury	Rear-end	Not Reported	
27	4699196	5/1/2019	11:11 AM	Davlight	Cloudy	Dry	Property Damage Only	Angled	No Improper Driving	
28	4699063 4/	/25/2019	4:15 PM	Davlight	Clear	Dry	Not reported	Not reported	Not Reported	
29	4679187	3/4/2019	6:31 AM	Dark - Lighted	Snow	snow	Not reported	Sideswipe	Not Reported	
30	4679171 3/	/16/2019	12:11 PM	Davlight	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Inattention / Distracted	
31	4662504	2/8/2019	8:09 AM	Davlight	Bain	Wet	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	Not Reported	
32	4645119 12	/12/2018	6:12 PM	Dark - Lighted	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	Other	
33	4645111 12/	/10/2018	7:56 PM	Dark - Lighted	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Angled	Failure to Yield Right-of-Way	
34	4645108 12/	/10/2018	11:55 AM	Davlight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Inattention / Distracted	
35	4632025 11/	/26/2018	12:16 PM	Davlight	Cloudy	Wet	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Followed Too Closely	
36	4629591 11/	/17/2018	5:47 PM	Dark - Lighted	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	No Improper Driving	
37	4623429 10/	/23/2018	9:23 AM	Davlight	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Inattention / Distracted	
38	4623354 1	1/7/2018	2:00 PM	Davlight	Clear	dry	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	Inattention / Distracted	
39	4610658 10	0/4/2018	3:13 PM	Davlight	Cloudy	dry	Property Damage Only	Angled	Not Reported	
40	4593403 8/	3/31/2018	1:07 PM	Davlight	Clear	dry	Non-fatal injury	Angled	Failure to Yield Right-of-Way	
41	4585275	8/9/2018	9:31 AM	Davlight	Clear	drv	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	Failure to Yield Right-of-Way	
42	4576761 7	/29/2018	2:51 PM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Non-fatal injurv	Angled	Disregarded Traffic Controls	
43	4572010 7	/16/2018	3:01 PM	Davlight	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	No Improper Driving	
44	4564786 6/	6/30/2018	3:20 PM	Daylight	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Angled	No Improper Driving	
45	4558179 6/		3:41 PM	Davlight	Clear	Dry	Non-fatal injury	Rear-end	Inattention / Distracted	
46	4558166 6/	6/16/2018	4:10 AM	Dark - Lighted	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Single vehicle	Inattention / Distracted	
47	4558160 6/	/12/2018	9:18 PM	Dark - Lighted	CLear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	Failure to Yield Right-of-Way	
48	4547078 5	/18/2018	5:56 PM	Not reported	Not reported	Drv	Not reported	Not reported	Not Reported	
49	4546967 5	/25/2018	9:00 AM	Davlight	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Followed Too Closely	
50	4536413	5/1/2018	10:07 AM	Davlight	Cloudy	drv	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Followed Too Closely	
51	4536391 4	/23/2018	4:28 PM	Davlight	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	No Improper Driving	
52	4526753 4	/12/2018	8:00 AM	Davlight	clear	drv	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	No Improper Driving	
53	4522792 3	/26/2018	2:14 PM	Daylight	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Angled	Over-Steering / Over-Correcting	
54	4522790 3	/26/2018	11:18 AM	Davlight	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	Not Reported	
55	4513896	3/5/2018	9:55 AM	Davlight	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Angled	Disregarded Traffic Controls	
56	4491154 1	/19/2018	7:54 AM	Davlight	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	Not Reported	
57	4462168 1	1/6/2017	9:12 AM	Daylight	Cloudy	Drv	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	Not Reported	
58	4444126 10)/22/2017	4:23 AM	Dark - Lighted	Clear	Drv	Property Damage Only	Sideswine	Other	
50		,, _01,		Dank Lighted	Cicai	5.7	. reperty buildinge only	Sidestripe	Other	



Crash Data Summary Tables

Dilla @ Fortune @ Cedar - Milford, MA 1/1/2017 - 12/31/2019

Collision									
Diagram	Crash Number Crash	h Date Crash Time	Ambient Light	Weather Condition	Road Surface	Crash Severity	Manner of Collision	Driver Contributing Codes	Detailed Narrative (from Crash Report)
59	4443830 10/24	24/2017 9:41 AM	Daylight	Cloudy	wet	Property Damage Only	Angled	No Improper Driving	
60	4443829 10/23	23/2017 7:14 PM	Dark - Lighted	Clear	Dry	Non-fatal injury	Angled	Disregarded Traffic Controls	
61	4427947 9/9	/9/2017 5:00 PM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Non-fatal injury	Rear-end	Inattention / Distracted	
62	4398328 7/25	25/2017 5:10 PM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Sideswipe	Inattention / Distracted	
63	4390746 7/1	/1/2017 2:25 PM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Angled	Failure to Yield Right-of-Way	
64	4383445 6/19	.9/2017 1:07 PM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Angled	Inattention / Distracted	
65	4374212 5/14	4/2017 1:07 PM	Daylight	Cloudy	Wet	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Followed Too Closely	
66	4357214 4/15	.5/2017 11:26 AM	Dawn	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Followed Too Closely	
67	4332872 2/21	21/2017 6:51 AM	Daylight	Clear	Dry	Property Damage Only	Single vehicle	Inattention / Distracted	
68	4787927 12/2	/2/2019 4:59 PM	Dark - Lighted	Snow	Snow	Non-fatal injury	Rear-end	No Improper Driving	
69	4787279 11/20	20/2019 5:30 PM	Dark - Lighted	Rain	Wet	Property Damage Only	Rear-end	Followed Too Closely	

