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## Abstract

The Route 28 Priority Corridor Study focuses on one of the locations identified in the Needs Assessment for Destination 2040, the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) endorsed in 2019. The LRTP is used to guide investment decisions regarding transportation infrastructure improvements in the Boston region. The MPO prioritized Route 28 in Milton for study after considering a number of factors: the need to address poor safety conditions and traffic congestion; the desire to enhance multimodal transportation; and the potential for recommendations from the study to be implemented. This report details the existing conditions, assesses safety and operational problems, discusses options for improvements, and makes recommendations for implementing improvements. The recommendations, if implemented, would transform the roadway into a more pedestrian- and bicyclistfriendly roadway, improve safety at high-crash locations, make traffic flow and operations efficient, support the vision of connecting the neighborhoods to places, such as schools and local businesses, and promote multimodal transportation.
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## Executive Summary

## ES. 1 BACKGROUND

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) selected Route 28 between Blue Hills Parkway and Chickatawbut Road in the Town of Milton as the subject of a corridor study in federal fiscal year 2020. The study focused on one of the locations identified in the Needs Assessment for Destination 2040, the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan endorsed in 2019. The Needs Assessment guides investment decisions regarding transportation infrastructure improvements in the Boston region. The MPO prioritized this location for study after considering a number of factors, including the need to address poor safety conditions and traffic congestion; desire to enhance multimodal transportation; need to maintain regional travel capacity; and the potential to implement the study recommendations. This report analyzes the existing conditions, assesses safety and operational problems in the corridor, and discusses concepts for roadway improvements.

## ES. 2 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Route 28 in Milton is a two-way, four-lane principal arterial under the jurisdiction of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) and Town of Milton. A series of maps are appended to this report. The maps in Figures 1 and 2 show the study area, roadway configuration, and study intersections. Because the corridor is long (about four miles), staff segmented it into three to reflect the varied contexts and allow these contexts to be considered in the needs assessment and improvement concepts. Figure 3 shows the three segments.

The MassDOT Highway Division and Boston Region MPO collected and assembled the data used to assess the existing conditions and identify problems in the corridor. The data included vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volumes; traffic speeds and crashes; and community input data (community survey). Figures 4 through 14 and Tables 1 through 6 summarize the collected data and Tables 7 through 10 present the existing levels of services, delays, and queues for the selected intersections. Key vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle issues and concerns identified within the corridor are summarized in Table 11 and described below. These concerns include crossing safety issues, school drop-off and pickup safety issues, parking problems, lack of adequate sidewalk conditions, insufficient pedestrian crossing intervals, wheelchair ramps that are not compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act, lack of safe bicycling facilities, and traffic congestion at some of the signalized intersections.

Many locations in the study area experienced a greater-than-expected number of crashes: one intersection is on the list of the Top 200 high-crash location in Massachusetts and four intersections (including the one top 200 high-crash locations) are on the list of Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) crash clusters. ${ }^{1}$ Figure 7 shows the intersection and segment crashes and HSIP intersection crash clusters. Figures 8 through 14 show the collision diagrams for the high-crash locations. Many of the crashes were caused by failure to yield, inattention or distraction, lack of left-turn lanes, and traveling at high speeds.

Complaints about high travel speeds were received for the entire corridor in the community survey. As Figure 6 shows, there is a considerable variation in posted speed limits throughout the corridor. High speed of vehicles was a major problem for people who walk or bicycle in the corridor. In addition, there were four fatalities in the segment with high posted speed limits (40-45 miles per hour) from Reedsdale Road to Chickatawbut Road.

Many of the signalized intersections in the corridor experience high levels of congestion. Tables 8 through 10 present the existing intersection levels of service and delays. The traffic safety and operational problems include, but are not limited to, lack of left-turn lanes, outdated signal timing plans, lane movement assignments, and cut-through traffic.

Based on the problems and deficiencies, staff determined the following corridor needs:

- measures to reduce vehicular speed and calm traffic
- measures to improve safety for pedestrians
- measures to provide safe facilities to accommodate people who walk, bicycle, or ride the bus
- measures to create placemaking and connect people to places
- measures to reduce crashes in the corridor
- measures to improve safety of turn maneuvers in the corridor
- measures to reduce congestion at the signalized intersections
- measures to provide designated parking spaces for people who drop-off and pick-up students or visit recreation areas on Brook Road
- measures to reduce cut-through traffic on side streets
- measures to improve street lighting

[^0]
## ES. 3 PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

MPO staff, working with an advisory task force (representatives from MassDOT, the Town of Milton, and state legislators) developed short- and long-term improvement concepts for the corridor.

## ES.3.1 Short-Term Improvements

The proposed short-term improvements address safety and operational concerns that, when implemented, will improve safety for people who walk and bike, and reduce congestion. The improvements include upgrading sidewalks and wheelchair ramps to MassDOT standards and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliance; adding countdown timers to help expedite pedestrian crossings; providing bicycle detections at signalized intersections; and painting high visibility crosswalks. In addition, the improvements include traffic signal optimization to reduce congestion, modifying clearance intervals to MassDOT standards to address high number of angle and rear-end crashes, and adding retroreflective backplates with yellow borders to the signal heads to make them more visible to motorists. These improvements are usually low cost, relatively uncomplicated and inexpensive to implement, and require minimal design efforts. The recommended short-term improvements are listed in Table 12, and the intersection level of service that would result from short-term improvements, such as signal retiming and coordination and lane movement assignments are presented in Tables 13 through 15. The analysis indicated that retiming the signals in the corridor would reduce delays between 10 and 30 percent during weekday AM and PM peak periods.

## ES.3.2 Long-Term Improvements

The long-term improvements, usually high cost, require more design and engineering efforts and more funding resources. These improvements would focus on modernizing the roadway to make it multimodal and pedestrian and bicycle friendly (safety, mobility, connectivity, and security). For the purposes of this study, MPO staff divided the corridor into three segments-Brook Road, Reedsdale Road, and Randolph Avenue—and developed improvement concepts for each segment. The improvement concepts are diagramed in Figures 17 through 24. The long-term improvements were aimed at transforming the roadway from a car-centric corridor into a route for everyone that meets the needs of local residents and businesses, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists.

## ES. 4 CONCLUSION

The concepts developed in this study provide MassDOT, the Town of Milton, and other stakeholders an opportunity to review conceptual options for addressing
deficiencies in the corridor before committing design and engineering funds to a roadway improvement project. If implemented, the proposed improvements offered in this report would increase traffic safety, make traffic operations more efficient, and modernize the roadway to accommodate all users. This document provides a guide to possible improvements on this roadway; however, MassDOT and the Town of Milton are not obligated to make these improvements. The study aligns with the Boston Region MPO's goals of increasing safety on the region's highway system; modernizing roadways to improve capacity and mobility by expanding the quantity and quality of walking and bicycling infrastructure; making transit service more efficient; reducing congestion; and preserving the transportation system.

## Chapter 1-Introduction

### 1.1 ORIGIN OF STUDY

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) has been conducting studies of roadway corridors identified through the Needs Assessment of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) as needing infrastructure improvements to address safety, mobility, and traffic operations problems. ${ }^{2}$ Municipalities in the region and the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) have been receptive to these studies, which provide the opportunity to review conceptual options to improve a specific arterial segment before committing design and engineering funds to a project. If a proponent initiates a project that qualifies for state and federal funds, the study's documentation may be useful to both MassDOT and the project proponent for completing MassDOT Highway Division's project initiation forms, identifying problems along the corridor, justifying the need for improvements, and providing improvement concepts to advance into the preliminary design and engineering stages.

MPO staff identified a number of arterial roadway segments listed in the LRTP that should be prioritized because the roadways require maintenance, modernization, and safety and mobility improvements. To address the problems that exist in some of these arterial segments, a LRTP priority corridor study was included in the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). ${ }^{3}$ Staff selected Route 28 in the Town of Milton as the subject of the priority corridor study. MPO staff selects locations for study (considering agency, municipal, subregional, and other public feedback) and collects data, conducts technical analysis, and recommends improvements. Recommendations from the study are sent to implementing agencies, which may choose to fund improvements through various federal, state, and local sources, separately or in combination.

[^1]
# Chapter 2-Study Location and Process 

### 2.1 SELECTION PROCESS

On November 7, 2019, the Boston Region MPO identified the Route 28 in Milton study, following a selection process that involved a review of safety conditions, congestion, multimodal and regional significance of the roadway, regional equity, and the potential for implementing study recommendations. ${ }^{4,5,6,7,8,9}$ Figure 1 shows the study corridor and the surrounding area.

The study location was selected from a list of 44 arterial segments in 37 municipalities in the Boston Region MPO area. ${ }^{10} \mathrm{~A}$ copy of the technical memorandum describing the selection process is included in Appendix A. MassDOT Highway Division District 6, the MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning, and the Town of Milton supported the study of Route 28 by collecting data needed for the analyses, reviewing documentation of existing conditions, identifying problems, and developing improvements to mitigate the problems.

[^2]

Route 28 in Milton Study Area and Nearby Roadways

### 2.2 STUDY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

MassDOT and the Town of Milton have shown a commitment to improving conditions to transform this car-centric corridor into a route for everyone by

- increasing safety for motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists;
- increasing the quality and quantity of walking and bicycling options;
- modernizing the roadway and making travel more efficient and reliable; and
- supporting economic vitality and livability of the communities.

Toward that end, the objectives of this study were to

- collect data on roadway conditions, pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit users;
- analyze data and identify existing problems;
- determine the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders; and
- develop improvement concepts to address problems and needs.


### 2.3 ADVISORY TASK FORCE

An advisory task force composed of representatives from Milton, MassDOT, and the state legislators representing Milton was established to guide this study. MPO staff met with the task force twice. In the first meeting, the work scope and existing problems were discussed. In the second meeting, MPO staff presented the existing condition analyses, proposed improvements, and received advice from the task force members. This report reflects the task force's feedback. Appendix A includes a list of task force members and comments.

## Chapter 3-Roadway Characteristics

### 3.1 STUDY AREA CORRIDOR

Route 28 in Milton is a state and town highway. Figure 2 shows the jurisdictions of the roadway and selected intersections identified for study. The study corridor is about four miles long and assumes the local road names of Brook Road, Reedsdale Road, and Randolph Avenue. It is a four-lane, two-way roadway classified as an urban principal arterial and part of the National Highway System program. The Brook Road segment was recently reconfigured in October 2020 to a two-way, two-lane roadway with on-street protected bicycle lanes on either side of the roadway and parking at selected locations (Appendix B). The reconfiguration allowed continuous bicycle lanes from Adams Street to the Blue Hills Parkway and added parking for recreational and school needs. The roadway's right-of-way width varies between 65 feet and 72 feet, with the wider sections on Brook Road and Reedsdale Road and the narrower section on Randolph Avenue. This roadway serves regional and local traffic and includes several MPO transportation equity zones. The posted speed limit varies from 25 miles per hour (mph) to 45 mph throughout the corridor.

In this study, the corridor was divided into three segments for evaluation: Brook Road, Reedsdale Road, and Randolph Avenue (Figure 3). These road segments have different characteristics and contexts that define needs and considerations for developing improvement concepts. The three roadway segments and selected intersections for study are described below.


| BOSTON <br> REGION <br> MPO |  | Figure 2 Jurisdiction Map and Study Intersections | Addressing Priority Corridors from the LRTP Needs Assessment: Route 28 Priority Corridor Study: Milton, Massachusetts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



### 3.2 Route 28 (Brook Road Corridor)

The Brook Road segment is about 0.75 miles long. The area surrounding Brook Road has mixed land uses: residential, recreational, and educational. The St. Mary of the Hills School and Pierce Middle School are located in this section of the corridor, and both driveways are on Brook Road. In addition, the Kelly Field and Brook Road Playground is located adjacent to the road on the west side. There are many residences abutting the road. The speed limit in this corridor is 20 mph at the school zones and 25 mph otherwise. Due to the schools and playgrounds, parking is an issue during school openings and closings and in afternoons for field and playground activities. There are sidewalks on either side of the street. In October 2020, Brook Road was converted from a four-lane road to a two lane road. The reconfiguration added bike lanes on either side of the road and parking at selected locations. The reconfiguration has addressed some of the parking issues and improve connectivity and safety for people who bike.

### 3.2 Route 28 (Reedsdale Road Corridor)

The Reedsdale Road segment is about one mile long. The area surrounding Reedsdale Road is primarily residential. The Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital is located in this corridor and has a driveway on Reedsdale Road. The speed limit is 30 mph near the signalized intersections and 35 mph otherwise. There are sidewalks on either side of the roadway, but bicycles share the road with vehicles. Transit and pedestrian improvements were previously constructed in April 2020 at the hospital's driveway, including the installation of a pedestrian hybrid beacon signal and ADA-compliant wheelchair ramps.

### 3.2 Route 28 (Randolph Avenue Corridor)

The Randolph Avenue segment is about 1.8 miles long. The area surrounding Randolph Avenue is primarily residential and recreational. The Wollaston Golf Club and Granite Links Golf Club are located in the corridor. Many of the residences have driveways on Randolph Avenue or the driveways are accessed through the side streets, requiring turns into and out of Randolph Avenue. There are sidewalks on either side of the street, but bicycles share the road with vehicles. The speed limits in this corridor are 40 mph and 45 mph . The Wollaston Golf Club has its main entrance on Randolph Avenue at the intersection with Ridgewood Road.

### 3.2 STUDY INTERSECTIONS

Several cross streets and driveways intersect Route 28, which creates safety and operations issues for motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists. There are eight signalized intersections in the corridor, equipped with fully- or semi-actuated traffic-control systems, however, these systems require updating, lack
emergency preemption, and the existing signal timings and phasing plans are outdated. The following section describes the geometry, traffic and control, and land uses surrounding the signalized intersections. Figure 2 shows the aerial photos of the study intersections.

### 3.2.1 Route 28 (Brook Road) and Blue Hills Parkway

Blue Hills Parkway is the first intersection to the north of the study area. It intersects Route 28 to form a four-leg signalized intersection. At the intersection, Blue Hills Parkway (Route 28) southbound approach has two travel lanes, a shared through and left-turn lane, and an exclusive left-turn lane. Blue Hills Parkway's northbound approach has two lanes, a share through/right lane and an exclusive through lane. Brook Road (Route 28) westbound approach has two exclusive right-turn lanes and one travel lane for moving traffic at the eastbound approach. The intersection is equipped with a TS2 Type 1 signal controller, which operates as a fully-actuated and isolated traffic signal with bicycle detection. The signal heads are mounted on overhead mast arms with black backplates and no retroreflective yellow borders. There are functioning pedestrian signals with pedestrian-activated pushbuttons, but these signals are not accessible. An accessible pedestrian signal is an integrated device that communicates information about the WALK and DON'T WALK intervals at signalized intersections in nonvisual formats (i.e., audible tones and vibrotactile surfaces) to pedestrians who are blind or have low vision. Crosswalks are provided on all legs of the intersection and the wheelchair/curb ramps have detectable warning plates. The channelized islands and medians at the intersection have adequate openings for wheelchairs ramps. Street lights are present at the intersection. This is one of the critical intersections in the corridor-congested during peak periods with high traffic volumes on Route 28 (a high crash location) and difficult to cross for people who walk and bike. The land use near the intersection is mostly residential and the Tucker Elementary School is 500 feet south of the intersection. A school crossing guard helps students cross at the intersection during school openings and closings.

### 3.2.2 Route 28 (Brook Road) at St. Mary's Road Intersection

St. Mary's Road is a town-owned street that intersects Brook Road to form a three-leg signalized intersection. Each of the approaches on Brook Road has one travel lane that is shared with the left- and right-turn movements, and one lane on St. Mary's Road for moving all traffic at the approach. The intersection has a semi-actuated and coordinated traffic signal system with functioning accessible pedestrian signals. The traffic signal is interconnected with the midblock pedestrian signal at the St. Mary of the Hills School. The signal heads are mounted on posts and have backplates with retroreflective yellow borders to make them more visible. Crosswalks are provided at the intersection and the
wheelchair ramps have detectable warning plates. Street lights are present at the intersection. The Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) Bus Route 245 has stops at the intersection. The land uses adjacent to the intersection are primarily residential, however, the St. Mary of the Hills School and Kelly Field are located about 500 feet south of the intersection.

### 3.2.3 Route 28 (Brook Road) at Standish Road Intersection

Standish Road is a town-owned street that intersects Brook Road to form a three-leg signalized intersection. At the intersection, each approach has one travel lane serving all traffic movements. The intersection has a semi-actuated and coordinated traffic signal system with functioning accessible pedestrian signals. The signal heads are mounted on posts and some have backplates with yellow retroreflective borders. Crosswalks are provided at the intersection, but the wheelchair ramps lack detectable warning plates and are not ADA compliant. Street lights are present at the intersection. The land uses adjacent to the intersection are a mix of educational, recreation, and residential.

### 3.2.4 Route 28 (Brook Road and Reedsdale Road) at Central Avenue Intersection

Reedsdale Road and Central Avenue are town-owned local roadways. They intersect Brook Road at oblique angles to form a five-leg signalized intersection. The westbound approach of Brook Road has two through lanes and an exclusive left turn lane. Each of the approaches of Brook Road eastbound, Reedsdale Road northbound, and Central Avenue southbound have two travel lanes (a shared left-turn/through lane and a shared through/right lane). The Central Avenue northbound approach has one lane moving traffic in all directions. The intersection is equipped with a fully-actuated and isolated traffic signal system with functioning accessible pedestrian signals. All of the signal heads are mounted on posts and do not have backplates with retroreflective yellow borders. Crosswalks are provided at the intersection, but the wheelchair ramps lack detectable warning plates and are not ADA compliant. Street lights are present at the intersection. Bicycle lanes are provided on the east leg of Brook Road and the north leg of Central Avenue, but the lanes end at the intersection. The land uses in the area are mostly educational and residential.

### 3.2.5 Route 28 (Reedsdale Road) at Canton Avenue and Centre Street Intersection

Canton Avenue and Centre Street are town-owned streets that intersect Reedsdale Road to form a five-leg signalized intersection. At the intersection, Reedsdale Road has two through lanes on each approach that are shared with left- and right-turn movements. The Canton Avenue eastbound approach has two
travel lanes, a shared left-turn/through lane, and an exclusive right-turn lane. The Canton Avenue westbound approach and Centre Street southbound approach each have one lane on the approach serving all traffic movements. The intersection is equipped with a fully-actuated and isolated traffic signal system with functioning accessible pedestrian signals. The signal heads are a mixture of mast arm and post mounts, and the signals have backplates with retroreflective yellow borders. Crosswalks are provided on all legs of the intersection, but the wheelchair ramps have no detectable warning plates. Street lights are present at the intersection. The intersection handles high traffic volumes and it is congested during peak periods. The land use in the area is mostly residential, and the Milton Public Library is located in the southeastern corner of the intersection.

### 3.2.6 Route 28 (Reedsdale Avenue) at Hospital Driveway Intersection

Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital's driveway intersects Reedsdale Road to form a three-leg unsignalized intersection. At the intersection, Reedsdale Road has two travel lanes on each approach that are shared with the left- and right-turn movements. The driveway has one lane on its approach serving all traffic movements. The intersection was recently equipped with pedestrian hybrid beacon signals that are mounted overhead on mast arms and have backplates. There are functioning pedestrian signals with pushbuttons, and the crosswalks have wheelchair ramps with detectable warning plates. Street lights are present at the intersection. The land use in the area is mostly residential.

### 3.2.7 Route 28 (Reedsdale Road) at Randolph Avenue Intersection

Reedsdale Road is a town-owned road, which intersects Randolph Avenue, a state-owned road to form a four-leg signalized intersection. The intersection is under MassDOT's jurisdiction. At the intersection, Randolph Avenue northbound approach has two travel lanes (an exclusive left-turn lane and shared through/right-turn lane) while the southbound approach has one lane serving all traffic movements. Reedsdale Road eastbound approach has two travel lanes (an exclusive right-turn lane and shared through/left-turn lane) while the westbound approach has two travel lanes (shared left-turn/through lane and shared through/right lane). The signal heads are mounted overhead on mast arms and the signals have backplates with no retroreflective yellow borders. There are functioning pedestrian signals at all four corners of the intersection, but the signals are not accessible. Crosswalks with wheelchair ramps are provided on all legs of the intersection, but the crosswalks have no detectable warning plates. The intersection handles high volumes of traffic and it is congested during peak periods. Street lights are present at the intersection. The land uses adjacent to the intersection are mixed commercial and residential. The St. Elizabeth Rectory is located in the northwestern corner of the intersection.

### 3.2.8 Route 28 (Randolph Avenue) at Reed Street/Access Road Intersection

Reed Street is a town-owned street that intersects Randolph Avenue to form a four-leg signalized intersection. The intersection is under MassDOT's jurisdiction. Access Road is a private road to the Granite Links Golf Club; it is currently closed to traffic. The intersection is under MassDOT's jurisdiction. Randolph Avenue has two through lanes on each approach that are shared with the left and right turns while Reed Street has one lane on its approach serving all movements. The intersection is equipped with a TS2 Type 1 signal controller, which operates as a fully-actuated system in isolated mode. The signal heads are mounted on a mixture of mast arms and posts, and the signals have backplates without yellow retroreflective borders. Functioning pedestrian signals with pedestrian-activated pushbuttons are provided, but are not accessible. There are crosswalks on all legs of the intersection with wheelchair ramps, but the crosswalks lack detectable warning. Street lights are present at the intersection. The land uses near the intersection are primarily residential and recreational. Because of cut-through traffic during the morning peak travel period, turns into Reed Street are prohibited from 7:00 AM-9:00 AM.

### 3.2.9 Route 28 (Randolph Avenue) at Hallen Avenue Intersection

Hallen Avenue is a town-owned street that intersects Randolph Avenue to form a three-leg unsignalized intersection. The intersection is under MassDOT's jurisdiction. At the intersection, Randolph Avenue has two lanes on each approach that are shared with the left- and right-turn lanes. Hallen Avenue has a single lane serving all traffic movements at the approach. There are no crosswalks at the intersection. The land use adjacent to the intersection is primarily residential. Because of cut-through traffic during the morning peak travel period, turns into Hallen Avenue are prohibited from 7:00 AM-9:00 AM.

### 3.2.10 Route 28 (Randolph Avenue) at Hillside Street/Driveway Intersection

Hillside Street is a town-owned road that intersects Randolph Avenue to form a four-leg signalized intersection. The intersection is under MassDOT's jurisdiction. At the intersection, Randolph Avenue has two through lanes on each approach, which are shared with the left and right turns. Hillside Street has a single lane on its approach for all movements. The fourth leg of the intersection is a driveway that provides access to an adjacent residence. The intersection is equipped with a TS2 Type 1 signal controller, which operates as a fully-actuated system in isolation mode. The signal heads are mounted on a combination of mast arms and posts, and have backplates without yellow retroreflective borders. Functioning pedestrian signals with pedestrian-activated pushbuttons are
provided but are not accessible. There are crosswalks on all legs of the intersection with wheelchair ramps, but the crosswalks lack detectable warning. Street lights are present at the intersection. The land use adjacent to the intersection is primarily residential.

### 3.2.11 Route 28 (Randolph Avenue) at Chickatawbut Road Intersection

Chickatawbut Road is a state-owned road that intersects Randolph Avenue to form a four-leg signalized intersection. The intersection is under MassDOT's jurisdiction. At the intersection, Randolph Avenue has two through lanes on each approach, which are shared with the left and right turns. Chickatawbut Road has a single lane on each approach for all movements. The intersection is equipped with a TS2 Type 1 signal controller, which operates as a fully-actuated system in isolation mode. The signal heads are mounted on mixture of mast arms and posts, and have backplates without yellow retroreflective borders. Functioning pedestrian signals with pedestrian-activated pushbuttons are provided, but the signals are not accessible. There are crosswalks on all legs of the intersection with wheelchair ramps, but there is no detectable warning. Street lights are present at the intersection. The land uses adjacent to the intersection are primarily residential and recreational. This intersection is currently in MassDOT's project design process and includes improvements to address its problems-it is therefore excluded from this study.

## Chapter 4-Data Collection

MPO staff gathered data on vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle volumes, vehicle travel speeds, crashes, signal timing information, and roadway and intersection geometry data for existing conditions analyses.

### 4.1 TRAFFIC DATA

MassDOT Highway Division's Traffic Data Collection section collected traffic data for the study. Automatic traffic recorder (ATR) counts were collected during a seven-day period from Monday, October 26, 2020, to Sunday, November 1, 2020. The ATR counts included daily traffic volumes, speeds, and traffic mix (light and heavy vehicles). MassDOT also collected turning-movement counts (TMC) in the study area on Thursday, October 15, 2020, and on Saturday, October 17, 2020. The TMC counts were performed during the weekday AM peak travel period (6:00 AM to 9:00 AM) and weekday PM peak travel period (3:00 PM to 6:00 PM). In all cases, heavy vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles were recorded separately.

### 4.2 INTERSECTION LAYOUTS AND SIGNAL TIMING DATA

MassDOT provided MPO staff with intersection layouts. Staff conducted field visits to verify modifications to the intersection layouts and signal timing plans. MassDOT Highway District 6 and the Town of Milton provided MPO staff with existing signal timings, as-built traffic signal plans, and signal-phase sequences of the signalized intersections.

### 4.3 CRASH DATA

MPO staff used crash data obtained from MassDOT's Registry of Motor Vehicles database from January 2013, through December 2017, to evaluate safety for motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists in the study area.

### 4.4 TRANSIT SERVICES

Transit service data from the MBTA and the Brockton Area Transit Authority (BAT) were gathered to evaluate transit services in the corridor.

### 4.5 PROJECTS

MassDOT and the Town of Milton provided information on planned and proposed projects in the corridor.

# Chapter 5-Existing Conditions Analysis 

### 5.1 VEHICLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND BICYCLE VOLUMES

### 5.1.1 Vehicular Volumes

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Route 28 October 2020 traffic counts were 30 percent lower. The counts were adjusted by using 2014 historical counts at the intersections of Reedsdale Road at Randolph Avenue and Randolph Road at Chickatawbut Road.

Figure 4 shows a summary of the adjusted average weekday traffic volumes. The amount of daily traffic volumes range from 18,000 to 30,000 vehicles per day. The volumes showed a gradual increase from north of the corridor to south of the corridor. The Randolph Avenue segment carried the highest volume of traffic and Brook Road and Reedsdale Road carried the lowest volume. The higher volumes occurred on Randolph Avenue, because major crossroads intersect Route 28 and connect to the Interstate 93 (Route 128) corridor via Randolph Avenue. Appendix C contains full records of the ATR counts.

Figure 5 shows the turning movement volumes at 12 intersections during the weekday AM and PM peak hours and Saturday PM peak hour. Peak hours in the corridor were recorded as 6:30 AM to 7:30 AM in the morning, 4:00 PM to 5:00 PM in the afternoon, and 12:30 PM to 1:30 PM on Saturday. Because of the pandemic, the October 2020 counts were lower by about 30 percent on Route 28. The counts were adjusted by using 2014 historical counts at the intersections of Reedsdale Road at Randolph Avenue and Randolph Road at Chickatawbut Road. The turning movement data are included in Appendix C.

### 5.1.2 Pedestrian Volumes

The TMC data also included volumes of pedestrians and bicyclists during the three-hour collection periods (weekday AM and PM and Saturday midday). Table 1 distinguishes the number of pedestrians that crossed Route 28 from those that crossed an adjacent side street on the east or west side of Route 28. The counts show that pedestrian activity is highest on Brook Road at Standish Road and Central Avenue intersections, which is also the area where the schools and playgrounds are located. The counts show that pedestrian activity is also high on Reedsdale Road, which serves the residential neighborhood and the Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital.




## Table 1

Peak Period Pedestrian Volumes

| Route 28 Intersection | Route 28 | Side Street <br> on the west | Side Street <br> on the east | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Blue Hills Parkway/Brook Road | 130 | 66 | -- | 196 |
| Thacher Street | 17 | 79 | -- | 96 |
| St. Mary's Road | 53 | 35 | 63 | 151 |
| Standish Road | 152 | 120 | 86 | 358 |
| Central Avenue/Brook Road | 114 | 53 | 64 | 231 |
| Canton Avenue/Centre Street | 97 | 35 | 47 | 179 |
| Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital | 21 | 56 | 82 | 159 |
| Reedsdale Road/Randolph Avenue | 107 | 14 | 16 | 137 |
| Reed Street/Access Road | 4 | 7 | 16 | 27 |
| Hallen Road | 0 | 9 | -- | 9 |
| Hillside Street | 11 | 9 | 7 | 27 |
| Chickatawbut Road | 11 | 1 | 0 | 12 |

Note: Weekday AM = 6:00 AM to 9:00 AM. Weekday PM = 3:00 PM to 6:00 PM. Weekend PM 11:00 AM to 2:00 PM. Shading denotes that a crosswalk is absent on Route 28 at this location.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

### 5.1.3 Bicycle Volumes

Counts of bicycles on the road and at crosswalks were moderate (Table 2). MPO staff attributes the moderate cyclist volumes primarily to the absence of appropriate facilities in the corridor, high volumes of traffic, and high speeds of vehicles, which create high stress and safety concerns. The data indicate that most bicycle activities take place on Brook Road and Reedsdale Road.

Table 2
Peak Period Bicycle Volumes

| Route 28 Intersection | Bicycle on <br> Road | Bicycle on <br> Crosswalk | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Blue Hills Parkway/Brook Road | 121 | 32 | 153 |
| Thacher Street | 37 | 6 | 43 |
| St. Mary's Road | 36 | 18 | 54 |
| Standish Road | 53 | 43 | 96 |
| Central Avenue/Brook Road | 52 | 36 | 88 |
| Canton Avenue/Centre Street | 23 | 23 | 46 |
| Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital | 10 | 23 | 33 |
| Reedsdale Road/Randolph Avenue | 17 | 23 | 40 |
| Reed Street/Access Road | 13 | 9 | 22 |
| Hallen Road | 10 | 3 | 13 |
| Hillside Street | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| Chickatawbut Road | 38 | 0 | 38 |

[^3]
### 5.2 VEHICLE SPEED INFORMATION

MPO staff collected vehicle spot speeds at three of the ATR sites on Route 28. The spot speeds measure vehicle speeds at a specific point and do not include delays at the intersections when traveling through the corridor. Table 3 presents the measured spot speeds, and Figure 6 shows the spot speed data and compares it with the posted speed regulations. The data show that the 85th percentile speeds were higher than the posted speed limits, because of the high speeds of vehicles during the off-peak periods. In other words, the 85th percentile speeds are speeds that 15 percent of the motorists sampled exceeded while driving in the corridor. The average spot speeds were also higher than the speed limits on Brook Road and Reedsdale Road, but consistent with the speed limits on Randolph Avenue. Appendix C includes the speed data.

Table 3
Observed Spot Speeds

| Location | Direction | Average Speed (mph) | 85th <br> Percentile Speed (mph) | 10 mph Pace Speed (mph) | Average Speed <br> Exceeds <br> Posted <br> Speed <br> Limit? | 85th <br> Percentile <br> Speed <br> Exceeds <br> Posted Speed <br> Limit? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brook Road south of Ridge Road | NB | No data | No data | No data | No data | No data |
| Brook Road south of Ridge Road | SB | 34 | 39 | 25-35 | Yes | Yes |
| Reedsdale Road north of Spafford Road | NB | 43 | 50 | 35-45 | Yes | Yes |
| Reedsdale Road north of Spafford Road | SB | 38 | 44 | 30-40 | Yes | Yes |
| Randolph Avenue south of Pleasant Street | NB | 37 | 43 | 30-40 | No | Yes |
| Randolph Avenue south of Pleasant Street | SB | 43 | 49 | 35-45 | Yes | Yes |
| Randolph Avenue south of Hillside Street | NB | 40 | 48 | 30-40 | Yes | Yes |
| Randolph Avenue south of Hillside Street | SB | 38 | 44 | 30-40 | No | Yes |

$\mathrm{mph}=$ miles per hour. NB = northbound. $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.


| BOSTON <br> REGION MPO |  | Figure 6 <br> Measured and Posted Speeds | Addressing Priority Corridors from the LRTP Needs Assessment: Route 28 Priority Corridor Study: Milton, Massachusetts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

### 5.3 CRASH DATA AND SAFETY ANALYSIS

### 5.3.1 Crash Summaries

During the five-year analysis period, 473 crashes were recorded in the MassDOT database. Table 4 presents a summary of the crashes. Some characteristics of the crashes include the following:

- four fatal crashes on the Randolph Avenue segment
- the injury rate was very high-40 percent of crashes resulted in injury to at least one of the involved parties
- thirty-six percent of all crashes were angle crashes
- twenty-seven percent of all crashes were rear-end crashes
- twenty-one percent of all crashes were single vehicle crashes
- many of the rear-end and angle crashes may have been caused by congestion and the lack of turn lanes at the signalized intersection
- thirty-eight percent of crashes took place during peak period (defined as 6:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM to 6:00 PM)
- three crashes involved a pedestrian and six crashes involved a bicyclist
- sixty-four percent of crashes took place at an intersection
- thirty-six percent of crashes took place along an open roadway segment
Table 4
Route 28 Crash Statistics (Five-Year Crash Summary)

| Crash Variable | All Crashes | Percent (\%) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Crash Severity | - | - |
| Fatal injury | 4 | 1 |
| Nonfatal injury | 189 | 40 |
| Property damage only (none injured) | 267 | 56 |
| Not Reported | 13 | 3 |
| Manner of Collision | - | - |
| Rear-end | 126 | 27 |
| Angle | 168 | 36 |
| Sideswipe, same direction | 42 | 9 |
| Single vehicle crash | 100 | 21 |
| Head-on | 17 | 4 |
| Sideswipe, opposite direction | 12 | 2 |
| Not reported | 8 | 1 |
| Road Surface Conditions | - | - |
| Dry | 361 | 76 |
| Wet | 74 | 16 |


| Snow/ice/slush | 34 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Not reported | 4 | 1 |
| Ambient Light Conditions | - | - |
| Daylight | 325 | 69 |
| Dark-lighted roadway | 123 | 26 |
| Dusk | 14 | 3 |
| Dawn | 4 | 1 |
| Dark—roadway not lighted | 2 | 0 |
| Other | 2 | 0 |
| Not reported | 3 | 1 |
| Weather Conditions | - | - |
| Clear | 290 | 61 |
| Cloudy | 99 | 21 |
| Rain | 54 | 11 |
| Snow/sleet/hail | 23 | 5 |
| Fog/smog/smoke | 3 | 1 |
| Not reported | 4 | 1 |
| Travel Period | 291 | - |
| Off-peak | 182 | 62 |
| Peak | - | 38 |
| Pedestrian and Bicycle Crashes | 464 | - |
| Vehicle crashes | 3 | 98 |
| Pedestrian-related crashes | 6 | 1 |
| Bicycle-related crashes |  | 1 |
| Crash Location | 302 |  |
| Intersection | 171 | 64 |
| Segment | 473 | 36 |
| Total crashes | 100 |  |
| Note: Peak periods are 6:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM to 7:00 PM, Monday through Friday. |  |  |
| Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff. |  |  |

### 5.3.2 Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Crash Clusters

The HSIP provides funding for eligible improvements that reduce fatalities and serious injuries on public roads. An HSIP-eligible cluster is one in which the total number of EPDO crashes are within the top five percent in the Metropolitan Area Planning Council region. An HSIP-eligible project is any strategy, activity, or project that corrects or improves a hazardous public road location or feature, or addresses a highway safety problem.

Figure 7 shows the crashes at the intersections and between segments, and identifies the HSIP intersection crash clusters within the study corridor. Four intersections on the corridor are HSIP crash clusters.


| BOSTON <br> REGION MPO | 25 | Figure 7 <br> Observed Intersection and Segment Crashes (2013-17) | Addressing Priority Corridors from the LRTP Needs Assessment: Route 28 Priority Corridor Study: Milton, Massachusetts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

- Route 28 (Brook Road) at Reedsdale Road and Central Avenue
- Route 28 (Reedsdale Road) at Canton Avenue and Centre Street
- Route 28 (Randolph Avenue) at Reedsdale Road
- Route 28 (Randolph Avenue) at Chickatawbut Road


### 5.3.3 Predicted and Expected Crashes

MPO staff used the regionalized versions of the Highway Safety Manual (HSM) method for its analysis of intersections. ${ }^{11}$ The techniques in the HSM combine roadway geometry, traffic volumes, crash history, and regional factors into unified metrics referred to as predicted and expected crashes. The predicted number of crashes is the estimated crashes under idealized circumstances. The expected number of crashes estimates the intrinsic safety conditions at a site by compensating for the random fluctuations typically associated with samples of crash data. The predicted and expected crashes are used to identify high-risk sites with potential for safety improvements, and to compare the relative merits of different intervention strategies. ${ }^{12}$ The difference between predicted and expected crashes is referred to as the potential for safety improvement (PSI). If the predicted number of crashes is significantly less than the expected number of crashes, it suggests that correctable factors are elevating the crash rate.

For each intersection and road segment, Table 5 shows the average number of observed, predicted, and expected crashes, along with the total number of crashes that were recorded between 2013 and 2017. Table 5 also shows the numerical values of the PSI for the different intersections and segments (shaded green) within the corridor. This comparison provides insight into the responsiveness of a particular location to potential safety interventions. Many locations in the study area are high-risk sites with potential for safety improvements.

Table 6 shows the total estimated comprehensive societal cost per year that resulted from crashes within the corridor. Estimated costs based on expected crashes per year are well above $\$ 12$ million, which demonstrates that investing in safety improvements inside the corridor could yield large returns when

[^4]considering the comprehensive societal cost. ${ }^{13}{ }^{14}$ Appendix D provides details about the input data, computational steps, and HSM formula outputs.

## Table 5 <br> Potential for Safety Improvements

| Intersection/Segment | Total Crashes (2013-17) | HSIP | Average Observed Crashes | Average Predicted Crashes | Average Expected Crashes | PSI | High -risk Site | Observed Crashes > Expected Crashes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brook Road segment | 42 | -- | 8.40 | 7.90 | 8.16 | 0.26 | Yes | Yes |
| Brook Road at Blue Hill Parkway/Thacher Street | 30 | No | 8.20 | 6.90 | 7.47 | 0.57 | Yes | Yes |
| Brook Road at St. Mary's Road | 5 | No | 1.00 | 4.80 | 1.35 | -3.45 | No | No |
| Brook Road at Standish Road | 8 | No | 1.60 | 3.90 | 0.91 | -2.99 | No | Yes |
| Brook Road at Central Avenue | 41 | Yes | 8.40 | 6.40 | 7.83 | 1.43 | Yes | Yes |
| Reedsdale Avenue segment | 31 | -- | 6.2 | 10.53 | 6.90 | -3.63 | No | No |
| Reedsdale Road at Canton Avenue | 32 | Yes | 7.40 | 7.20 | 7.26 | 0.06 | Yes | Yes |
| Reedsdale Road at Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital | 4 | No | 0.60 | 2.30 | 0.96 | -1.34 | No | No |
| Randolph Avenue segment | 88 | -- | 17.60 | 14.01 | 14.42 | 0.41 | Yes | Yes |
| Randolph Avenue and Reedsdale Road | 29 | Yes | 6.20 | 10.70 | 7.33 | -3.37 | No | No |
| Randolph Avenue at Reeds Road | 17 | No | 3.60 | 7.80 | 4.81 | -2.99 | No | No |
| Randolph Avenue at Hallen Avenue | 24 | No | 4.80 | 6.50 | 5.44 | -1.06 | No | No |
| Randolph Avenue at Hillside Street | 11 | No | 2.20 | 14.50 | 4.24 | -10.26 | No | No |
| Randolph Avenue at Chickatawbut Road | 102 | Yes | 20.20 | 11.86 | 20.55 | 8.69 | Yes | No |

[^5][^6]
## Table 6

Comprehensive Costs of Crashes

|  | Expected |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Crash Severity | Crashes per Year | Annual Expected Cost |
| Property Damage Only | 79.68 | $\$ 1,243,008$ |
| Fatal and Injury | 41.65 | $\$ 10,862,320$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2 1 . 3 3}$ | $\$ 12,105, \mathbf{3 2 8}$ |

Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

### 5.3.4 Analysis of Collision Diagrams

MPO staff prepared collision diagrams for the entire length of the corridor to examine patterns within the crash data. The collision diagrams are included in Appendix D. The associated tables may be used to look up additional details for specific crash events. Figures 8 through 11 show the collision diagrams for the HSIP intersection clusters. Figures 12 through 14 show the collision diagrams for locations with fatal crashes. Considering all the available data, MPO staff drew the following conclusions about conditions at different intersections within the study area:

## High Priority Segments

Randolph Avenue and Brook Road segments are the high priority segments. Each of these segments has large numbers of observed crashes and great potential for safety improvement, making them clear targets for intervention. The Brook Road segment has schools, recreational areas, and residences; therefore, its four travel lanes, low volumes, and high vehicle speeds make it unsafe for people who walk or bike. The Randolph Avenue segment has recreational areas, businesses, and residences; therefore, its straight alignment, high speed, and high volume makes it unsafe for people who drive, walk, or bike. There were four fatalities on the Randolph Avenue segment. Important contributing factors in these crashes were peak-period congestion, high speed of vehicles, and lack of turn lanes.

## High Priority Intersections

Six intersections were included in this category based on the collision diagrams, HSIP crash clusters, PSI analysis, and unconventional geometry:

- Brook Road at Blue Hills Parkway
- Brook Road at Reedsdale Road and Central Avenue
- Reedsdale Road at Canton Avenue
- Reedsdale Road at Randolph Avenue
- Randolph Avenue at Hallen Avenue
- Randolph Avenue at Chickatawbut









### 5.4 LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) ANALYSIS

### 5.4.1 Intersection LOS

MPO staff conducted traffic operations analyses consistent with the HCM methodologies. ${ }^{15} \mathrm{HCM}$ methodology is used to assess traffic conditions at signalized and unsignalized intersections and to rate the LOS from A to F. LOS A represents the best operating conditions (little to no delay), while LOS F represents the worst operating conditions (long delay). LOS E represents operating conditions at capacity (the limit of acceptable delay). Table 7 presents the control delays (standards for comparison) associated with each LOS for signalized and unsignalized intersections.

Using the traffic and signal data collected, MPO staff built traffic analysis networks for the weekday AM and weekday PM peak hours. Synchro traffic analysis was used to assess the capacity and quality of traffic flow. ${ }^{16}$ Tables 8 through 10 show the analysis results for the weekday AM, weekday PM, respectively. Appendix E presents the existing conditions LOS analysis worksheets. Based on the traffic operations analyses, these intersections are congested and have long queues during peak travel hours:

- Brook Road at Blue Hills Parkway
- Brook Road at Reedsdale Road/Central Avenue
- Reedsdale Road at Canton Avenue/Centre Street
- Randolph Avenue at Reedsdale Road

Table 7
Intersection Level of Service Criteria

| Level of Service | Signalized Intersection <br> Control Delay (seconds per <br> vehicle) | Unsignalized Intersection <br> Control Delay (seconds per <br> vehicle) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | $<10$ | $<10$ |
| B | $10-20$ | $10-15$ |
| C | $20-35$ | $15-25$ |
| D | $35-55$ | $25-35$ |
| E | $55-80$ | $35-50$ |
| F | $>80$ | $>50$ |

Source: Highway Capacity Manual 2010.

[^7]Table 8
Brook Road: Existing Conditions, Levels of Service, Delays, and Queues

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.)* } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ (\mathrm{ft})^{* \star} \end{array}$ | AM Delay Delay (s) <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.)* } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ (\mathrm{ft})^{* \star} \end{array}$ | PM Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | SB | L | 171 | 328 | 28.2 | C | 606 | -1207 | 67.1 | E |
| Route 28 | SB | LT | 175 | 334 | 27.9 | C | 670 | -1309 | 73.4 | E |
| Route 28 Blue Hill | NB | R | 303 | -551 | 36.8 | D | 283 | 505 | 35.3 | D |
| Parkway | NB | TR | 172 | -294 | 48.1 | D | 185 | 299 | 68.5 | E |
| Brook Road | EB | LTR | 155 | -324 | 57.9 | E | 235 | 395 | 72.7 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 39.1 | D | -- | -- | 61.1 | E |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | 0 | 3 | 0.4 | A | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A |
| Thacher Street | NB | LR | 50 | 82 | 43.1 | E | 100 | 144 | 102.8 | F |
| Intersection | All | All |  |  | 3.5 | A |  |  | 6.7 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 0 | 121 | 4.2 | A | 0 | 201 | 4.8 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | 0 | 201 | 5.0 | A | 0 | 149 | 4.6 | A |
| St. Mary's Road | NE | LR | 1 | 27 | 11.6 | B | 3 | 32 | 12.8 | B |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 4.9 | A | -- | -- | 4.9 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | 43 | 204 | 8.4 | A | 36 | 171 | 8.4 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | LTR | 26 | 128 | 7.3 | A | 50 | 230 | 9.2 | A |
| Standish Street | SW | LTR | 3 | 25 | 16.8 | C | 9 | 40 | 20.8 | C |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 8.1 | A | -- | -- | 9.1 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | -354 | -522 | 84.7 | F | 238 | 306 | 64.6 | E |
| Route 28 | SB | LT | -516 | -755 | 290.2 | F | -628 | -869 | 365.1 | F |
| Route 28 | SB | R | -386 | -609 | 171.5 | F | -393 | -635 | 105.5 | F |
| Brook Road | WB | L | 125 | 203 | 42.8 | D | 142 | 222 | 45.4 | D |
| Brook Road | WB | TR | 150 | 210 | 42.2 | D | 171 | 231 | 44.4 | D |
| Central Avenue | NE | LR | 64 | -194 | 58 | E | -275 | -460 | 288.1 | F |
| Central Avenue | SB | LTR | 123 | 172 | 65.6 | E | 205 | 273 | 68.5 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 117.3 | F | -- | -- | 137.4 | F |

Note: Shading denotes intersections that are congested during peak travel hours.

* Negative (-) sign = Volume exceeds capacity (queue may be longer)
** Negative (-) sign $=95$ percentile volume exceed capacity, queue may be longer
$E B=$ eastbound. $L O S=$ level of service. $L=$ left. $R=$ right. $L R=$ left and right. $L T=$ left and through. $T R=$ through and right. LTR = left, through, and right. $\mathrm{NE}=$ northeast. $\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound. WB = westbound $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. NW = northwest. SE = southeast. SW = southwest.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

Table 9
Reedsdale Road: Existing Conditions Levels of Service, Delays, and Queues

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ (\mathrm{ft})^{*} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.)** } \end{array}$ | Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.)* } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.)** } \end{array}$ | PM Delay Delay $(\mathrm{s})$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | -354 | -522 | 84.7 | F | 238 | 306 | 64.6 | E |
| Route 28 | SB | LT | -516 | -755 | 290.2 | F | -628 | -869 | 365.1 | F |
| Route 28 | SB | R | -386 | -609 | 171.5 | F | -393 | -635 | 105.5 | F |
| Brook Road | WB | L | 125 | 203 | 42.8 | D | 142 | 222 | 45.4 | D |
| Brook Road | WB | TR | 150 | 210 | 42.2 | D | 171 | 231 | 44.4 | D |
| Central Avenue | NE | LR | 64 | -194 | 58 | E | -275 | -460 | 288.1 | F |
| Central Avenue | SB | LTR | 123 | 172 | 65.6 | E | 205 | 273 | 68.5 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 117.3 | F | -- | -- | 137.4 | F |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | -595 | -889 | 104.2 | F | 348 | -530 | 75.7 | E |
| Route 28 | SB | LTR | 218 | 327 | 53.8 | D | -466 | -711 | 125.2 | F |
| Canton Avenue | NE | LT | -466 | -815 | 125 | F | -527 | -906 | 145.2 | F |
| Canton Avenue | NE | R | 41 | 123 | 21.9 | C | 41 | 125 | 22.6 | C |
| Canton Avenue | SB | LR | 143 | -275 | 102.3 | F | -249 | -509 | 147.3 | F |
| Centre Street | SW | LTR | -457 | -802 | 122.9 | F | 405 | -755 | 107 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 96.3 | F | -- | -- | 109.3 | F |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | 0 | 12 | 1.6 | A | 0 | 8 | 1.5 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A |
| Hospital Driveway | EB | LR | 0 | 21 | 21.1 | C | 0 | 71 | 24.9 | C |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 1.7 | A | -- | -- | 3.0 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | L | -466 | -1193 | 177.7 | F | 129 | -591 | 53.5 | D |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | 159 | 505 | 21.3 | C | 115 | 322 | 17.5 | B |
| Route 28 | SB | LT | 117 | 316 | 27.9 | C | 157 | 324 | 32.6 | C |
| Route 28 | SB | R | 50 | 131 | 8.8 | A | -439 | -905 | 67.6 | E |
| Reedsdale Road | WB | LTR | 91 | 233 | 28.9 | C | 168 | -354 | 53.2 | D |
| Randolph Avenue | SB | LTR | 115 | 310 | 34.8 | C | 212 | -538 | 37.5 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 69.2 | E | -- | -- | 47.7 | D |

[^8]Table 10
Randolph Avenue: Existing Conditions Levels of Service, Delays, and Queues

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | AM Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \end{array}$ | PM $95 \%$ Queue <br> (ft.) | PM Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | NB | L | -466 | -1193 | 177.7 | F | 129 | -591 | 53.5 | D |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | 159 | 505 | 21.3 | C | 115 | 322 | 17.5 | B |
| Route 28 | SB | LT | 117 | 316 | 27.9 | C | 157 | 324 | 32.6 | C |
| Route 28 | SB | R | 50 | 131 | 8.8 | A | -439 | -905 | 67.6 | E |
| Reedsdale Road | WB | LTR | 91 | 233 | 28.9 | C | 168 | -354 | 53.2 | D |
| Randolph Avenue | SB | LTR | 115 | 310 | 34.8 | C | 212 | -538 | 37.5 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 69.2 | E | -- | -- | 47.7 | D |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | 0 | -797 | 9.2 | A | 130 | 372 | 13.3 | B |
| Route 28 | SB | T | 0 | 182 | 4.8 | A | 221 | 621 | 17.6 | B |
| Reeds Street | EB | LR | 9 | 46 | 32.9 | C | 21 | 83 | 31.2 | C |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 8.2 | A | -- | -- | 16.2 | B |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | 0 | 3 | 0.3 | A | 0 | 19 | 2.5 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 0 | 0 | 0 | A | 0 | 0 | 0 | A |
| Hallen Avenue | EB | LR | 0 | 13 | 15.9 | B | 20 | 72 | 42.2 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 0.6 | A | -- | -- | 2.6 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | 214 | -980 | 16.7 | B | 113 | -573 | 15.6 | B |
| Route 28 | SB | LTR | 56 | 268 | 9.1 | A | 220 | -981 | 17 | B |
| Hillside Street | EB | LTR | 48 | 132 | 43.6 | D | 59 | 157 | 44.4 | D |
| Driveway | WB | LTR | 2 | 17 | 44 | D | 2 | 17 | 44.8 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 15.6 | B | -- | -- | 17.8 | B |

Note: Shading denotes intersections that are congested during peak travel hours.

* Negative (-) sign = Volume exceeds capacity (queue may be longer)
** Negative (-) sign = 95 percentile volume exceed capacity, queue may be longer
$E B=$ eastbound. $L O S=$ level of service. $L=$ left. $R=$ right. $L R=$ left and right. $L T=$ left and through. $T R=$ through and right. LTR = left, through, and right. NE = northeast. NB = northbound. WB = westbound SB = southbound. NW = Northwest. SE = southeast. SW = southwest.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.


### 5.4.2 Pedestrian Level of Service (PLOS)

The quality of pedestrian travel is largely affected by the roadway infrastructure, such as whether there are sidewalks and crosswalks present or pedestrian signals that allow pedestrians time to cross an intersection before vehicles get a green light. To reflect the complex relationship between pedestrians and the travel environments, MPO staff developed a PLOS tool, which grades a given roadway on its quality of pedestrian travel, and whether it reflects these objectives: safety, system preservation, capacity management and mobility, and
economic vitality. ${ }^{17}$ Based on the tool, Route 28 in Milton was rated poor in terms of safety, poor in terms of system preservation, and poor in terms of economic vitality, and capacity management and mobility. Overall, the assessment indicates that the roadway needs improvements to safely accommodate pedestrians. The ratings from this pedestrian assessment tool are in Appendix F.

### 5.4.3 Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS)

The quality of bicycle travel is largely affected by the character of the roadway, safety, and security, such as speed of vehicles, travel time, comfort and convenience, and freedom to maneuver. The BLOS tool is intended to help users and planners assess the infrastructure to facilitate bicycle travel. The approach is similar to the PLOS tool in that it grades locations with features that are suitable or unsuitable for bicyclists-areas well suited for bicycle travel are awarded high scores and areas unsuitable for bicycle travel are awarded low scores. In addition, the BLOS ratings correlate with the objectives emphasized for PLOS. Based on the BLOS tool, Route 28 in Milton was rated poor in terms of safety, poor in terms of system preservation, and poor in terms of economic vitality, and capacity management and mobility. Overall, the assessment indicates that the roadway needs improvements to accommodate bicyclists. The ratings from this bicycle assessment tool are in Appendix F.

### 5.5 TRANSIT SERVICES

The Route 28 corridor in Milton and surrounding areas are served by three bus routes operated by the MBTA and BAT. BAT's Route 12 and MBTA's Route 240 operate full daily schedules, while MBTA's Route 245 operates only on weekdays with five inbound and outbound trips. All three routes share stops and have designated signs at each of the stops. There are no benches or shelters at any of the bus stops.

The BAT's Route 12, which serves Ashmont Station to the BAT Center in Brockton, operates on Randolph Avenue, Reedsdale Road, and Central Avenue. It provides bus service to Milton Hospital, the Mattapan High Speed Line, and the Red Line. Buses run Monday through Friday every 15 to 30 minutes from 5:45 AM to 12:02 AM; every 30 minutes on Saturdays from 6:20 AM to 11:45 PM; and every 40 to 80 minutes on Sundays from 11:20 AM to 7:40 PM.

MBTA bus Route 240, which serves Avon Square or Holbrook/Randolph Commuter Rail Station to Ashmont Station, operates through the area on Randolph Avenue, Reedsdale Road, and Central Avenue. It provides bus service

[^9]to Milton Hospital, the Mattapan High Speed Line, and Red Line. Buses run Monday through Friday every 10 to 30 minutes from 4:45 AM to 12:45 AM; every 30 to 60 minutes on Saturdays from 5:50 AM to 12:45 AM; and every 60 to 90 minutes on Sundays from 7:00 AM to 12:35 AM. On weekdays, Route 240 operates a total of 50 inbound buses and 50 outbound buses through the corridor. On Saturdays, it operates a total of 37 inbound buses and 37outbound buses through the corridor. On Sundays, it operates 15 buses in each direction through the corridor. Total weekday ridership is 4,400 passengers.

MBTA bus Route 245, which serves Quincy Center Station to Mattapan Station, operates through the area on Reedsdale Road, Brook Road, and Blue Hills Parkway. It provides bus service to Milton Hospital and the Mattapan High Speed Line. Buses run Monday through Friday only with five inbound and five outbound trips-two trips in the morning and three trips in the afternoon for each direction. There is no weekend service or service during school vacation days.

## Chapter 6-Projects and Studies

Previous transportation projects and studies for the Route 28 corridor that addressed the study area problems are described below. The conceptual improvements developed in this study considered and incorporated recommendations from the previous studies.

### 6.1 RECONSTRUCTION OF RANDOLPH ROAD AND CHICKATAWBUT ROAD INTERSECTION

MassDOT's project number 607342 will reconstruct this intersection to address the high number of crashes. This intersection ranks second in the state's top 200 list given the severity of accidents that occur at this location. The project work will include replacing the existing traffic signal with a two-lane modern roundabout. This project is funded through the MPO's 2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and it is currently at 25 percent design.

### 6.2 THE BROOK ROAD-ROAD DIET

The main goals of the Road Diet project were to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists by repurposing the existing road cross section along the corridor. In doing so, Brook Road becomes a safer environment for all users-people who walk, bike, ride the bus, or drive. The improvements allocated space for separated bike lanes on either side of the road to connect the neighborhood roads to the St. Mary's School and Pierce Middle School, and gave students a safer route to school. It also provided parking and designated pick-up and dropoff spaces at the schools to satisfy demand. Detail of the designs, which were implemented on October 10-14, 2020, are included in Appendix B.

### 6.3 REEDSDALE ROAD AT BETH ISRAEL DEACONESS HOSPITAL: PEDESTRIAN AND TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS

These improvements were constructed by the Town of Milton through the Complete Streets program. The improvements widened the existing sidewalk on the hospital side to provide a bus shelter at the heavily used bus stop, and installed ADA-compliant wheelchair curb ramps and high-visibility crosswalks. In addition, a pedestrian hybrid beacon signal was installed at the existing bus stop to facilitate heavy pedestrian crossing demand.

# Chapter 7-Community and Stakeholder Engagement 

Stakeholder participation is a crucial part of any study. Hence, MPO staff used a number of methods to engage the community and stakeholders in planning for improvements to Route 28.

### 7.1 COMMUNITY SURVEY

MPO staff developed a survey to help determine the public's opinion about concerns and problems on Route 28 in Milton and how to resolve them. The online survey, posted on the Town of Milton's website received 550 responses in April 2020. Figure 15 shows the questions contained in the survey, along with the answers received. Many of the respondents left significant free-response feedback for one or more questions; those comments are included in Appendix G. Feedback from the survey was helpful to gauge community sentiment and to solicit ideas for solutions to the existing problems. Some notable conclusions drawn from the survey are below.

- The vast majority of respondents (73 percent) drive on the corridor; however, 27 percent of respondents also said that they walk, bicycle, or ride on bus in the corridor.
- High speed of vehicles, safety concerns, high volumes of traffic, difficulty crossing Route 28, poor accommodation for pedestrians and bicyclists, and cut-through were the most commonly cited problems, both in the survey answers and in free responses.
- Many respondents expressed surprise that anyone would consider bicycling in the corridor because of the dangerous conditions.
- Despite being a population of mostly drivers, the respondents seemed extremely receptive to the idea of improving facilities for active transportation modes (walking and bicycling).
- Eighty percent of residents indicated they would like to see reduced traffic speeds, vehicle crashes, and congestion; high quality bicycle lanes or multiuse paths, more greenery and welcoming streetscape, and enhanced safety for all users in the corridor; and investments to make bus service more attractive.
- The written comments were focused on improving safety for pedestrians and bicyclists throughout the corridor, constructing high quality sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and multiuse paths for nonmotorized uses.

What is your relationship with Route $\mathbf{2 8}$ ?


How do you typically travel on Route 28?

$$
\text { Drive alone } 378
$$

Drive others or travel as a passenger 320
Walk $\uparrow 128$
Bicycle ofor 86
Ride on a bus 27

Transportation problems and issues--Safety
High speed of vehicles 410
Crashes and vehicle conflict points
Difficulty crossing Route 28 284
Poor street lighting 88
Other 52

Transportation problems and issues--Congestion


Transportation problems and issues--Pedestrians and Bicyclist
High speed of vehicles
High volume of vehicles 28
Difficulty crossing Route 28
Lack of accommodation for bicycles Sidewalks in poor conditions 13


What investments would make it more likely for you to bicycle?



What investments would make it more likely for you to ride the bus?


## Chapter 8-Deficiencies and Needs

The corridor deficiencies listed below are based on analyzing the collected data from field visits, determining the public's opinion about the problems, and obtaining feedback from the advisory task force.

### 8.1 DEFICIENCIES

Table 11 presents the safety, operational problems, and deficiencies in the Brook Road, Reedsdale Road, and Randolph Avenue corridor.

## Table 11 <br> Problems and Deficiencies

| Issue | Deficiencies | Jurisdiction |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian and bicyclists | High vehicle speeds present safety problems for parents and students walking, bicycling, or crossing the road | Milton/Mass DOT |
| Pedestrians and bicyclists | Very difficult to cross (four travel lanes), unsafe for students and parents walking and bicycling to and from schools and recreational areas | Milton/Mass DOT |
| Pedestrians | Many wheelchair ramps are not ADA compliant | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Milton/Mass } \\ \text { DOT } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Pedestrians | Inadequate sidewalk width and lack of sidewalk buffer place pedestrians too close to high-speed travel lanes, making them uncomfortable | Milton/Mass DOT |
| Pedestrians | Sidewalks obstructed with vegetation outgrowth that reduces width of sidewalk | Milton/Mass DOT |
| Bicyclists | Absence of separated bicycle lanes creates problems for people who bicycle | Milton/Mass DOT |
| Bicyclists | Lack of bicycle racks at destination locations create inconveniences for people who bicycle | Milton |
| Parking | Lack of parking spaces on Brook Road for people who drop and pick-up students or visit recreation areas on Brook Road | Milton |
| Safety | High crash segments with three HSIP locations-the intersections of Brook Road at Reedsdale Road and Central Avenue, Reedsdale Road at Canton Avenue, Randolph Avenue at Reedsdale Road and Randolph Avenue at Chickatawbut Road | Milton/ MassDOT |
| Safety | High numbers of angle, rear-end, and left-turn related crashes at intersections | Milton/Mass DOT |
| Safety and operations | Lack of turn lanes present problems for traffic turning into and out of side streets and driveways | Milton/Mass DOT |
| Safety and operations | Four travel lanes with low volume of traffic causes motorists to drive at high speeds | Milton/Mass DOT |
| Safety | Motorists on Brook Road repeatedly run red lights at St. Mary's Road and Standish Road | Milton |
| Safety | Post-mounted signals on Brook Road and Reedsdale Road do not provide adequate visibility for drivers | Milton |


| Issue | Deficiencies | Jurisdiction |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safety and operations | Peak period traffic congestion at the intersections of Brook Road at Central Avenue, Reedsdale Road at Canton Avenue, and Reedsdale Road at Randolph Avenue, and Randolph Avenue at Chickatawbut Road | Milton/ MassDOT |
| Safety and operations | Lane configuration at Brook Road and Central Avenue intersection is confusing to many motorists | Milton |
| Operations | Existing traffic signal timings are outdated resulting in poorly timed signals | Milton/Mass DOT |
| Safety and operations | Cut-through traffic on side streets creates safety problems for residents | Milton/ <br> MassDOT |
| Safety | Four fatal crashes occurred on Randolph Avenue between 2013-17 | MassDOT |
| Safety and operations | High volume of cut-through traffic on Reed Street, Highland Street, and Hallen Avenue create safety problems for residents | MassDOT |
| Safety and operations | High volumes of cut-through traffic on Pleasant Street heading to the Interstate 93 corridor during morning and afternoon peak periods | MassDOT |
| Safety and operations | Congestion and queues southbound on Randolph Avenue during the afternoon peak period divert high volumes of traffic through Heather Drive and Mark Lane; Cut-through and diverted traffic often speed on these otherwise quiet residential streets, which is a huge safety risk for residents | MassDOT |
| Safety and operations | Very dangerous turns into and out of Hallen Avenue and Ridgewood Road/Wollaston Golf Club due to high vehicle volumes and speeds; Lack of a traffic light at these locations make for dangerous turns | MassDOT |

ADA = Americans with Disabilities Act. HSIP = Highway Safety Improvement Program. MassDOT = Massachusetts Department of Transportation.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

### 8.2 NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Based on the problems and deficiencies, staff determined the following corridor needs:

- measures to reduce vehicular speed and calm traffic
- measures to reduce pedestrian crossing distances to improve safety for pedestrians
- measures to provide safe facilities to accommodate people who walk, bicycle, or ride the bus.
- measures to create placemaking and connect people to places
- measures to reduces crashes in the corridor
- measures to improve safety of turn maneuvers in the corridor
- measures to reduce congestion at the signalized intersections
- measures to provide designated parking spaces for people who drop and pick-up students or visit recreation areas on Brook Road
- measures to reduce cut-through traffic on side streets


## Chapter 9-Short-Term Improvements

### 9.1 SHORT-TERM IMPROVEMENTS

The corridor would immensely benefit from short-term improvements. These improvements include installing signs, marking pavement, painting high-visibility crosswalks, adding detectable warning plates to existing wheelchair ramps, and upgrading signal-head sections. Additional short-term improvements include adding countdown timers for pedestrians, retiming and coordinating signals, repairing substandard sidewalks, and making minor geometric modifications. The time frame categorized as short-term is typically less than five years and the costs are usually low, which can be funded through maintenance budgets. Most short-term improvements typically do not require design and engineering efforts.

Table 12 shows the short-term safety and operational improvements for the Brook Road, Reedsdale Road, and Randolph Avenue segments along with the time frame, cost, and jurisdiction. A high proportion of Randolph Avenue northbound traffic turn left on Reedsdale Road. This movement experiences high delay during peak travel periods because the exclusive left-turn lane is insufficient. Providing double left-turn lane on that approach and retiming the signals would reduce congestion (Figure 16).

MPO staff evaluated what the LOS of Route 28 would be if the traffic signals were retimed and coordinated and double left-turn movement was provided at the intersection of Randolph Avenue and Reedsdale Road. The analysis focused on modifying the yellow and all-red intervals, phase splits, cycle lengths, and offsets to determine the effects of changes on the existing traffic volumes. The results of the LOS analyses are shown in Tables 13 through 15. Appendix E presents the short-term signal timing and coordination LOS analysis worksheets. The short-term analysis indicated that retiming the signals could reduce existing AM and PM peak-hour traffic signal delays by about 16 to 20 percent.

## Table 12

Short-Term Improvements

| Issue | Improvement | Time Frame | Cost | Jurisdiction |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian safety | Trim vegetation outgrowth blocking or reducing sidewalk width | Short | Low | Milton/ MassDOT |
| Pedestrian safety | Make wheelchair ramps ADAcompliant by adding detectable plates | Short | Medium | Milton/ <br> MassDOT |
| Pedestrian safety | Bring poor sidewalks to meet MassDOT standards and ADA compliance | Medium | Medium | Milton/ MassDOT |
| Pedestrian safety | Paint crosswalks and make them highly visible | Short | Low | Milton/ MassDOT |
| Pedestrian safety | Add countdown timers to help expedite pedestrian crossing at signalized intersections | Short | Medium | Milton/ MassDOT |
| Pedestrian safety | Conduct a pedestrian study to determine feasibility of a pedestrian hybrid beacon on Randolph Avenue at Pleasant Street | Short | Medium | MassDOT |
| Pedestrian safety | Inspect and repair broken pedestrian pushbuttons | Short | Medium | MassDOT |
| Bicycle safety | Provide bicycle detection at the signalized intersections | Medium | Medium | Milton/ MassDOT |
| Safety | Modify clearance intervals to MassDOT standards to address high number of angle and rear-end crashes | Short | Low | Milton/ MassDOT |
| Safety | Repaint or remark turn arrows at the intersections to make them highly visible to motorists | Short | Low | Milton/ <br> MassDOT |
| Safety | Install signs in advance of the signalized intersections to direct motorists to the appropriate turn lanes | Short | Low | Milton/ MassDOT |
| Safety | Add backplates with retroreflective to signal heads to make them more visible to motorists | Short | Medium | Milton/ MassDOT |
| Congestion | Optimize traffic signal timings and coordinate signals to reduce congestion and delay | Short | Medium | Milton/ MassDOT |
| Congestion | Provide double left-turn lane on the approach and retime the signals to reduce congestion | Short | Medium | MassDOT |
| Safety | Install signs to prohibit cut-through traffic by nonresident commuters during peak travel periods: Heather Drive and Mark Lane | Short | Low | Milton/ MassDOT |
| Safety | Consider prohibiting cut-through traffic by nonresident commuters during the afternoon peak travel period (3:00 pm-6:00pm) | Short | Low | Milton/ <br> MassDOT |

ADA = Americans with Disabilities Act. MassDOT = Massachusetts Department of Transportation.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.


Table 13
Brook Road: Performance of Short-Term Improvements (Optimize Signal Timings)

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | AM $50 \%$ Queue (ft.)* | AM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | AM Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \end{array}$ | PM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | PM Delay <br> Delay (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | SB | L | 160 | 314 | 26.4 | C | 584 | -1038 | 46.5 | D |
| Route 28 | SB | LT | 164 | 320 | 26.2 | C | 646 | -1133 | 48.9 | D |
| Route 28 | NB | R | 286 | -523 | 35.3 | D | 273 | 428 | 28.8 | C |
| Blue Hill Parkway | NB | TR | 177 | -327 | 53.4 | D | 211 | -366 | 90.8 | F |
| Brook Road | EB | LTR | 160 | -356 | 64.7 | E | 264 | -501 | 90.7 | F |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 39.9 | D | -- | -- | 53.0 | D |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | A | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A |
| Thacher Street | NB | LR | 0 | 79 | 40.8 | E | 0 | 133 | 88.0 | F |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 3.3 | A | -- | -- | 5.7 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 0 | 126 | 4.5 | A | 0 | 201 | 4.8 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | 0 | 216 | 5.8 | A | 0 | 149 | 4.6 | A |
| St. Mary's Road | NE | LR | 1 | 27 | 11.7 | B | 3 | 32 | 12.8 | B |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 5.4 | A | -- | -- | 4.9 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | 43 | 202 | 8.3 | A | 36 | 171 | 8.4 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | LTR | 26 | 128 | 7.3 | A | 50 | 230 | 9.2 | A |
| Standish Street | SW | LTR | 3 | 25 | 16.8 | B | 9 | 40 | 20.8 | C |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 8.1 | A |  |  | 9.1 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | -400 | -533 | 96.8 | F | -286 | -405 | 125.2 | F |
| Route 28 | SB | LT | 395 | -620 | 92.9 | F | -538 | -758 | 173.8 | F |
| Route 28 | SB | R | 312 | -462 | 61.9 | E | 338 | -571 | 67.2 | E |
| Brook Road | WB | L | 115 | 176 | 33.1 | C | 130 | 197 | 37.5 | D |
| Brook Road | WB | TR | 138 | 182 | 33.4 | C | 157 | 206 | 37.4 | D |
| Central Avenue | NE | LR | 71 | -229 | 93.7 | F | -248 | -424 | 192.5 | F |
| Central Avenue | SB | LTR | -149 | -246 | 135.7 | F | 217 | -314 | 83.6 | F |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 81.0 | F | -- | -- | 102.5 | F |

Note: * Negative (-) sign = Volume exceeds capacity (queue may be longer)
** Negative (-) sign = 95 percentile volume exceed capacity, queue may be longer
$E B=$ eastbound. $L=$ left. LOS = level of service. $L R=$ left and right. $L T=$ left and through. $L T R=$ left, through, and right. NB $=$ northbound. NE = northeast. NW = northwest. $\mathrm{R}=$ right. $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. $\mathrm{SE}=$ southeast. $\mathrm{SW}=$ southwest. $\mathrm{TR}=$ through and right. WB = westbound.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

## Table 14

Reedsdale Road: Performance of Short-Term Improvements (Optimize Signal Timings)

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | AM $50 \%$ Queue (ft.)* | AM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | AM Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | PM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | PM Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | 538 | -820 | 75.9 | E | 328 | 480 | 63.2 | E |
| Route 28 | SB | LTR | 190 | 288 | 47.8 | D | 408 | -629 | 79.2 | E |
| Canton Avenue | NE | LT | -450 | -802 | 121.8 | F | -430 | -828 | 138.0 | F |
| Canton Avenue | NE | R | 40 | 121 | 21.4 | C | 134 | 257 | 65.6 | E |
| Canton Avenue | SB | LR | -158 | -355 | 171.4 | F | 223 | -505 | 142.3 | F |
| Centre Street | SW | LTR | -462 | -802 | 128.6 | F | -390 | -788 | 127.5 | F |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 88.8 | F | -- | -- | 95.7 | F |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | 0 | 12 | 1.6 | A | 0 | 12 | 1.5 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A |
| Hospital Driveway | EB | LR | 0 | 21 | 21.8 | C | 0 | 73 | 25.3 | C |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 1.7 | A | -- | -- | 3.0 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | L | -287 | -925 | 74.0 | E | 134 | -375 | 28.4 | C |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | 329 | -1012 | 46.6 | D | 168 | 374 | 18.8 | B |
| Route 28 | SB | LT | 184 | 353 | 44.0 | D | 186 | 357 | 39.9 | D |
| Route 28 | SB | R | 0 | 31 | 2.1 | A | 92 | 196 | 8.3 | A |
| Reedsdale Road | WB | LTR | 146 | -302 | 56.5 | E | 201 | -419 | 78.9 | E |
| Randolph Avenue | SB | LTR | 161 | 328 | 38.0 | D | 292 | -639 | 78.0 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 48.0 | D | -- | -- | 40.6 | D |

Note: * Negative (-) sign = Volume exceeds capacity (queue may be longer)
** Negative (-) sign = 95 percentile volume exceed capacity, queue may be longer
$E B=$ eastbound. $L=$ left. LOS = level of service. $L R=$ left and right. LT= left and through. LTR $=$ left, through, and right. NB $=$ northbound. $\mathrm{NE}=$ northeast. $\mathrm{R}=$ right. $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. $\mathrm{SW}=$ southwest. $\mathrm{TR}=$ through and right. $\mathrm{WB}=$ westbound.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

## Table 15

Randolph Avenue: Performance of Short-Term Improvements
(Optimize Signal Timings)

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM $50 \%$ Queue (ft.)* | AM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | AM Delay Delay $(\mathrm{s})$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{array}$ | PM 50\% Queue (ft.)* | PM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | PM Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Route 28 | NB | L | -287 | -925 | 74.0 | E | 134 | -375 | 28.4 | C |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | 329 | -1012 | 46.6 | D | 168 | 374 | 18.8 | B |
| Route 28 | SB | LT | 184 | 353 | 44.0 | D | 186 | 357 | 39.9 | D |
| Route 28 | SB | R | 0 | 31 | 2.1 | A | 92 | 196 | 8.3 | A |
| Reedsdale Road | WB | LTR | 146 | -302 | 56.5 | E | 201 | -419 | 78.9 | E |
| Randolph Avenue | SB | LTR | 161 | 328 | 38.0 | D | 292 | -639 | 78.0 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 48.0 | D |  |  | 40.6 | D |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | 212 | -827 | 13.8 | B | 87 | 323 | 9.9 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | T | 47 | 181 | 6.3 | A | 152 | 548 | 13.3 | B |
| Reeds Street | EB | LR | 12 | 48 | 37.3 | D | 19 | 90 | 35.2 | D |
| Intersection | All | All |  |  | 11.9 | B | -- | -- | 12.4 | B |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | 0 | 3 | 0.0 | A | 0 | 19 | 2.5 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A |
| Hallen Avenue | EB | LR | 0 | 13 | 16.0 | B | 0 | 72 | 42.2 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 0.6 | A | -- | -- | 2.6 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | 256 | -877 | 16.4 | B | 118 | -593 | 16.5 | B |
| Route 28 | SB | LTR | 65 | 227 | 8.0 | A | 231 | -1010 | 18.2 | B |
| Hillside Street | EB | LTR | 51 | -154 | 52.7 | D | 59 | 158 | 45.0 | D |
| Driveway | WB | LTR | 2 | 15 | 37.0 | D | 2 | 17 | 45.0 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 15.4 | B | -- | -- | 18.8 | B |

Note: * Negative (-) sign = Volume exceeds capacity (queue may be longer)
** Negative (-) sign = 95 percentile volume exceed capacity, queue may be longer
$E B=$ eastbound. $L=$ left. LOS = level of service. $L R=$ left and right. $L T=$ left and through. $L T R=$ left, through, and right.
$\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound. $\mathrm{NE}=$ northeast. $\mathrm{R}=$ right. $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. $\mathrm{SW}=$ southwest. $\mathrm{TR}=$ through and right. $\mathrm{WB}=$
westbound.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

## Chapter 10-Long-Term Improvement Concepts

The corridor needs long-term improvements to address multimodal transportation needs. Long-term improvements typically require design and engineering efforts and larger funding resources. The time frame categorized as long-term is typically greater than five years, and can be as long as 15 years. The goals of implementing these long-term improvements are to modernize a car-centric corridor into a roadway that connects people to places and provides safe access to schools, recreational areas, neighborhoods, and transit; to increase safety for people who walk, bicycle, or ride the bus; and to support livable communities and economic vitality.

Due to varying needs along the corridor, MPO staff divided the roadway into three segments for long-term improvement concepts—Brook Road, Reedsdale Road, and Randolph Avenue (see Figure 3). Chapter 3 describes the character and context of each segment. Based on discussions with the advisory task force, MPO staff developed three long-term alternatives for each segment. All the alternatives have improvements that mostly fall within the existing roadway's right-of-way width and considers the needs of abutters and users.

### 10.1 FUTURE TRAFFIC PROJECTIONS

Planners typically use a planning model to forecast traffic volumes based on changes in the transportation network or land use. For this study, MPO staff used the Boston Region MPO's transportation model, which was recently adopted for the development of the LRTP. This model's socioeconomic components are derived from forecasts produced by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council. Using this model, staff projected that between now and 2040, traffic volume on Route 28 in Milton would grow by about five percent. Staff grew the existing peak-hour turning movement volumes by five percent to test the impact of future traffic conditions that would result from proposed improvements.

### 10.2 BROOK ROAD IMPROVEMENT CONCEPTS

The needs of the Brook Road segments are described in Chapter 8. Three improvement concepts suggested below are designed to address those needs.

### 10.2.1 Concept 1-Road Diet, Separated Bike Lanes, and Parking

Figure 17 shows the cross-sectional configuration of Concept 1.


Concept 1 would remove a travel lane in each direction and reconfigure the roadway to install on-street parking, separated bicycle lanes, and sidewalks to ADA standards on either side of the roadway. Concept 1 retains the current configuration at the major signalized intersections. The new roadway could include green streetscape, ornamental street lighting, and bus shelters with benches at the bus stops near the schools and recreation areas. Concept 1 renovates the corridor to meet current needs, making it easier and safer to walk and bike. It provides parking for school drop-off and pick-up and for recreational activities. The improvements would also calm traffic and reduce high speeds of vehicles. Table 16 presents the performance of Concept 1.

Table 16 Brook Road: Performance of Long-Term Improvement Concept 1

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | AM $50 \%$ Queue (ft.) | AM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | AM Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ (\mathrm{ft})^{* *} \end{array}$ | PM Delay (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | WB | R | 303 | -560 | 36.0 | D | 233 | 399 | 26.8 | C |
| Route 28 | SB | L | 168 | 333 | 26.7 | C | -534 | -1003 | 75.0 | E |
| Route 28 | SB | LT | 172 | 337 | 26.4 | C | -626 | -1086 | 84.4 | F |
| Blue Hill Parkway | NB | TR | 186 | -347 | 54.1 | D | 158 | -315 | 74.2 | E |
| Brook Road | EB | LTR | 168 | -376 | 65.7 | E | 196 | -427 | 69.9 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 40.5 | D | -- | -- | 64.2 | E |
| Route 28 | EB | TR | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A |
| Route 28 | WB | LT | 0 | 2 | 0.0 | A | 0 | 1 | 0.1 | A |
| Thacher Street | NB | LR | 10 | 43 | 21.5 | C | 20 | 115 | 64.4 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 2.3 | A | -- | -- | 4.2 | A |
| Route 28 | EB | TR | 0 | 331 | 6.6 | A | 0 | -705 | 11.1 | B |
| Route 28 | WB | LT | 0 | -706 | 11.4 | B | 0 | -495 | 9.4 | A |
| St. Mary's Road | NE | LR | 2 | 31 | 15.9 | B | 3 | 32 | 12.8 | B |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 9.6 | A | -- | -- | 10.4 | B |
| Route 28 | NW | LTR | 0 | -775 | 9.4 | A | 103 | 512 | 9.0 | A |
| Route 28 | SE | LTR | 0 | 370 | 6.0 | A | 162 | -837 | 12.0 | B |
| Standish Street | SW | LTR | 4 | 31 | 20.6 | C | 12 | 49 | 27.9 | C |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 8.3 | A | -- | -- | 11.1 | B |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | -440 | -580 | 112.4 | F | -300 | -423 | 121.6 | F |
| Route 28 | EB | LT | -481 | -704 | 135.6 | F | -523 | -745 | 125.9 | F |
| Route 28 | EB | R | 182 | 309 | 34.0 | C | 360 | -593 | 63.9 | E |
| Brook Road | WB | L | 126 | 192 | 35.2 | D | -155 | -319 | 151.7 | F |
| Brook Road | WB | TR | 143 | 191 | 34.0 | C | 156 | 204 | 34.2 | C |
| Central Avenue | NE | LR | 2 | -98 | 27.5 | C | 66 | -247 | 74.3 | E |
| Central Avenue | SB | LTR | 141 | -225 | 89.6 | F | 224 | -313 | 77.8 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 79.5 | E | -- | -- | 89.7 | F |

Note: * Negative (-) sign = Volume exceeds capacity (queue may be longer)
** Negative (-) sign $=95$ percentile volume exceed capacity, queue may be longer
$E B=$ eastbound. $L=$ left. LOS = level of service. $L R=$ left and right. $L T=$ left and through. $L T R=$ left, through, and right. $\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound. $\mathrm{NE}=$ northeast. NW = northwest. $\mathrm{R}=$ right. $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. $\mathrm{SW}=$ southwest. TR $=$ through and right. WB = westbound.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

### 10.2.2 Concept 2-Road Diet, Separated Bike Lanes, Parking, and Median with Left-turn Lanes

Figure 18 shows the cross-sectional configuration of Concept 2 . It is similar to Concept 1 and would reconfigure the roadway to include separated bicycle lane and sidewalks on either side of the roadway, and on-street parking on one side. In addition, Concept 2 adds a median to make it easier to cross the road. The median in Concept 2 could transition into left-turn lanes at the some of the signalized intersections to improve traffic flow and safety. The new roadway could include green streetscape, ornamental street lighting, and bus shelters with benches at the bus stops near the schools and recreation areas.

Concept 2 renovates the corridor to meet current needs, making it easier and safer to walk, bike, cross the road, and provides parking for school and recreational activities. Adding a median would calm traffic, reduce high speeds of vehicles, reduce crossing distances, and provide refuge areas for pedestrians crossing the road. In addition, left-turn lanes at the some of the signalized intersections (Standish Road and St Mary's Road) would improve traffic flow and safety in the segment during peak travel periods. Table 17 presents the performance of Concept 2.

### 10.2.3 Concept 3-Road Diet, Separated Bike Lanes, Parking, and TwoWay Left-Turn Lane

Figure 18 shows the cross-sectional configuration of Concept 3 . It includes many of the same elements in Concept 2, except that the median is replaced with a two-way left-turn lane. Concept 3 also renovates the corridor to address current needs of the corridor-safe accommodation for people who walk and bike and parking for school and recreational activities. The two-way left-turn lane would improve safety of left-turn maneuvers, traffic flow, and safety in the segment. Table 17 presents the performance of Concept 3.

### 10.2.4 Retrofit Brook Road and Reedsdale Road and Central Avenue Intersection with Roundabout

This intersection experiences congestion during peak travel periods. The lane assignments at the approaches of Brook Road and Reedsdale Road are confusing to some motorists and it is a high-crash intersection. Figure 19 shows a roundabout concept that MPO staff developed for the intersection.


Analysis indicates that retrofitting the signalized intersection with roundabout would work well and reduce severe injury crashes. Roundabouts are geometrically designed to reduce speeds to $15-25 \mathrm{mph}$ and have traffic calming benefits. Table 18 presents the performance of the roundabout concept.

## Table 17

Brook Road: Performance of Long-Term Improvements Concepts 2 and 3

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { AM } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.)** } \end{gathered}$ | AM Delay Delay (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.)* } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.)** } \end{array}$ | PM Delay Delay (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | WB | R | 303 | -560 | 36.0 | D | 233 | 399 | 26.8 | C |
| Route 28 | SB | L | 168 | 333 | 26.7 | C | -534 | -1003 | 75.0 | E |
| Route 28 | SB | LT | 172 | 337 | 26.4 | C | -626 | -1086 | 84.4 | F |
| Blue Hill Parkway | NB | TR | 186 | -347 | 54.1 | D | 158 | -315 | 74.2 | E |
| Brook Road | EB | LTR | 168 | -376 | 65.7 | E | 196 | -427 | 69.9 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 40.5 | D | -- | -- | 64.2 | E |
| Route 28 | EB | TR | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A |
| Route 28 | WB | LT | 2 | 2 | 0.4 | A | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A |
| Thacher Street | NB | LR | 20 | 43 | 21.5 | C | 50 | 115 | 64.4 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 2.3 | A | -- | -- | 4.2 | A |
| Route 28 | EB | TR | 0 | 331 | 6.6 | A | 0 | -705 | 11.1 | B |
| Route 28 | WB | L | 0 | 33 | 5.9 | A | 0 | 20 | 7.6 | A |
| Route 28 | WB | T | 0 | -623 | 9.7 | A | 0 | -465 | 8.7 | A |
| St. Mary's Road | NE | LR | 2 | 31 | 16.0 | B | 3 | 32 | 12.8 | B |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 8.5 | A | -- | -- | 10.2 | B |
| Route 28 | NW | L | 0 | 17 | 5.2 | A | 3 | 26 | 7.5 | A |
| Route 28 | NW | TR | 0 | -742 | 9.0 | A | 91 | 442 | 7.9 | A |
| Route 28 | SE | L | 0 | 19 | 6.0 | A | 2 | 17 | 6.1 | A |
| Route 28 | SE | TR | 0 | 341 | 5.6 | A | 151 | -796 | 11.4 | B |
| Standish Street | SW | LTR | 4 | 31 | 20.6 | C | 11 | 49 | 26.6 | C |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 7.8 | A | -- | -- | 10.2 | B |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | -440 | -580 | 112.4 | F | -300 | -423 | 121.6 | F |
| Route 28 | EB | LT | -481 | -704 | 135.6 | F | -523 | -745 | 125.9 | F |
| Route 28 | EB | R | 182 | 309 | 34.0 | C | 360 | -593 | 63.9 | E |
| Brook Road | WB | L | 126 | 192 | 35.2 | D | -155 | -319 | 151.7 | F |
| Brook Road | WB | TR | 143 | 191 | 34.0 | C | 156 | 204 | 34.2 | C |
| Central Avenue | NE | LR | 2 | -98 | 27.5 | C | 66 | -247 | 74.3 | E |
| Central Avenue | SB | LTR | 141 | -225 | 89.6 | F | 224 | -313 | 77.8 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 79.5 | E | -- | -- | 89.7 | F |

[^10]


Table 18
Performance of Brook Road and Reedsdale Road Roundabout Concept

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ 50 \% \end{array}$ <br> Queue <br> (ft.)* | AM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | AM Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 50 \% \end{array}$ <br> Queue <br> (ft.)* | PM 95\% Queue (ft.)** | PM Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | NB | L | -- | 100 | 15.5 | C | -- | 200 | 19.2 | D |
|  | NB | LTR | -- | 75 | 11.3 | B | -- | 0 | 5.3 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | LT | -- | 75 | 11.4 | B | -- | 125 | 18.7 | C |
|  | SB | R | -- | 50 | 8.6 | A | -- | 125 | 16.4 | C |
| Brook Road | WB | LT | -- | 75 | 14.8 | B | -- | 50 | 11.7 | B |
|  | WB | TR | -- | 75 | 13.6 | B | -- | 50 | 10.6 | B |
| Central Avenue | SB | LT | -- | 25 | 12.6 | B | -- | 50 | 14.3 | B |
| Central Avenue | SB | TR | -- | 25 | 11.3 | B | -- | 50 | 12.9 | B |
| Central Avenue | NB | LTR | -- | 25 | 10.5 | B | -- | 75 | 21.2 | C |
| Intersection | All | -- | -- | -- | 12.2 | B | -- | -- | 17.7 | C |

LOS = level of service. $\mathrm{EB}=$ e eastbound. $\mathrm{L}=$ left. $\mathrm{LOS}=$ level of service. $\mathrm{LR}=$ left and right. $\mathrm{LT}=$ left and through. LTR = left, through, and right. NB = northbound. $\mathrm{R}=$ right. $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. $\mathrm{WB}=$ westbound.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

### 10.3 REEDSDALE ROAD IMPROVEMENT CONCEPTS

The needs of the Reedsdale Road segment are described in Chapter 8. The improvement concepts suggested below are designed to address those needs.

### 10.3.1 Concept 1-Road Diet Separated Bike Lanes, and Two-Way LeftTurn Lane

Figure 20 shows the cross-sectional configuration of Concept 1 . Concept 1 would remove a travel lane in each direction on Reedsdale Road and reconfigure the roadway to include a two-way, left-turn lane, separated bicycle lanes, and ADAcompliant sidewalks. Additional improvements include green streetscape design, ornamental street lighting, bike racks, and bus shelters with benches near the Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital and Milton Library.

Concept 1 renovates the corridor to address current needs, making it easier and safer to walk or bicycle in the segment. The improvements would also calm traffic and reduce high speeds of vehicles. The two-way left-turn lanes would improve safety of left-turn maneuvers. Table 19 presents the performance of Concepts 1 and 2.


Improvement Concept 1
Road Diet, Separated Bicycle Lanes, Two-way Left-Turn Lane, and Parking


Reedsdale Road: Performance of Long-Term Improvements-Concepts 1 and 2

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | AM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)* | AM Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | PM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | PM Delay Delay (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | NW | LTR | -630 | -771 | 83.4 | F | 361 | -547 | 71.6 | E |
| Route 28 | SE | LTR | 198 | 257 | 35.7 | D | -492 | -743 | 121.1 | F |
| Canton Avenue | NE | LT | -555 | -779 | 164.3 | F | -613 | -1004 | 220.5 | F |
| Canton Avenue | NE | R | 49 | 123 | 22.9 | C | 46 | 134 | 23.3 | C |
| Canton Avenue | SB | LR | 42 | -168 | 57.8 | E | -295 | -564 | 207.1 | F |
| Centre Street | SW | LTR | -545 | -769 | 161.1 | F | -515 | -879 | 193 | F |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 94.5 | F | -- | -- | 137.1 | F |
| Route 28 | NB | L | 5 | 15 | 10.1 | B | 5 | 14 | 13.3 | B |
| Route 28 | NB | T | 0 | 0 | 0 | A | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A |
| Hospital Driveway | EB | LR | 30 | 80 | 89.5 | F | 200 | 337 | 307.7 | F |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 3.7 | A | -- | -- | 31.0 | C |
| Route 28 | NB | L | -356 | -977 | 97.3 | F | 133 | -405 | 34.9 | C |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | 367 | -1061 | 57.3 | E | 190 | 412 | 22 | C |
| Route 28 | EB | LT | 199 | -406 | 44.8 | D | 191 | 369 | 37.9 | D |
| Route 28 | EB | R | 0 | 34 | 2.3 | A | 146 | -380 | 12.4 | B |
| Reedsdale Road | WB | LTR | 160 | -337 | 60.1 | E | 209 | -433 | 72.2 | E |
| Randolph Avenue | SB | LTR | 168 | 331 | 35.7 | D | 290 | -619 | 54.6 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 56.6 | E | -- | -- | 37.8 | D |

Note: Shading denotes intersections that are congested during peak travel hours.

* Negative (-) sign = Volume exceeds capacity (queue may be longer)
** Negative (-) sign = 95 percentile volume exceed capacity, queue may be longer
$E B=$ eastbound. $L=$ left. $L O S=$ level of service. $L R=$ left and right. $L T=$ left and through. $L T R=$ left, through, and right. $\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound. $\mathrm{NE}=$ northeast. $\mathrm{NW}=$ northwest. $\mathrm{R}=$ right. $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. $\mathrm{SE}=$ southeast. $\mathrm{T}=$ through. $\mathrm{SW}=$ southwest.TR = through and right. WB = westbound.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.


### 10.3.2 Concept 2-Road Diet, Multiuse Path, Median with Left-Turn Lanes, and Parking

Figure 21 shows the roadway cross-sectional configuration of Concepts 2 and 3. Concept 2 would reconfigure the roadway to include an ADA-compliant sidewalk on one side of the roadway and a multiuse path on the other side. Concept 2 also includes a median to make it easier to cross the road and on-street parking for residents. The median would transition into left-turn lanes at the signalized intersections at Central Avenue, Canton Avenue, and Randolph Avenue. Additional improvements include trees or grass buffers to separate pedestrians from travel lanes, ornamental street lighting, and bus shelters with benches near the Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital and Milton Library. Table 19 presents the performance of Concepts 1 and 2 .


Concept 2 addresses the corridor issues, making it easier and safer to walk, bike, and cross the road. It would improve the safety of left-turn maneuvers, provide parking for residents, calm traffic, reduce high speeds of vehicles, and provide median refuge areas for pedestrians.

### 10.3.3 Concept 3-Lane Diet (Narrow Lanes) with Multiuse Path

Figure 21 shows the roadway cross-sectional configuration of Concepts 2 and 3. Concept 3 maintains the four travel lanes (two in each direction) but reduces lane widths and utilizes the shoulders to install a multiuse path on one side of the roadway and a sidewalk on the other. Table 20 presents the performance of Concept 3.

Table 20
Reedsdale Road: Performance of Long-Term Improvement-Concept 3

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ (\mathrm{ft})^{* *} \end{array}$ | AM Delay $(\mathbf{s})$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \end{array}$ | PM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | PM Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | NW | LTR | -594 | -908 | 96.1 | F | 354 | -535 | 68.4 | E |
| Route 28 | SE | LTR | 205 | 310 | 49.7 | D | -476 | -718 | 105.3 | F |
| Canton Avenue | NE | LT | -520 | -873 | 150.1 | F | -505 | -892 | 172 | F |
| Canton Avenue | NE | R | 47 | 133 | 23.1 | C | 147 | 271 | 67.9 | E |
| Canton Avenue | SB | LR | -180 | -382 | 201.2 | F | -270 | -549 | 172.6 | F |
| Centre Street | SW | LTR | -522 | -873 | 158.7 | F | -474 | -852 | 158.9 | F |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 108.2 | F | -- | -- | 117.5 | F |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | 0 | 13 | 1.8 | A | 0 | 9 | 1.3 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | A |
| Hospital Driveway | EB | LR | 10 | 25 | 24.3 | C | 30 | 90 | 30.0 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 1.8 | A | -- | -- | 3.5 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | L | -385 | -841 | 110.6 | F | 154 | -415 | 33.1 | C |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | -433 | -1083 | 71.9 | E | 184 | 407 | 20.7 | C |
| Route 28 | EB | LTR | 238 | -516 | 55.3 | E | 200 | -419 | 43 | D |
| Route 28 | EB | R | 68 | 116 | 9.3 | A | 427 | -1039 | 39 | D |
| Reedsdale Road | WB | LTR | 165 | -350 | 77.7 | E | -241 | -456 | 107.8 | F |
| Randolph Avenue | SB | LTR | 180 | -373 | 41 | D | -318 | -678 | 93.1 | F |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 69.6 | E | -- | -- | 58.0 | E |

[^11]Concept 3 renovates the corridor to address some of the corridor needs, making it easier and safer to walk and bicycle, and it reduces congestion. The weaknesses of Concept 3 include minimal impact on high speed and crossing distances, and it does not improve the safety of left-turn maneuvers.

### 10.4 RANDOLPH AVENUE SEGMENT IMPROVEMENT CONCEPTS

The needs of the Randolph Avenue segment are described in Chapter 8. Unlike the Brook Road and Reedsdale Avenue segments, the right-of-way in the Randolph Avenue segment is constrained, which limits the concepts choices for the segment. The objectives of the improvement concepts are to improve safety for people who walk, bicycle, or drive in the Randolph Avenue segment. There were four fatalities and a high number of crashes in 2013-17. The improvement concepts suggested below are designed to address those needs.

### 10.4.1 Concept 1-Lane Diet (Narrow Lanes) with Multiuse Path

Figure 22 shows the roadway cross-sectional configuration of Concept 1. Concept 1 maintains the four travel lanes (two in each direction) but reduces lane widths to install a multiuse path on one side of the roadway and a sidewalk on the other side. Additional improvements include better streetscape design that could include trees or grass buffers and street lighting. This concept creates space for people who walk and bike, making it easier and safer to walk and bicycle in the segment. Table 21 presents the performance of Concept 1.

A shortcoming of this concept is that it does not address the lack of turn lanes on Randolph Avenue, a major contributor of crashes in the segment, and would not improve the safety of left-turn maneuvers or reduce the high number of crashes or the severity.


Table 21
Randolph Avenue: Performance of Long-Term Improvement-Concept 1

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | AM $50 \%$ Queue (ft.) | AM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | AM Delay $\qquad$ <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) }{ }^{* \star} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | PM Delay Delay $(\mathbf{s})$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | NB | L | -392 | -995 | 122.2 | F | 146 | -429 | 38.1 | D |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | -412 | -1082 | 72.4 | E | 192 | 420 | 23.0 | C |
| Route 28 | EB | LT | 200 | -418 | 45.2 | D | 193 | -375 | 38.8 | D |
| Route 28 | EB | R | 0 | 35 | 2.5 | A | 138 | -371 | 12.1 | B |
| Reedsdale Road | WB | LTR | 162 | -343 | 60.9 | E | 212 | -442 | 80.3 | F |
| Randolph Avenue | SB | LTR | 167 | 331 | 35.6 | D | 303 | -657 | 72.3 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 66.4 | E | -- | -- | 42.7 | D |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | 237 | -898 | 14.4 | B | 95 | 350 | 9.9 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | T | 51 | 192 | 6.2 | A | 166 | 602 | 13.7 | B |
| Reeds Street | EB | LR | 13 | 51 | 37.4 | D | 21 | 92 | 36.8 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 12.4 | B | -- | -- | 12.7 | B |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | 177 | 327 | 5.9 | A | 92 | -575 | 12.9 | B |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 36 | 63 | 2.2 | A | 126 | -752 | 10.6 | B |
| Hallen Avenue | EB | L | 2 | 13 | 29.8 | C | 2 | 16 | 36.5 | C |
| Hallen Avenue | EB | R | 0 | 31 | 13.7 | B | 0 | 51 | 15.2 | B |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 5.0 | A | -- | -- | 11.7 | B |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | 296 | -947 | 18.3 | B | 139 | -660 | 18.8 | B |
| Route 28 | SB | LTR | 72 | 241 | 8.3 | A | 266 | -1088 | 20.2 | C |
| Hillside Street | EB | LTR | 53 | -164 | 53.7 | D | 63 | 166 | 45.5 | D |
| Driveway | WB | LTR | 2 | 15 | 37 | D | 2 | 17 | 45.2 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 16.8 | B | -- | -- | 20.9 | C |

Note: * Negative (-) sign = Volume exceeds capacity (queue may be longer)
** Negative (-) sign = 95 percentile volume exceed capacity, queue may be longer
$E B=$ eastbound. $L=$ left. $L O S=$ level of service. $L R=$ left and right. $L T=$ left and through. $L T R=$ left, through, and right.
$\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound. $\mathrm{R}=$ right. $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. $\mathrm{SE}=$ southeast. $\mathrm{T}=$ through. $\mathrm{TR}=$ through and right. $\mathrm{WB}=$ westbound.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

### 10.4.3 Concept 2-Two Southbound Lanes, One Northbound Lane, LeftTurn Lanes, and Multiuse Path

Figure 23 shows the roadway cross-sectional configuration of Concept 2 and 3. Concept 2 reconfigures the roadway to provide two southbound lanes and one northbound lane with left-turn lanes at the intersections. Concept 2 also includes a multiuse path on one side of the roadway and a sidewalk on the other.

Concept 2 renovates the corridor to meet current needs, improves quality of life in the neighborhood, and makes it easier and safer to walk, bike, and cross the road. Concept 2 would calm traffic, reduce high speeds of vehicle, and high number of crashes. The left-turn lanes and two-way, left-turn lanes would
improve safety for left-turn maneuvers and reduce crashes on the segment. Concept 2 works well during the PM peak hours of travel. The shortcoming of Concept 2 is that congestion worsens during the AM peak hours of travel with long traffic queues in the northbound direction. Table 22 presents the performance of Concept 2.

### 10.4.2 Concept 3-Two-Way Left-Turn Lane, Separated Bike Lanes, and Improved Sidewalks

Concept 3 was included in this study because there were comments from the community survey about keeping Randolph Avenue as two-lane, two-way road throughout Milton. The four-lane segment is perceived by some residents to attract cut-through traffic avoiding congestion on the Route 128 and the Southeast Expressway. Figure 23 shows the roadway cross-sectional configuration of Concept 3 . Concept 3 removes a travel lane in each direction on Randolph Avenue and reconfigures the roadway to include a two-way left-turn lane, separated bicycle lanes, and ADA-compliant sidewalks on both sides of the roadway. The two-way left-turn lane would transition into left-turn lanes at the signalized intersections. Additional improvements include better streetscape design and street lighting.

Concept 3 renovates the corridor to meet current needs, improves quality of life in the neighborhood, and makes it easier and safer to walk, bike, and cross the road. Concept 3 would calm traffic, reduce high speeds of vehicle, and high number of crashes. The two-way left-turn lanes would improve safety for left-turn maneuvers. The shortcoming of Concept 3 is that congestion worsens and traffic operation deteriorates during the peak hours of travel with long traffic queues. The congestion and queues resulting from this concept could increase rear-end crashes and offset safety benefits. Table 23 presents the performance of Concept 3.

### 10.4.5 Retrofit Randolph Avenue and Reedsdale Road Intersection into Roundabout

Besides traffic congestion, the intersection of Randolph Avenue and Reedsdale Road is a HSIP crash cluster with many angle crashes. Figure 24 shows a roundabout retrofit concept for the intersection. Analysis indicates that retrofitting the signalized intersection with roundabout would work well and reduce crashes. Table 24 presents the performance of the roundabout concept versus the signalized intersection.


Table 22
Randolph Avenue: Performance of Long-Term Improvement—Concept 2

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | AM $50 \%$ Queue (ft.)* | AM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | AM Delay $(\mathbf{s})$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | PM $50 \%$ Queue (ft.)* | PM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | PM Delay $\qquad$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | NB | L | -388 | -977 | 118.8 | F | 188 | -515 | 49.8 | D |
| Route 28 | NB | LTR | -412 | -1082 | 72.0 | E | 139 | 307 | 16.7 | B |
| Route 28 | EB | LT | 200 | -418 | 45.2 | D | 196 | -400 | 40.4 | D |
| Route 28 | EB | R | 0 | 35 | 2.4 | A | 138 | -361 | 12.1 | B |
| Reedsdale Road | WB | LTR | 162 | -343 | 60.9 | E | -232 | -450 | 92.9 | F |
| Randolph Avenue | SB | LTR | 170 | 335 | 36.9 | D | 303 | -655 | 71.7 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 65.6 | E | -- | -- | 46.5 | D |
| Route 28 | NB | L | 0 | 7 | 6 | A | 1 | 10 | 5.4 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | T | -93 | -2308 | 120.5 | F | 318 | -1287 | 18.2 | B |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 0 | 246 | 6.6 | A | 166 | 726 | 11.2 | B |
| Reeds Street | EB | LR | 10 | 50 | 35.0 | C | 6 | 34 | 39.6 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 87.0 | F | -- | -- | 14.2 | B |
| Route 28 | NB | L | 1 | 23 | 4.9 | A | 0 | 13 | 3.9 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | T | -88 | -2163 | 92.4 | F | 0 | 351 | 3.4 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 35 | 240 | 7.6 | A | 110 | 324 | 6.1 | A |
| Hallen Avenue | EB | L | 2 | 17 | 35.8 | D | 2 | 15 | 32.8 | C |
| Hallen Avenue | EB | R | 0 | 21 | 10.4 | B | 0 | 44 | 13.8 | B |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 65.8 | E | -- | -- | 5.4 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | L | 2 | 19 | 4.6 | A | 6 | 41 | 6.8 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | TR | -1539 | -2930 | 193.2 | F | 267 | -1361 | 21.2 | C |
| Route 28 | NB | L | 1 | 8 | 8.4 | A | 1 | 9 | 8.0 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 55 | 288 | 8.4 | A | 386 | -1127 | 22.8 | C |
| Hillside Street | EB | LTR | 67 | -239 | 79.1 | E | 77 | -258 | 69.5 | E |
| Driveway | WB | LTR | 2 | 18 | 50.2 | D | 2 | 17 | 45.2 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 134.4 | F | -- | -- | 24.0 | C |

Note: * Negative (-) sign = Volume exceeds capacity (queue may be longer)
** Negative (-) sign = 95 percentile volume exceed capacity, queue may be longer
$\mathrm{EB}=$ e eastbound. $\mathrm{L}=$ left. $\mathrm{LOS}=$ level of service. $\mathrm{LR}=$ left and right. $\mathrm{LT}=$ left and through. $\mathrm{LTR}=$ left, through, and right.
$\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound. $\mathrm{R}=$ right. $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. $\mathrm{T}=$ through. $\mathrm{TR}=$ through and right. $\mathrm{WB}=$ westbound.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

Table 23
Randolph Avenue: Performance of Long-Term Improvement-Concept 3

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | AM $95 \%$ Queue (ft.)** | AM Delay $\qquad$ <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 50 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ (\mathrm{ft})^{* \star} \end{array}$ | PM Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | NB | L | -640 | -1145 | 150.8 | F | 182 | -500 | 43.8 | D |
| Route 28 | NB | TR | 202 | 450 | 96.9 | F | 138 | 303 | 16.7 | B |
| Route 28 | EB | LT | 202 | -418 | 45.9 | D | 194 | 374 | 39.4 | D |
| Route 28 | EB | R | 0 | 22 | 1.4 | A | 133 | -268 | 11.1 | B |
| Reedsdale Road | WB | LTR | 163 | -345 | 63.7 | E | 213 | -442 | 82.1 | F |
| Randolph Avenue | SB | LTR | 206 | -484 | 87.7 | F | 299 | -643 | 64.9 | E |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 73.2 | E | -- | -- | 42.0 | D |
| Route 28 | NB | L | 0 | 7 | 6.0 | A | 1 | 10 | 5.7 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | T | -39 | -2280 | 103.0 | F | 300 | -1252 | 16.7 | B |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 0 | -730 | 10.5 | B | -1161 | -2273 | 119.8 | F |
| Reeds Street | EB | LR | 10 | 50 | 34.8 | C | 6 | 34 | 38.7 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 75.6 | E | -- | -- | 77.0 | E |
| Route 28 | NB | L | 2 | 7 | 1.5 | A | 11 | -88 | 36.3 | D |
| Route 28 | NB | T | -1704 | -1942 | 90.5 | F | 175 | 414 | 5.9 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 174 | 288 | 5.4 | A | -1514 | -1927 | 95.9 | F |
| Hallen Avenue | EB | L | 4 | 18 | 49.2 | D | 4 | 19 | 52.7 | D |
| Hallen Avenue | EB | R | 0 | 40 | 20.9 | C | 7 | 64 | 24.8 | C |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 64.1 | E | -- | -- | 58.3 | E |
| Route 28 | NB | L | 2 | 17 | 5.1 | A | 5 | 32 | 4.7 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | TR | -1525 | -2505 | 160.3 | F | 238 | -1198 | 15.7 | B |
| Route 28 | SB | L | 1 | 12 | 14.0 | B | 1 | 7 | 5.5 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | TR | 144 | 740 | 13.2 | B | -1661 | -2648 | 235.4 | F |
| Hillside Street | EB | LTR | 74 | -238 | 122.1 | F | 88 | -273 | 109.1 | F |
| Driveway | WB | LTR | 3 | 18 | 50.8 | D | 2 | 16 | 43.0 | D |
| Intersection | All | All | -- | -- | 114.4 | F | -- | -- | 150.0 | F |

Note: * Negative (-) sign = Volume exceeds capacity (queue may be longer)
** Negative (-) sign $=95$ percentile volume exceed capacity, queue may be longer
$E B=$ eastbound. $L=$ left. $L O S=$ level of service. $L R=$ left and right. $L T=$ left and through. $L T R=$ left, through, and right.
$\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound. $\mathrm{R}=$ right. $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. $\mathrm{SE}=$ southeast. $\mathrm{T}=$ through. $\mathrm{TR}=$ through and right. $\mathrm{WB}=$ westbound.
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

Table 24
Performance of Randolph Avenue and Reedsdale Roundabout Concept

| Street Name | Approach | Lane Group | AM 50\% Queue (ft.)* | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ 95 \% \end{array}$ <br> Queue <br> (ft.)** |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{array}$ | PM $50 \%$ Queue <br> (ft.)* | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Queue } \\ (\mathrm{ft} .)^{\star *} \end{array}$ | PM <br> Delay <br> (s) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 28 | NB | LT | -- | 250 | 23.3 | C | -- | 75 | 9.8 | A |
| Route 28 | NB | TR | -- | 150 | 14.1 | B | -- | 50 | 7.9 | A |
| Route 28 | SB | LTR | -- | 50 | 9.2 | A | -- | 300 | 47.3 | E |
| Route 28 | SB | R | -- | 50 | 8.1 | A | -- | 325 | 45.3 | E |
| Reedsdale Road | WB | L | -- | 75 | 24.9 | C | -- | 75 | 16.2 | B |
| Reedsdale Road | WB | TR | -- | 200 | 45.7 | E | -- | 50 | 11.9 | B |
| Randolph Avenue | SB | LT | -- | 50 | 17.9 | C | -- | 50 | 15.5 | C |
| Randolph Avenue | SB | TR | -- | 50 | 15.5 | C | -- | 50 | 14.0 | B |
| Intersection | All | -- | -- | -- | 19.6 | C | -- | -- | 25.0 | D |

[^12]

### 10.4.3 Signalize the Intersections of Randolph Avenue at Hallen Avenue and Ridgewood Road/Wollaston Golf Club Driveway

These two intersections and the road segment between them experience high numbers of crashes, including two fatalities and several injuries as shown in Figures 12 through 14. Many of the crashes are left-turn-related angle and rearend crashes and lane-changing-related sideswipes crashes.

MPO staff recommends signalizing these intersections to reduce left-turn-related crashes. The LOS analysis indicates that installing a traffic signal at Hallen Avenue and adding a northbound left-turn lane would operate well. Due to the low traffic volumes collected during the pandemic, staff recommends that MassDOT collect additional traffic volumes to perform traffic signal warrant analysis for these intersections.

Installing additional traffic signals at these intersections would also help to calm traffic, reduce high speeds of vehicles, and add additional crossing opportunities for at these intersections for pedestrians and bicycles.

### 10.5 PEDESTRIAN LOS WITH IMPROVEMENTS

MPO staff evaluated what the future PLOS of Route 28 would be if the recommendations from this study were implemented. Appendix F contains results of the PLOS scorecard analyses. Based on the assessment, Route 28 was rated good in terms of meeting the MPO's goals for capacity management and mobility and economic vitality because of the prioritization of safe accommodations for people who walk and for improving the connectivity of the pedestrian network.

### 10.6 BICYCLE LOS WITH IMPROVEMENTS

MPO staff evaluated what the future BLOS of Route 28 would be in Milton if the recommendations from this study were implemented. Appendix F contains results of the BLOS scorecard analyses. Based on the assessment, Route 28 was rated excellent in terms of meeting the MPO's goals for capacity management and mobility and economic vitality because of the prioritization of safe accommodations for people who bike, and for improving the connectivity of the bicycle network.

### 10.7 SAFETY IMPACTS OF PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

Each of the proposed improvements was chosen to target specific safety and operational deficiencies present in the study area.

- Corridor and Intersection Lighting Upgrades. MPO staff recommends upgrading or replacing these facilities as part of any future project. Providing intersection and highway lighting could reduce nighttime crashes by approximately 18 percent to 38 percent. ${ }^{18}$
- Pedestrian Crossing Safety. Improving the ability of pedestrians to cross Route 28 safely was a major priority in this study. The recommendations include fitting all signalized intersections with high-visibility crosswalks and installing midblock pedestrian-activated crossing signals at selected locations. Upgrading crossings has been shown to reduce vehiclepedestrian collisions by about 40 percent. ${ }^{19}$ Providing pedestrian-activated crossing signals could reduce vehicle-pedestrian crashes by as much as 55 percent.
- Bicycle Safety. The survey responses showed that Route 28 is generally not considered for people who bike. The concepts in this study seek to remedy this problem by providing people who bike with separated bicycle lanes or multiuse paths separated from the travel lanes. A 2014 analysis of bicycle crashes in Florida showed a 25 percent reduction in vehicle/bicycle collision totals after installing shared-use paths. ${ }^{20}$
- Pavement Resurfacing. A corridor project like this will include some degree of pavement resurfacing or replacement. This change could improve safety by increasing pavement friction and replacing faded pavement markings. However, currently available studies cannot reliably correlate the magnitude of the effect, as it depends heavily on the characteristics of the site.
- Retiming and Coordinating Traffic Signals. The analysis shows that retiming the signals in the corridor could reduce AM and PM peak-hour signal delays by 16 to 20 percent.


### 10.8 COMPARISON OF IMPROVEMENT CONCEPTS

A summary of all the improvement concepts showing their advantages and disadvantages are presented in Figure 25. These concepts include safety, congestion, operations, multimodal features (pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure), and traffic calming.

[^13]Figure 25
Comparisons of Improvement Concepts

| Concept | Increase Safety | Reduce Congestion | Accommodate Pedestrians | Accommodate Bicycles | Address Left-Turn Operations | Address <br> Parking <br> Needs | Calm <br> Traffic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brook Road Concept 1 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Brook Road Concept 2 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Brook Road Concept 3 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Reedsdale Road Concept 1 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Reedsdale Road Concept 2 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Reedsdale Road Concept 3 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Randolph Avenue Concept 1 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Randolph Avenue Concept 2 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Randolph Avenue Concept 3 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |

Full support. 〇 Some support. $\qquad$ Not applicable

Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

## Chapter 11-Conclusion and Next Steps

The concepts developed in this study provide MassDOT, the Town of Milton, and other stakeholders an opportunity to review conceptual options for addressing deficiencies in the corridor before committing design and engineering funds to a roadway improvement project. If implemented, the improvement concepts in this report would yield the following benefits:

- transform the car-centric corridor into a road that connects people to places and meets the needs of local residents and businesses, people who walk, bicycle, drive, and ride the bus
- transform the road to provide safe access to schools, recreational areas, neighborhoods, transit areas and other destinations
- transform the road to improve travel choices and connectivity for pedestrian and bicycle modes by closing gaps in the sidewalk and bicycle networks
- improve safety at HSIP intersection crash cluster locations and other highcrash locations in the corridor
- transform Route 28 to support the vision of connecting the neighborhoods to places and promoting multimodal transportation


### 11.1 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Successful implementation of the improvements would require cooperation between the MassDOT Highway Division and the Town of Milton to ensure that sidewalks and multiuse paths are continuous and connected, and to ensure that MassDOT's standards guide the design of roadway elements. In addition, it is important for stakeholders to evaluate the improvement concepts with all road users in mind. MassDOT has jurisdiction of Randolph Avenue and the Town of Milton has jurisdiction of Brook Road and Reedsdale Road, and each would be responsible for implementing renovations to the roadway in its jurisdiction.

### 11.2 PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Project development is the process that takes transportation improvements from planning concept to construction. This process will depend on cooperation between MassDOT, the Town of Milton, and the Boston Region MPO. This planning study provides the necessary information for the project proponents to initiate the project notification and review process. After completing these initial steps, the proponents can start preliminary design and engineering and begin working with the MPO to program funding for the project in the TIP. Appendix H contains an overview of the project development process.

# Appendix A: Comments and Selection Process 

1. Review Comments
2. Selection of Study Locations
3. Support Letters
4. Public Participation

## Part 1: Review Comments

## Seth Asante

| From: | Driscoll, William - Rep. (HOU) [William.Driscoll@mahouse.gov](mailto:William.Driscoll@mahouse.gov) on behalf of Driscoll, <br>  <br> William - Rep. (HOU) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, February 5, 2021 4:01 PM |
| To: | Seth Asante |
| Cc: | Ordaz, Summer (HOU) |
| Subject: | Re: [External]: Route 28 Priority Corridor Study |

Dear Seth,

Thank you for your recent update on the Route 28 Corridor study. Please see below for my feedback.

## Speed Limit Reduction

The study notes that one of the improvements to Route 28 is to reduce speed limits to $30 / 35 \mathrm{mph}$ from $40 / 45 \mathrm{mph}$. Is MassDOT/MPO aware that the town of Milton passed a petition last year to reduce the speed limit to 25 mph on portions of Route 28 and Chickatawbut Road? This home rule petition has been filed in the Legislature and is currently in motion (SD115).

## Multiuse Path -- Transportation Bond Bill Earmark

I would like to reiterate that we secured an earmark for part of this project in the most recent transportation bond bill. The earmark is for $\$ 10 \mathrm{M}$ to be expended for a multi-use path connecting the MBTA Milton Station to Houghton's Pond Recreational Area in the Town of Milton via Adams Street, Randolph Avenue, Chickatawbut Road and Hillside Street. (Chapter 383 of the Acts of 2020, Line Item 6921-2115)

## 2-4-2 Lane Configuration

Re: the section of roadway Randolph Ave (Route 28 between Chickatawbut Rd and the intersection of Reedsdale Rd and Randolph Ave), I found it odd that this section of road did not have the same number of alternatives to consider as the other section of road. The impetus for this corridor study is directly related to the speeding and crash issues on this stretch in particular.

Could an alternative design be mocked up that looks at two vehicle lanes, a multi-use path and turn lane options in and out of adjacent neighboring streets? Turn lanes in to and out of the intersecting streets would increase quality of life and safety for this stretch of Route 28.

## Hallen Ave/Signalization/One-way issue

I think signalization with a 2 way as it is now makes the most sense, or some type of turn lane configuration. There is right of way to take on the Blue Hills side of the road so widening is easier than dealing with private property impacts re widening.

## Ridgewood Rd/Wollaston Golf Course Stop Light

This was not mentioned in the study. I would like to see this addressed considering the dangerousness of this area and the previous fatalities. Again, this stretch of road on 28 (segment 3 in the presentation) and this intersection were one of the key reasons that a corridor study was sought in the first place. to have this intersection left out is puzzling.

Again, thank you for the recent update. I am hopeful this feedback will be incorporated as we seek to address the transportation needs of the corridor.

Sincerely,

Bill Driscoll Jr.
7th Norfolk District

From: Seth Asante [sasante@ctps.org](mailto:sasante@ctps.org)
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 1:06 PM
To: Timilty, Walter (SEN) [Walter.Timilty@masenate.gov](mailto:Walter.Timilty@masenate.gov); Driscoll, William - Rep. (HOU)
[William.Driscoll@mahouse.gov](mailto:William.Driscoll@mahouse.gov); Fluker Oakley, Brandy - Rep. (HOU) [Brandy.FlukerOakley@mahouse.gov](mailto:Brandy.FlukerOakley@mahouse.gov); Buntich, Hannah (SEN) [Hannah.Buntich@masenate.gov](mailto:Hannah.Buntich@masenate.gov); Ordaz, Summer (HOU) [Summer.Ordaz@mahouse.gov](mailto:Summer.Ordaz@mahouse.gov); Chris
Westfall (HOU) [Christ.Westfall@mahouse.gov](mailto:Christ.Westfall@mahouse.gov)
Subject: [External]: Route 28 Priority Corridor Study

Good afternoon,
Thank you for your participation and the feedback you provided on the Route 28 Priority Corridor Study meeting. Your feedback will help us address the transportation needs of the corridor. I have attached the presentation slides and would welcome any feedback or questions about the presentation and study. Please provide us with your input by February 5.

Thank you,
Seth

Seth A. Asante, P.E. | Chief Transportation Planner
CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING STAFF
857.702.3644 | sasante@ctps.org
www.ctps.org/bostonmpo


Please be advised that the Massachusetts Secretary of State considers e-mail to be a public record, and therefore subject to the Massachusetts Public Records Law, M.G.L. c. 66 § 10.

## Feedback on the Improvement Concepts

- Representative Brandy Fluker Oakley: What is the community outreach of the study? At the planning stage, the outreach involves MassDOT, Town of Milton, and State Legislators. MPO staff also conducted a community survey to solicit input from Milton residents. After the planning study, if MassDOT or Town of Milton advance any of the concepts into projects, there would be public hearings at various stages of the project. It will be similar to what was done for the Route 138 project in Canton and Milton.
- Representative Brandy Fluker Oakley: What is the status of the Route 138 project? I have other questions and will send them to you by email. MassDOT has advanced the concepts from that study into a project. A public hearing was held on October 22, 2019 in Milton for the project.
- Melinda Collins, Milton Select Board: How does the study relates to the project at Chickatawbut Road intersection? Going forward, the question residents will have is how the two solutions be married together? Typically what we do, when we are doing our studies and we know that there is another project going on at one end or the other, in this case the Chickatawbut Road intersection project, we would not design or recommend anything for that location, so we can marry into their project. However, we would mention the recommendations from that project in the current study.

Melinda Collins, Milton Select Board: There is real interest in making the Skyline Trail crossing located south of the study area safer for pedestrians and hikers? Yes, this request has been brought to the attention of the MPO and MassDOT. The Skyline Trail crossing is outside the study limits.

- Chase Berkeley, Milton DPW: We did implement a road diet on the northern portion of the quarter, very recently. The project was done through a grant from Shared Streets and Open Spaces program. Thank you to all the elected officials and MassDOT who supported that funding. We send you details of that project. Thank you for sharing the project information.
- Raj Kulen, MassDOT: Brook Road Concept 3 does not have a shoulder and that could affect traffic operations if there is a breakdown or incident. We will review the concept and make necessary changes.
- Raj Kulen, MassDOT: Reducing the speed limit on Randolph Avenue from 45 mph to 35 mph would be difficult to enforce and would not accomplish the desired results, unless the roadway is designed to calm traffic. We will review this recommendation and design in some traffic calming measures to reduce traffic speeds.
- Mark Alba, Milton Police: In the northerly section down by St Mary's School, the road has curves, kind of a winding road, so I am not sure a
median is perfect for that location, a winding road with children crossing, pedestrian traffic, and turning traffic. Thank you, we will review that concept.
- Representative William Driscoll: One of the issues on Randolph Avenue is turning in and out of the neighborhoods. The roadway width in this segment is just not wide enough to include kind of a center turn lane. However, it would be an ideal type of roadway to have that center turn lane to improve safety. The concepts we developed, we tried to stay within the existing right-of-way, but we can include in the report that future process look at possible land takings to include turn lanes at the at the major intersections on that segment
- Representative William Driscoll: The other thing I hear you know from residents a lot in terms of constituent feedback, I don't know if this is reflected in the comments that you received as part of the study, but just the fact that it goes from two lanes on Route 28 to four lanes and then back to two lane. The cut through traffic that we see there is the additional 10,000 cars. So I don't know if there's any additional thoughts there in terms of looking at going down to two lanes of travel and some other improvements. Yes, this idea was reflected in the comments from the community survey. We will review this concept further and include it in the report.
- Representative William Driscoll: A new bond bill allocated $\$ 10$ million to try to improve the multiuse lanes on that section of Randolph Avenue. It is meant to connect the Milton MBTA stops with and high speed line to the Houghton's Pond recreation area, so if you follow that kind of trajectory of the streets mentioned Randolph Avenue in segment three do fall into this project so just point that out as something that's out there for the can be capitalized on. Okay thank you.

Mr. Dennehy: For the Hallen Avenue intersection, obviously the safest path of travel for anyone is a signaling the intersection but just having been in Milton for a long time, taking that left turn away on Randolph Avenue put an abundance of pressure onto specific neighborhoods. Residents are already feeling some of the heat of cut through traffic in the Hillside Street and Highland Street neighborhoods. We are getting a lot of traffic through them now and in the PM commute. I am all for the safest left hand turn, because that was a location of one of the fatalities in the reports two summers ago a tragic accident.

In addition, Hallen Avenue is used by many people to get to the hospital. I think you can corroborate this is part of the destination, to the hospital, which is becoming a regional hospital. To include ambulances as well, so some points coming from the other way. Possible signalization at Hallen Avenue, we would look at the traffic signal warrants there, but some of the
volumes are just a bit short right now, we have to wait until after the pandemic when traffic volumes return to normal.

Senator Walter Timilty: I thank you very much a couple of points—number one, a couple years back, I filed an amendment and I have had some talks with MassDOT on this to fund an additional traffic light on Randolph Avenue somewhere around the side streets that are across from the Pepsi plantation or new Wollaston Golf Club. At the determination of the Town Administrator in Milton and with conversations with MassDOT, I was told that if we do that, we would have to regrade the road. However, it's something that I believe there's a great deal worth and exploring because it is one way to slow down traffic, I would also like to point out that anytime we talked about land takings, whether it be for a roundabout or to widened Randolph Avenue, you are going to engender pushback. Yes, that's why, when we do our studies we try to stay on with existing right away as much as possible, we understand that anytime you propose land takings whether it's empty space or someone's yard does become a contentious issue.

Raj Kulen, MassDOT: Yes, this is to make the Senator Timilty's point. Did you take a traffic count at that at that location? The second question is about the golf course entrance. In order to install the traffic signal we need to do a traffic signal warrant analysis. No, we did take a traffic count at Hallen Avenue, not at the Golf Course entrance. Maybe we'll put in a request to for a traffic count, but the volume will be low due to the pandemic.

Raj Kulen, MassDOT: Knowing the intersection, probably it would not meet many of the warrants for signalization, but we could look at other ones such as systems warrants or other ones. Okay thank you.

Mark Alba, Milton Police: Just real quickly to revisit the Hallen Avenue, some of those side streets are one-way leading up to Randolph Avenue or are time restricted, so the one way would not work well. Okay, thank you.

## Closing comments

Mark Abbott, Boston Region MPO: MPO staff will be trying to wrap up the draft report, shortly after receiving feedback. Once the draft ready we will send it to all of you once again for your comments and questions on that before we finalize it. Any further feedback is welcome throughout the course of the study. All your questions and comments are greatly appreciated, especially people from Milton that travel the roadway and see it all the time. You provided some valuable input into our reports as well, and thank you, Senator Walter Timilty, Representative William Driscoll, and Representative Brandy Fluker Oakley for attending. Thank you Town of Milton and MassDOT representatives and legislative staff.

## Seth Asante

| From: | Kinahan, Erin (DOT) [erin.kinahan@state.ma.us](mailto:erin.kinahan@state.ma.us) on behalf of Kinahan, Erin (DOT) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, February $8,202112: 16$ PM |
| To: | Seth Asante |
| Subject: | $2021-01-27$ Milton Route 28 Presentation.pdf |

Seth

I have made some comments regarding the Route 28 study Please let me know if you have any questions

Thanks
Erin Kinahan

You can view "2021-01-27 Milton Route 28 Presentation.pdf" at:
https://documentcloud.adobe.com/link/track?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:84ad5741-1d75-4e9a-8562-68ea67b7d4c6

## Comments

1. The MassDOT project will improve transit accommodations along. Should this study mention potential transit improvements?
2. What is the $85 \%$ speeds along corridor, will the speed zoning be updated if not this recommendation may be difficult to implement.
3. How will the reduction in speed limits be achieved currently based on $85 \%$.
4. Why is this bullet red text? Does this intersection meet 8 hour warrants?
5. Cross section north of Chickatawbut Road should tie into the proposed improvements. Most recent design should be submitted to MassDOT by end of February
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## Part 2: Selection of Study Locations

## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 7, 2019
TO: Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization

## FROM: Seth Asante, MPO Staff

RE: Selection of FFY 2020 LRTP Priority Corridor Study Location

## 1 BACKGROUND

During the development of the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Destination 2040, the MPO staff identified the existing needs for all transportation modes in the region. ${ }^{1}$ The results were compiled in the LRTP Needs Assessment, which is used to guide the MPO's decision-making process for selecting transportation projects to fund in future Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs). The MPO goals that guided the development of the LRTP Needs Assessment include the following:

- Safety—make all modes safe
- Preservation-maintain and modernize the system
- Capacity Management and Mobility—use existing facility capacity more efficiently and increase healthy transportation capacity
- Clean Air/Clean Communities—create an environmentally friendly transportation system
- Transportation Equity—provide comparable transportation access and service quality among communities, regardless of income level or minority population
- Economic Vitality—ensure our transportation network serves as a strong foundation for economic vitality

Based on previous and ongoing transportation-planning work-including the MPO's Congestion Management Process (CMP) and planning studies-MPO staff identified several priority arterial roadway segments that require maintenance, modernization, and safety and mobility improvements. These locations are documented in the LRTP Needs Assessment.

[^14]To address problems on some of these arterial segments, the Addressing Priority Corridors from the Long-Range Transportation Plan Needs Assessment study was included in the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). ${ }^{2}$ This memorandum presents the results of the selection process and a recommendation for a location to study to the MPO board for discussion. ${ }^{3}$

By focusing on arterial segments rather than intersections, planners can evaluate multimodal transportation needs comprehensively (with the goal of creating Complete Streets). A holistic approach to analyzing problems and forming recommendations ensures that the needs of all transportation users are considered. Ultimately, this approach will result in roadways where it is safe to cross the street and walk or bicycle to shops, schools, train stations, and recreational facilities, and where buses can run on time. Typically, the recommended improvements are within a roadway's right-of-way. When developing the recommendations, the needs of abutters and users are taken into account. The interests and support of stakeholders are also considered.

## 2 SELECTION PROCEDURE

The process for selecting study locations consisted of three steps:

1. MPO staff gathered and assembled data about the arterial segments from the LRTP Needs Assessment and used the data to identify and prioritize the segments in need of improvements.
2. Staff examined the arterial segments more closely by applying specific criteria.
3. Staff scored each arterial segment and assigned a priority of low, medium, or high to each segment.

Details about each step in the process are provided below.

### 2.1 Gathering Data and Identifying Potential Arterial Segments

MPO staff identified 43 arterial segments in 33 municipalities in the Boston region based on the following data sources:

- The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) 2017 Road Inventory File and 2012-16 crash database were used to assemble the

[^15]following information for each arterial segment: roadway jurisdiction, National Highway System status, average daily traffic (ADT), high-crash locations, and crash rates.

- The MPO's CMP data on arterial congestion were used to determine average travel speeds, travel-time index (travel time in the peak period divided by travel time during free-flow conditions), and speed index (average travel speed divided by the speed limit) on each arterial segment.
- The MPO's data on gaps in the bike network and data on the location of MassDOT's bike facilities were used to identify bicyclists' needs, including locations where connectivity between bicycle facilities and bicyclists' accommodations could be improved.
- Data on Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) bus service performance and passenger loads were used to determine the percentage of bus trips that do not adhere to the schedule (in other words, that provide late service) or do not adhere to passenger load standards (resulting in crowding).
- Data on MBTA bus routes, subway lines, and commuter rail lines were used to identify which arterial segments serve MBTA buses or stations.
- Data on the MPO's transportation equity analysis zones were used to identify areas of concern as relates to transportation equity.
- Data selected from MassDOT's project-information database, the MPO's FFY 2020-24 TIP project database, MPO planning studies and other studies, and municipal websites were used to obtain data on projects, studies, and TIP projects that are planned or programmed for each arterial segment.

Table 1 (attached) presents the data and information gathered about each of the arterial segments:

- Municipality
- Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) subregion
- Jurisdiction
- MassDOT district office
- Number of top-200 high-crash locations
- Number of crash clusters that are eligible for Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funding
- Travel-time index
- Transit service performance
- Proximity to a transportation equity analysis zone (within one-half mile distance)
- Relevant studies or projects within or near the segment

Table 1 also includes the score and priority rating that were determined by applying the selection criteria. The processes for scoring and assigning priority ratings to segments are described below.

### 2.2 Selection Criteria

MPO staff examined the arterial segments more closely by applying the following six criteria and assigning points based on the number of criteria that apply to each location.

1. Safety Conditions, $0-4$ points (each of the four criteria is worth one point)
o Location has a higher-than-average crash rate for its functional class
o Location contains an HSIP-eligible crash cluster
o Location is identified in the Massachusetts Top High Crash Locations Report
o Location has a significant number of pedestrian and bicycle crashes per year (two or more per mile) or contains one or more HSIP-eligible bike-pedestrian crash cluster
2. Congested Conditions, $0-2$ points (each of the two criteria is worth one point)
o Travel-time index is at least 1.3
o Travel-time index is at least 2.0
3. Multimodal Significance, 0-3 points (each of the three criteria is worth one point)
o Location currently supports transit, bicycle, or pedestrian activities
o Location needs to have improved transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities
o Location has a high volume of truck traffic serving regional commerce
4. Regional Significance, 0-4 points (each of the four criteria is worth one point)
o Location is in the National Highway System
o Location carries a significant portion of regional traffic (ADT is greater than 20,000)
o Location lies within 0.5 miles of a transportation equity analysis zone
o Location is essential for the region's economic, cultural, or recreational development
5. Regional Equity, 0-2 points (each of the two criteria is worth one point)
o Location is in an MAPC subregion for which there has not been a Priority Corridors study
o Location is in an MAPC subregion for which there has not been a Priority Corridors study in the previous three years
6. Implementation Potential, 0-3 points (each of the three criteria is worth one point)
o Location is proposed or endorsed for study by the agency that administers the roadway
o Location is proposed or endorsed by its MAPC subregional group and is a priority for that subregional group
o Other stakeholders strongly support improvements for the location

### 2.3 Rating Potential Roadways

MPO staff rated arterial segments with a total score of 11 or fewer points as low priority; those with a score of 12 to 13 points as medium priority; and those with a total score of 14 or more points as high priority. Staff gave 12 arterial segments a high-priority rating based on safety and operational needs, multimodal and regional significance, regional equity, and support for improvements from agencies and municipalities. Staff then examined high-priority segments more closely and excluded arterials for which there were projects meeting any of the following criteria from further consideration for this cycle of the Priority Corridors study: recently completed, in construction, in design, under study, or programmed in the TIP with the 25 percent design completed.

Staff also evaluated the pedestrian accommodation and safety improvement needs for the segment with the highest score by applying the MPO's Pedestrian Report Card Assessment and Bicycle Level-of-Service Metric (Bicycle Report Card). ${ }^{4}$ These locations highly qualify based on pedestrian and bicycle accommodation or safety improvement requirements. Appendix A contains detailed results of the assessments for Route 28 in Milton, the arterial segment with the highest score.

[^16]Based on this evaluation, staff recommends studying the segment on Route 28 in Milton. Figure 1 shows the study area with four HSIP intersection crash clusters.

# ARTERIAL SEGMENT SELECTED FOR STUDY: ROUTE 28 IN MILTON 

The arterial segment on Route 28 in Milton received a total score of 15, based on five of the six selection criteria (safety, congestion, multimodal and regional significance, regional equity, and implementation potential). Route 28 runs north and south through Milton and it serves residential, educational, and recreational areas, and a medical center. Route 28 also carries commuter traffic to and from Boston. Staff's evaluation indicates that there are safety, capacity management, and mobility problems in the segment. Four locations along the segment contain HSIP-eligible crash clusters, one of which is in the top 200 of intersection crash clusters in Massachusetts. Also, accommodation for bicyclists is poor and better bicycle connections are needed in the area.

The Town of Milton and the MassDOT Highway Division are looking for solutions to the problems in the corridor and have expressed support for and willingness to participate in a study of this arterial segment (see Appendix B). MPO staff would identify the problems and develop solutions that could be incorporated into MassDOT's project \#609396 for resurfacing and related work on Route 28. The improvements would be implemented by the Town of Milton and MassDOT. The recommended arterial segment meets the selection criteria of this study, especially by supporting the transportation improvement priorities of the MPO's LRTP.

## 4 NEXT STEPS

After the MPO board discusses this recommendation, staff will meet with officials from the Town of Milton and MassDOT and other stakeholders to discuss the study specifics, conduct field visits, collect data, identify needs, and develop solutions.

SA/sa


| table 1 <br> Arterial Segments Considered for Study: Priority Corridors for Long-Range Transportation Plan Needs Assessment Study |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atereral Segment | Community | ${ }_{\text {Mapc }}^{\text {Supcegion }}$ | Massoot | urisidicion |  | cunctional |  | Number of HSIP <br> Eligible Crash <br> 2014-16* | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Trave } \\ & \text { Une } \\ & \text { Undex } \end{aligned}$ | Transit Service | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Crowded } \\ & \text { or Late } \\ & \text { Bus } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In or Near } \\ & \text { Transportation } \\ & \text { Equity Priority } \\ & \text { Area } \end{aligned}$ | Study, Project, or TIP Project |  | Congested Conditions | Multimodal Significance** | Regional Significance*** | $\underset{\substack{\text { Regional } \\ \text { Equity }}}{ }$ | Implementation Potential | Score | $\underset{\substack{\text { Priorty } \\ \text { Rating }}}{ }$ | Summary of Comments |
| Route 28 | Milon | ICC and TRIC | 6 | mssot and | yes | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2.48 | MBTA bus Routes $240,245,24,28,26$, MBTA Red Line rapid transit at Mattapan/Ashmont 12 | Yes | yes | MassDOT Project \#607342, Intersection and Signal Improvements at Route 28 (Randolph Avenue) and Chickatawbut Road, MassDOT Project \#609396, Resurfacing and related work on Route 28, in preliminary design. 1: Reconstruction on Route 28 (Randolph Avenue) from Reedsdale Road to Quincy town line, completed in 2008. | ${ }_{4}$ | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 15 | High | This arterial segment was recommended for study because of <br>  segment, which presennts sisinficicant oonnectivity problem - <br>  <br>  an new roiject. |
| Roue 107 | Salem | nstF | 4 | $\underbrace{\substack{\text { Saiem }}}_{\text {Massoot and }}$ | Y | 3 | 4 | ${ }^{13}$ | 2.84 | MBTA bus Routes 450, 456, 459, 461 465 , and 469 <br> MBTA commuter rail at Salem and Beverly Ferry service | ${ }^{\text {res }}$ | Yes | Route 107 Coridor Study in Salem and Lynn, completed in 2016 . <br>  MassDOT Project \#608650: Adaptive Signal Controls on Route 107 (Highland Avenue), in construction. MassDOT Project \#608817: Resurfacing and related work on Route 107, programme 2022 TIP preliminary design. | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 14 | High |  |
| Route 3 A | Buringoon | NsPC | 4 | Massot | Yes | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1.67 | MBTA bus Routes $350,351,352,353$, across the segment | None | Yes | MassDOT Project \#608068, will install an adaptive traffic contro signal system on Cambridge Street, Middlessex Turnpike, and compatible traffic signal control equipment, video detection, communication devices and software to integrate 11 MassDOT and 16 Town-owned traffic signal locations into one adaptive signal system. The project is in construction | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 14 | High |  |
| Route 9 | Framingham | mwRC | 3 | Massot | Yes | 2 | 2 | 7 | 3.47 |  | 2. None | Yes |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 14 | High | This arterial segment was not selected because, according to MassDOT District 3 , most of the intersections on this corricor have already been studied and there are several MassDOT projects under construction in the corridor |
| Roue 135 | Framingham | mwRC | 3 | Framingham | ves | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1.63 | MBTA commuter rail at Framingam. MWTAR Routes 4,5, 6, , and 11 |  | yes |  | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 14 | High | MassDOT Project \#606109: Intersection improvements at Route 126/135/MBTA and CSX railroad. Roadway has receitimodal (accommodation for pedestrians and bicycles). |
| Route 16 | Mediord | ${ }^{10}$ | 4 | Massot | Yes | 2,3 | 1 | 5 | 3.04 | MBTA bus Routes 0, 97, 99, 100, 106 134 <br> MBTA rapid transit on the Orange Line at Wellington and on the Red Line at Porter Square; MBTA West Medford and Porter Square |  | Yes | MassDOT Project $\# 604660$ : Everett-Medford-Bridge Replacements, Revere Beach Parkway (Route 16), E-12-004=M- 12-018 over the Malden River (Woods Memorial Bridge) and M-1 017 over MBTA and Rivers Edge Drive-The purpose of this project is to replace the existing non-operating draw bridge with a new fixed bridge. The project is under construction. 12-018, Rever (Rout 16) over the Malden River (Woods Memorial Draw Bridge), in construction. | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 14 | High | n FFY 2019, MPO staff studied Route 16 in Chelsea and Everett and suggested improvements to address safety, congestion, multimodal transportation, pedestrian and bicycle HSIP intersection clusters, including two pedestrian clusters. The roadway experiences congestion and high truck volumes. It is also carries vehiclular, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic to Wellington Station. Studying this segment in Med provide MassDOT with improvement concepts to comprehensively address safety, capacity management and mobility, and pedestrian and bicycle accommodations in the mobility, corridor. |
| Route 16 | Milord | sWAP | 3 | $\underset{\substack{\text { Massoot and } \\ \text { Milord }}}{\text { des }}$ | ${ }_{\text {res }}$ | 3 | 0 | 5 | 3.58 | MwRTA Route 14 |  | yes | MassDOT Project \#607428: Resurfacing and intersection mprovements on Route 16 (Main Street), from Water Street west o approximately 120 feet west of the Milford/Hopedale town lin and the intersection of Route 140; programmed FFY 2019. <br> on Route 16 (Main Street and East Main Street) at six locations; completed in 2013. | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 14 | High | This corridor is not recommended for study. The corridor received improvements in 2013 based on a CTPS study and currently a MassDOT resurfacing and intersection improvement project has been programmed for FFY 2019 |
| Route 114 | Salem | nstf | 4 | $\underset{\substack{\text { Massoot and } \\ \text { Salem }}}{\text { and }}$ | ${ }_{\text {ves }}$ | 2,3 | 0 | 3 | 206 | MBTA bus Routes 450, 451, 455, 456 459 , and 465 <br> MBTA commuter rail t Salem and Beverly; Ferry service | Yes | Yes |  <br>  North Street over North River; in preliminary design | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 14 | High |  |
| Roule 16 | welessey | mwRC | 6 |  |  | 3 | 0 | 5 | 2.57 |  | ${ }^{\text {NA }}$ | yes | MassDOT Project \#94762: Bridge Rehabilitation, Br\# W-13-014 Route 16 (Washington Street) over Route 9 including relocation of retaining wall. | ${ }^{3}$ | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 14 | High |  |

TABLE 1

| Atreial Segment | Community | MAPC Subregio | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Massoot } \\ \text { District }}}^{\text {a }}$ | rissicition | $\begin{aligned} & \text { National } \\ & \text { Highway } \\ & \text { System } \end{aligned}$ | cunctional | Number of Top- <br> 200 High-Crash Locations 2014-16 | $\underset{\substack{\text { Number of HIP } \\ \text { Eligibe Crash } \\ \text { cilutirs } \\ 2014-16^{* \prime}}}{ }$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Travel } \\ \text { Time } \\ \text { Index } \end{gathered}$ | ransit Serice | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Crowded } \\ & \text { or Late } \\ & \text { Bus } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { In or Near } \\ \text { Transportation } \\ \text { Equity Priority } \\ \text { Area }}}{ }$ | Stud, Project, or TIP Project | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Safety } \\ \text { Conditions+m }}}^{\text {and }}$ | Congested | Sultimodal | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Regional } \\ \text { Significance*** } \end{array}$ | ${ }_{\text {Regional }}^{\substack{\text { Rauly }}}$ | (mplementation | Score | ${ }_{\text {Prority }}^{\text {Prity }}$ | Summary of Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 20 | Weston | mwR | 6 | spot | Yes | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3.06 | MBTA bus Route 70 <br> MBTA commuter rai at Waltham and Kendal Green | ves | yes | Intersection improvements on Boston Post Road (Route 20) at Wellesley Street; preliminary design stage. | 2 | 2 | 2 | ${ }_{4}$ | 2 | 2 | 14 | High | A congestion study was suggested through UPWP and LRTP outreach in 2012, 2013, and 2014 by MAGIC; a formal letter subregion meeting. <br> A suggestion to study this location was resubmitted in a comment on the Draft FFY 2014 UPWP and during the 2017 MPO outreach program |
| Route 18 | veym | ssc | 6 | ssoot | Yes | 3 | 3 | 9 | 2.55 | MBTA bus Route 225 <br> MBTA commuter rail at South Weymouth | Yes | Yes | MassDOT Project \#601630-Reconstruction and widening on Route 18 (Main Street) from Highland Place to Route 139 (4.0 miles) includes replacing $W$ - $-32-013$, Route 18 over the Old Colony Railroad (MBTA); in construction | ${ }^{4}$ | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 14 | High | This arterial segment was not selected because a MassDOT project, currently in construction, would address problems in the entire segment and no study is needed at this time. |
| Routes 38129 | Wimington | NSPC | 4 | Massot and $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wininigton }\end{aligned}$ | Yes | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3.31 | MBTA commuter rai at Wilmington <br> Anderson/Woburn <br> and Reading | N | Yes | MassDOT Project \#608051, Reconstruct Route 38 from Route 62 to the Woburn city line, add bike lanes, sidewalks, and turn lanes, and upgrade signals; in design. <br> assDOT Projer Street (Route 129) and Woburn Street; in design MassDOT Project \#601732, Rehabilitation, Rout Street) from Route 38 (Main Street) to Woburn Street; completed in 2009 . | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 14 | High | Several sections of the arterial have projects that are currently in design. These MassDOT projects would address problems the corridor. |
| Route 2 A3 | Afington | 1 cc | 4 | Afingon | Yes | 3 | 0 | 2 | ${ }^{2} 3$ | MBTA bus Routes 67, 77, 79, 80, 87 and 350 travel on or $\qquad$ | Yes | ves | None | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | ${ }^{13}$ | High | None |
| Route 203 | Boston | ${ }^{10}$ | 6 | от | Yes | 3 | 5 | 9 | 2.94 | MBTA bus Routes 14,26, 201, 202, 215 and 217 travel on or across the segment across the segment. |  | Yes | MassDOT Project \#606318, Intersection improvements at Gallivan Boulevard (Route 203) and Morton Street; in construction <br> MassDOT Project \#608755, Intersection improvements Morton Street (Route 203) at Blue Hill Ave, at Courtland Road/Havelock Street, and at Havard Street; programmed in the FFY 2019 TIP, in design. design. <br> MassDOT Project \#606896, Reconstruction on (Route 203) Gallivan Boulevard, from Neponset Circle to east of Morton Street intersection; in preliminary design. <br> MassDOT Project \#606897, Improvements on (Route 203) Morton Street, from west of Gallivan Boulevard to Shea Circle; in preliminary design. | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | ${ }^{13}$ | High | The FFY 2012 Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment Study and several MassDOT projects in the corridor will address issues. |
| Route 37 | Braintee | ssc | 6 | оот | Yes | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2.73 | MBTA bus Routes 230 and 236 and travel on or acro the segment. |  | Yes | MassDOT Project \#608651, Adaptive traffic signal control on Route 37 (Granite Street). Installation of adaptive traffic control signal equipment, vehicle detection, communication equipment and managing software at seven traffic signals on Route 37; in construction. <br> MassDOT Project \#607684, Bridge replacement, B-21-017 Washington Street (Route 37) over MBTA/CSX railroad; preliminary design. | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | ${ }^{13}$ | High | The arterial segment has a 5- to 6-foot shoulder on either side f the roadway for most of the corridor. There are sidewalks on either side of the rodeway throughout the corridor. In addition, MassDOT is installing adaptive traffic control signal equipment, vehicle detection, communication equipment, and managing under construction. |
| Route 2 A | embirige | cc | 6 | ${ }_{\substack{\text { cambidge } \\ \text { and DCR }}}$ | Yes | 3 | 1 | 14 | 2.05 | MBTA bus Routes $67,77,79,80,87$ and 350 travel on or $\qquad$ |  | Yes | None | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | ${ }^{13}$ | High | None |
| Roule 2 | Conord | Magic | 4 | ssoot | ves | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5.93 | MBTA commuter rai at West Concord, Concord, and Lincoln |  | Yes | MassDot Project \#602984, Crosby's Cormer (Route 2 at Route ${ }^{2}$ Massporot Project $\#$ \#60 2015 , Recononstruction and widening on Route 2, from Sandy Pond Road to Bridge over MBTABBM railroad MassDOT Project \#602091, Concord Rotary; in preliminary design MassDOT Project $\# 604069$, Bridge Replacement over Sudbury River; in preliminary design. MassDOT Proiect $\# 606223$ <br> Phase II-B) in Acton and Cornce freeman Rail Trail Construction Route 2; programmed in the FFY 2019 TIP, in design. | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | ${ }^{13}$ | High | FFY 2013 Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment Study (Concord and Lincoin) <br> Route 2 was suggested during MPO outreach as a route experiencing congestion that affects MAGIC communities as well as Cambridge. <br> There are many projects and studies conducted for this corridor, including the Route 2 (Crosby's Corner) improvements. |
| de 16 | Holiston | mwRC | 3 | ${ }_{\text {chen }}^{\substack{\text { Massoot and } \\ \text { Holison }}}$ | r | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1.76 |  | None | ves | 2011 CTPS study, Route 126 Corridor: Transportation Improvement Study. <br> 2008 CTPS study, Washington Street (Route 16/126) at Hollis Street. | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | ${ }^{13}$ | High | This location has MassDOT projects and CTPS studies, which have not been implemented. <br> The 495/MetroWest Partnership expressed interest in a Route 16 study. <br> The section that experiences the most crashes is the town center portion (under Holliston jurisdiction). A road safety audit was performed for the town center portion in December 2012. |

TABLE 1
dors
oro Long-Range Transportation Plan Needs Assessment Study

| Aterial Segment | communty | $\underset{\substack{\text { Mapc } \\ \text { Subregion }}}{ }$ | Massoot | urisiciction | $\begin{aligned} & \text { National } \\ & \text { Highway } \\ & \text { Suster } \end{aligned}$ | Functiona |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Travel } \\ \text { Time } \\ \text { Index } \end{gathered}$ | nsit Service | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Crowded } \\ & \text { OrLated } \\ & \text { Bus } \end{aligned}$ |  | Study, Project, or Tlip Project |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Congested } \\ \text { Conditions } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Multimodal } \\ \text { Significance*** }^{*} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Regional } \\ \text { Significance*** } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\substack{\text { Regional } \\ \text { Equity }}_{\substack{\text { a }}}$ | Implementation Potential*** | score | (Prority | Summary of Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 107 | Lyn | 100 | 4 | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{\text { Massoot and } \\ \text { Lym }}}$ | ${ }_{\text {Yes }}$ | 3 | [ | 13 | 1.87 |  | Yes | yes | MassDOT Project \#808817: Resurfacing of Route 107 and related improvements: progammed FFY 2022. <br>  and Salem: in prelimininar design. <br> Rosber 10roured <br>  <br> the saugus River procrammened 2019 . <br>  <br>  | ${ }^{4}$ | 1 | ${ }_{3}$ | ${ }_{4}$ | 0 | 1 | ${ }^{13}$ | High | This arterial segment was not selected for study because a Route 107 Corridor Study in Lynn and Salem has been improvements would be addressed under project \#608927, which is in design which is in design. |
| Route 114 | Peabody | nstF | 4 | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Massoot and } \\ \text { Peaboy }}}^{\text {and }}$ | ${ }_{\text {res }}$ | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3.60 | MBTA bus Routes 435,465 | Yes | yes | MassDOT Project \# 608567, Improvements at Route 114 at Sylvan Street, Cross Street, Northshore Mall, Loris Road, Route 128 Interchange, and Esquire Drive; programmed FFY 2022. Interchange, and Esquire Dive, programmed $\overline{\text { F }} 2022$. | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | ${ }^{13}$ | High | Route 114 in Peabody was listed as a potential corridor in need of signal progression and improvements to accommodate not selected because, according to MassDOT Highway District 4, a road safety audit was completed for the segment in Augus 2016 and a consultant has started design work as part of project \#608567, which is programed for FFY 2022. |
| Route 3A | Quincy | ${ }^{\text {IcC }}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | MassDOT DCR, and Quincy Quincy | Yes | 3 | 1 | 10 | 2.76 |  | ${ }_{\text {Yes }}$ | yes | MassDOT Project \#608569, Intersection improvements at Route 3A (Southern Artery) and Broad Street; programmed FFY 2022 TIP. OT Project \#605729, Intersection and signal improvements at Hancock Street and East/West Squantum streets; completed in 2015. <br> problems at the | ${ }_{4}$ | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | ${ }^{13}$ | High | Route $3 A$ (Hancook Streetand Southem Atrer) has received several inporovement projects and was the focus ofa cips stuxy. The location was suggested in ine 2017 MPO outrach program. |
| Route 1A | Salem | nstr | 4 | $\underbrace{\text { a }}_{\substack{\text { Massoot and } \\ \text { Salem }}}$ | ${ }_{\text {Yes }}$ | 2 | 0 | 9 | 1.59 | 16 MBTA bus stops MBTA bus Routes 455 and 459 MBTA commuter rail at Salem Ferry service | Yes | Yes | MassDOT Project \#605146: Reconstruction of Canal Street from ashington Street and Mill Street to Loring Avenue (Route 1A) nd Jefferson Street; completed in 2018. <br> MassDOT Project \#601017: Reconstruction of Route 1A (Bridge Street) from the Beverly/Salem Bridge to Washington Street (6,000 feet); completed in 2013 . | ${ }^{3}$ | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | ${ }^{13}$ | High | This arterial segment was not selected because the southern解 at Vinnin Square in Marblehead and in Swampscott; this Corridors Study. The intersection of Route 1A and Jefferson Street and Canal Street was reconstructed in 2018. |
| Route 16 | Sherborn | SWAP | 3 | Sherborn | Yes | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3.20 | None | NA | yes | None | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | ${ }^{13}$ | High | This location was suggested during 2014 LRTP outreach at a 495/MetroWest Partnership meeting. <br> The section that experiences the most crashes and congestion is in the town center, where Route 16 and Route 27 combine and split. |
| Route 3 A | Weymuth | ssc | 6 | Massot | Yes | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1.74 | 30 MBTA bus stops MBTA bus Routes MBTA commuter rail at Quincy Center Landing/East Braintree, and West Ferry service <br> Ferry service | Yes | Yes | MassDOT Project \#608231, Reconstruction of Route 3A including pedestrian and traffic signal improvements; in design. <br> MassDOT Project \#604382, Route 3A (Washington Street) Bridge; in construction. <br> MassDOT Project \#608483, Work consists of resurfacing on Route <br> $3 A$; in preliminary design. | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | ${ }^{13}$ | High |  |
| Route 60 | Afington | ${ }^{\text {Ic }}$ | 4 | Afringon | Yes | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.92 | MBTA bus Routes $67,77,79,80,87$, across the segmen | Yes | Yes |  | ${ }^{3}$ | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | ${ }^{12}$ | Medium | None |
| Route 2733A16 | Cambrigge | Ic | 6 | DCR | Yes | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.80 | MBTA bus Routes $75,71,72,73,74$, and 78 MBTA Red Line rapid transit <br> MBTA commuter rail at Porter Square | ${ }^{\text {res }}$ | Yes | DCR announced that the agency will conduct a traffic study of several intersections along Mount Auburn Street and Fresh Pond The study will focus on safety measures, bus prioritization, and accessibility. <br> MassDOT Project \#608806, Multi-use Path Contruction (Phase II), will create a multi-use greenway on the former B\&M railroad rightFresh Pond Reservation, under Huron Avenue and Mount Auburn Street and into Watertown; this project is in construction. MassDOT Project \#609290, Intersection inprovem Pond Parkway/Gerrys Landing Road, fron Brattle Road to Memorial Drive. | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 12 | Medium | The Fresh Pond Residents Alliance identified Fresh Pond Parkway and Alewife Brook Parkway as locations in need of transportation improvements. Concerns include pedestrian School, because of high traffic volumes, environmental issues, and lack of livability. |
| Route 16 | ${ }_{\substack{\text { chelsea and } \\ \text { Everett }}}^{\text {and }}$ | 1 cc | 4 | Massot | Yes | 2 | 6 | 7 | 1.99 | MBTA bus Routes <br> 97, 99, 106, 110, <br> 12, 104, 105, and <br> MBTA Orange Line rapid transit at MBTA commuter ra at Chelsea | Yes | Yes | FFY 2019 Priority Corridor for LRTP Needs Assessment Study (Chelsea and Everett) (Chelsea and Everett) | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | ${ }^{12}$ | Medium | FFY 2019 Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment Study (Concord and Lincoln) |


| TABLE 1 <br> Arterial Segments Considered for Study: Priority Corridors for Long-Range Transportation Plan Needs Assessment Study |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Afterial Segment | Community | $\mathrm{m}_{\text {mapc }}^{\text {subregion }}$ | Massot | Jursisiction | $\begin{aligned} & \text { National } \\ & \text { Heghay } \\ & \text { Hystem } \end{aligned}$ | Functiona ${ }_{\text {chass }}$ | Number of Top- <br> 200 High-Crash 2014-16 | Number of HSIP <br> Eligible Crash Clusters | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Travel } \\ & \text { Time } \\ & \text { Index } \end{aligned}$ | Transit Sevice | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Crowded } \\ & \text { or Late } \\ & \text { Bus } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In or Near } \\ & \text { Transportation } \\ & \text { Equity Priority } \\ & \text { Area } \end{aligned}$ | Study, Project, or TliP Project | $\begin{gathered} \text { Safety } \\ \text { Conditions } \end{gathered}$ | Congested | Multimodal Significance*** | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Regional } \\ \text { Significance*** } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Regional Equity"\#* | Implementation Potential*** | Score | ${ }_{\text {Premer }}^{\substack{\text { Priotity } \\ \text { Rating }}}$ | Summary of Comments |
| Route 99 | Everett | ${ }^{10}$ | 4 | Evereat | Yes | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2.23 | MBTA bus Routes 97, 99, 104, 105, 112 travel on or across the segment | Yes | Yes | MassDOT Project \#602383 reconstructed Route 99 with a traffic signal upgrade, from Second Street to the Malden city line completed in 2008 <br> MassDOT Project \#602382 reconstructed Route 99 from Sweetse Circle to the Alford Street Bridge in 2013; completed spring 2013. | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 12 | Medium | This roadway is not recommended for study because MassDOT completely reconstructed Route 99 with mprovements from Alford Street Bridge to the Malden city line Route 99 (Lower Broadway) has also received improvements, including pedestrian and bicycle accommodation, as a result of the Encore Boston Harbor mitigation improvements. |
| Route 3 A | Hingham | ssc | 5 | Massoot | Yes | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1.69 | MBTA commuter rai at Cohasset, <br> Wantasket Junction, East Weymouth <br> Ferry service <br> MBTA bus Routes <br> 220 and 221 | NA | yes |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 12 | Medium | In FFY 2015 a a subregional priority roadway study was conducted for Route 3 in in fingham and Hul. Conducted for Route 3 A in Hingham and Hull. The location received strong support from the Towns of Hingham and Hull, as well as the South Shore Coalition and the MassDOT Highway Divis |
| Route 1 | Nomood | TRIC | 5 | Massot | Yes | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3.85 | MBTA commuter rail at islington, Dedham Corp. Center Depot, Norwood Central, Windsor Gardens, and Plimptonville | NA | ves | MassDOT's I-95 South Corridor Study, provided a comprehensive evaluation of the I-95 and Route 1 corridors south of Route 128 improvements; June 2010 <br> MassDOT Project \#609371, Median jersey barrier and fencing upgrade; programmed FFY 2019. <br> MassDOT Project \#608052, Route 1 at Morse Street (approved by PRC November 2014); programmed FFY 2023. <br> MassDOT Project \#605857, Route 1 at University Avenue and MassDOT Project \#605321, Bridge Preservation, Route 1 over the Neponset River; in design stage <br> dian jersey barrier and fencing <br> upgrade; completed in 2012 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 12 | Medium | The location has MassDOT projects and studies and it is not recommended for study |
| Route 28 | Randolph | TRIC | 6 | ${ }_{\text {M }}^{\substack{\text { Massoot and } \\ \text { Ranoloph }}}$ | Yes | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2.00 | MBTA bus Routes 240 and 238 MBTA commuter rail BAT Route 12 | ${ }^{\text {res }}$ | Yes | MassDOT Project \#609399, Resurfacing and related work on Route 28; in preliminary design. <br> Arterial Coordination Study, CTPS study (2010) | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | ${ }^{12}$ | Medium | The location has reeived several Massoot projecs and |
| $\underbrace{\text { Beach Parkway }}_{\text {Reute } 16 \text { (Revere }}$ | Revere | ${ }^{1 c}$ | 4 | Massot | Yes | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2.93 | MBTA bus Routes <br> 110,116 , and 117 the segment MBTA rapid transit on Blue Line <br> at Chelsea | ${ }^{\text {nes }}$ | Yes | None | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 12 | Medium | This location is not recommended for study because the Sufflok Downs Redevelopment project is evaluating several scenarios that would affect traffic on Route 16 and Route 1A. scenarios that would affect traffic on Route 16 and Route 1A. |
| Route 20 | Watham | ${ }^{1 c}$ | 6 |  | rester | 3 | 0 | 9 | 2.45 | MBTA bus Routes , 170, 505, and across the segment | res | Yes | Cily of Wallam Transporation Master Plan, Januar 2017. | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | ${ }^{12}$ | Medium | This location is not recommended for study because this location had been studied and improvements proposed in the Waltham Transportation Master Plan |
| Route 9 | Welessey | mwRc | 6 | Massoot | Yes | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1.77 | MBTA commuter rail at Wellestey Hills and Wellesley Farms MWRTA bus Route 1 | None | Yes | MassDOT Project \#608180: Resurfacing on Route 9, from limit of add-a-lane to east of Overbrook intersection; in construction MassDOT Project \#606530: Drainage improvements along Route 9 Boulder Brook Culvert (design only); in design <br> Route 9 from Dearborn Street to Natick town line; in prelimiary design <br> MassDOT Project \#609402: Resurfacing and related work on Route 9; in preliminary design. <br> Wasshington St Washington Street) over Route 9, including relocation of retaining wall; completed summer 2010 <br> MAPC Land Use/Corridor Study (fall 2013). | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 12 | Medium | MassDOT has completed a preliminary assessment of this corridor that will develop into 25 percent design plans for roadway improvements. |
| Route 117 | ${ }^{\text {Bolton }}$ | MAGIC | 3 | Boton |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1.70 | None |  | Yes | None | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 11 | Medium | None |
| Route 62 | Conoord | magic | 4 | Conorord | Yes | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2.65 | MBTA commuter rail t Concord and West Concord |  | Yes |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 11 | Med | None |
| Route 60 | Mediord | Icc | 4 | Mediord | No | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3.00 | MBTA bus Routes $95,101,194,134$ 326 and 710 <br> MBTA commuter rail West Medford and Porter Square |  | Yes | None | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 11 | Medium | None |


| TABLE 1 <br> Arterial Segments Considered for Study: Priority Corridors for Long-Range Transportation Plan Needs Assessment Study |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atrerial Segment | Community | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAPC } \\ & \text { Subregion } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Massoot | urisicicition | $\begin{aligned} & \text { National } \\ & \text { Highway } \\ & \text { System } \end{aligned}$ | Functional <br> Class* | Number of Top- <br> 200 High-Crash 2014-16 |  | $\begin{gathered} \substack{\text { Trave } \\ \text { Time }} \end{gathered}$ | ransit Service | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Crowded } \\ & \text { Oroated } \\ & \text { Bus } \end{aligned}$ | In or Near Transportation Equity Priority $\qquad$ | Study, Project, or Tlip Project | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Safety } \\ \text { Conditions*** } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Congested Conditions*** | $\begin{gathered} \text { Multimodal } \\ \text { Significance*** } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { Regional } \\ \text { Significance*** } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Regional } \\ & \text { Equity } \end{aligned}$ | Implementation <br> Potentialtat | Score | ${ }_{\text {Prem }}^{\substack{\text { Priority } \\ \text { Rating }}}$ | Summary of Comments |
| Route 138 | Milon | ICC and TRIC | 6 | Massoot | Yes | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2.41 | MBTA bus Routes 245 and 716 <br> at Route 128 Station <br> MBTA Red Line rapid <br> ransit at Mattapan <br> Station | r | yes | MassDOT Project \#608484, Roadway Improvements on Route 138, is planned to be funded through the Boston Region Impropolitan Planning Organization's FFY 2020 Transportation planned originally for Project \#607763 (described below): programmed FFY 2020. <br> FFY 2018 LRTP Priority Corridor Study | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 11 | Medium | FFY 2018 Priority Corridors for LRTP Needs Assessment Study (Canton). MassDOT Project \#608484, Roadway Improvements on Roure address problems and needs in the the corididor. |
| Route 135 | Natiok | MwRC | 3 | $\underset{\substack{\text { Massoot and } \\ \text { Natiok }}}{\text { a }}$ | res | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1.97 | 10 and 11 <br> MBTA commuter rail at Natick and West Natick | None | Yes | MassDOT Project \#600573 reconstructed Route 135 in Natick in 2008. More extensive improvements were proposed in the downtown area, on East Central Street between North Main Street and Union Street, including signal upgrades, new sidewalks, completed; all construction operations were suspended (as of June 30, 2007). <br> 2010 CTPS study, West Central Street (Route 135) at Speen stree. | ${ }^{3}$ | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 11 | Medium | There is congestion in the downtown area. The likely focus area would be on the intersection of Route 135 at Route 27 and the intersection of Route 135 at Speen Street because of the crash history of those locations. |
| Route 9 | Newon | Ic | 6 | Massoot | Yes | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.98 | MWRTA Route 1 <br> MBTA bus Routes 60, 51, 52, and 59 travel on or across the segment <br> MBTA Green Line | Yes | Yes | MassDOT Project \#608821, Resurfacing and related work on Route 9; in preliminary design. <br> Route 9 (Boylston Stret) fresurfacing and Related Work on Noute 9 (Boylston Street) from the Wellesley/Newton city line to MassDOT Project \#606635, Reconstruction of Highle 2012. Needham Street, and Charles River Bridge, from Webster Ste, Needham Street, and Charles Riv Route 9; programmed FFY 2019. | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 11 | Medium | According to MassDot District 6 , improvements were recently made to accommodate new developments. An analysis of the new existing conditions would be helpfulu to compare with the future projected conditions |
| ute 12 | Reading | nspC | 4 | MassDOT and Reading | ${ }_{\text {res }}$ | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1.82 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MBTA bus Route } 136 \\ & \text { MBTA commuter rail } \\ & \text { at Wakefield, } \\ & \text { Reading, and } \\ & \text { Woburn } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | Yes | No projects | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 11 | Medium | None |
| Route 1 | Waloole | TRIC | 5 | Massot | Yes | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1.53 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MBTA commuter rail } \\ & \text { at sharon and } \\ & \text { Wapole } \end{aligned}$ | NA | Yes | MassDOT's l-95 South Corridor Study presented a comprehensive evaluation of the I-95 and Route 1 corridors south of Route 128 and included a recommended plan of short-term and long-term improvements; June 2010. <br> , Resurfacing and related work on Route 1; programmed FFY 2020. MassDOT Project \#608599, Stormwater Improvements to treat discharges from Route 1, I-95, and Route 1A to the Neponse River and an Unnamed Tributary; programmed FFY 2022. River and an Unnamed Tributary; programmed FFY 2022 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 11 | Medium | The location has MassDOT projects and studies and was not recommended for study by MassDOT Highway District 5 |
| Route 1 | Westwod | TRIC | 6 | Massoot | Yes | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.49 |  | NA | ves | MassDOT's I-95 South Corridor Study provided a comprehensive evaluation of the I-95 and Route 1 corridors south of Route 128 and included a recommended plan of short-term and long-term improvements; June 2010. <br> MassDOT Project \#603162, Route 128 Add-a-Lane Bridges (Bridge III), Route 1 and 1A over I-95/128; completed in 2012 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 11 | Medium | This segmentis the subject of Massoot projects and studies. |

Notes
*Functional Class
$2=$ priniciana a arerial





Acronyms
DDA

 Program. VHB $=$ Vanasse, Hangen, Busustin nc.

## Part 3: Support Letters

## Seth Asante

| From: | John Thompson |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, October 11, 2019 10:54 AM |
| To: | Vatan, Geraldine T. (DOT); Seth Asante; Dwyer, Courtney (DOT) |
| Cc: | Mark Abbott; Michael D. Dennehy; Chase Berkeley |
| Subject: | RE: Milton - Route 28 - Corridor Study |

Good Morning Seth,

The Town of Milton still very much supports a corridor study for Route 28 as well. As you know, the Town sees a huge influx of cut through traffic in the peak hours along this corridor and safety and efficiency are of the utmost importance to the Town and residents.

Thank-you for the consideration.

Regards,

John P. Thompson, P.E.
Town Engineer

Town of Milton - Engineering Dept.
525 Canton Avenue
Milton, MA 02186
(617) 898-4869

From: Vatan, Geraldine T. (DOT) [geraldine.vatan@state.ma.us](mailto:geraldine.vatan@state.ma.us)
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2019 10:00 AM
To: Seth Asante [sasante@ctps.org](mailto:sasante@ctps.org); Dwyer, Courtney (DOT) [courtney.dwyer@state.ma.us](mailto:courtney.dwyer@state.ma.us)
Cc: Mark Abbott [mabbott@ctps.org](mailto:mabbott@ctps.org); John Thompson [jthompson@townofmilton.org](mailto:jthompson@townofmilton.org)
Subject: RE: Milton - Route 28 - Corridor Study

Hello Seth,
Yes, thank you for your consideration, D6 is still in support of a Route 28 corridor study in Milton. Geri

Geraldine Vatan - District 6 Project Development Engineer
MassDOT Highway Division
185 Kneeland Street, Boston MA 02111
Office (857) 368-6115 Cell (508) 330-1078 geraldine.vatan@state.ma.us

From: Seth Asante [sasante@ctps.org](mailto:sasante@ctps.org)
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2019 3:02 PM
To: Vatan, Geraldine T. (DOT) [Geraldine.Vatan@dot.state.ma.us](mailto:Geraldine.Vatan@dot.state.ma.us); Worhunsky, Courtney (DOT)
[Courtney.Dwyer@dot.state.ma.us](mailto:Courtney.Dwyer@dot.state.ma.us)
Cc: Mark Abbott [mabbott@ctps.org](mailto:mabbott@ctps.org)
Subject: RE: Milton - Route 28 - Corridor Study

Good afternoon Geri and Courtney,

I am reviewing the arterial segments that were identified in the needs assessment of the MPO's Long-Range Transportation Plan to select a priority corridor for study this year.

Last April, you requested for a Route 28 corridor study in Milton with the support of the Town and Representative William Driscoll. This corridor ranks high on our list and so I wanted to confer with you if District 6 and Milton are still interested in pursuing the Route 28 study.

Please let me know as soon as possible.

Thank you, Seth

Seth A. Asante, P.E. | Chief Transportation Planner
CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING STAFF
857.702.3644 | sasante@ctps.org
www.ctps.org/bostonmpo
Ten Park Plaza, Suite 2150 | Boston, MA 02116-3968
Main 857.702 .3700 | Fax 617.570 .9192 | TTY 617.570 .9193


From: Dwyer, Courtney (DOT) [courtney.dwyer@state.ma.us](mailto:courtney.dwyer@state.ma.us)
Sent: Monday, April 1, 2019 2:50 PM
To: Mark Abbott [mabbott@ctps.org](mailto:mabbott@ctps.org); sasante@ctps.org
Cc: Vatan, Geraldine T. (DOT) [geraldine.vatan@state.ma.us](mailto:geraldine.vatan@state.ma.us)
Subject: Milton - Route 28 - Corridor Study

Good Afternoon Mark \& Seth,
The Town of Milton has requested for a corridor study to be conducted on Route 28. State Representative William Driscoll has been supportive of this request and has asked for an update regarding next steps and what, if anything, is required from Milton to get this study programmed. We have committed that the District will get back to the Town and Rep. Driscoll, after we hear back from you.

In March 2019, there was a Project (\#609396) initiated for Resurfacing and Related Work on Route 28. The project is scheduled for advertisement in April 2024.

Please let us know if there is anything else you need from the District or Milton to help process this request.
Thank you, Courtney

Courtney (Dwyer) Worhunsky, P.E.
District 6 Projects Engineer
MassDOT - Highway Division | 185 Kneeland Street, 9th Floor Boston, MA 02111
office (857)368-6165 | courtney.dwyer@state.ma.us

Please be advised that the Massachusetts Secretary of State considers e-mail to be a public record, and therefore subject to the Massachusetts Public Records Law, M.G.L. c. 66 § 10.

## Part 4: Public Participation

## Route 28 Priority Corridor Study in Milton

Kickoff Meeting
Blute Conference Room
Milton Town Hall,
January 21, 2020, 10:00 AM — 11:00 AM

## ATTENDANCE

| John Thompson | Town of Milton |
| :--- | :--- |
| William Clark | Town of Milton |
| Chase Berkeley | Town of Milton |
| Michael Dennehy | Town of Milton |
| Mark Alba | Town of Milton |
| Chris Trudel | Town of Milton |
| Makaela Niles | MassDOT—Planning |
| Raj Kulen | MassDOT—District 6 |
| Courtney Worhunsky | MassDOT—District 6 |
| Bryan Sutherland | BETA Group |
| Hameed Pervez | Boston Region MPO |
| Jeff Maxtutis | Boston Region MPO |

## MEETING SUMMARY

## Summary of Study Tasks

- Collect Data for Analysis—intersection geometry, signal timings, turning movement counts (TMCs), automatic traffic recorder (ATR) counts, spot speed data, crash data, community survey data-by January 2020
- Analyze Existing Conditions/Identify Problems—by March 2020
- Develop Conceptual Improvements-by June 2020
- Prepare Study Document for Review—by July 2020
- Final Report—by September 2020


## ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED

## Data Collection

- Additional counts are needed at the John Kelly Field/Playground between St Mary's Road and Lincoln Street to capture recreational trips.

Additional counts would be scheduled in May from 2:00 pm to 6:00 pm when schools are in section and weather conditions are warmer for outdoor recreational activities.

- The traffic count periods will miss afternoon school closing trips at the Pierce Middle School and St Mary of the Hills School.

Additional traffic counts will be scheduled from 2:00 pm to $6: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ for the intersections of Route 28 at Central Avenue, Lincoln Street, and the driveway of St Mary of the Hills School. The school and playground counts would be combined.

- Include the intersection of Route 28 and Pleasant Street in the turning movement counts.
- Modify the speed survey locations on Route 28 between Chickatawbut Road and Hillside Street to capture high speeds of vehicles on the sag curve in the segment.
- MassDOT expressed interest in the traffic counts for the Chickatawbut Road intersection, especially accounting for the long traffic queues at the intersection during peak travel periods.


## Traffic Safety Issues

- There have been fatal crashes on the Route 28 segment between Chickatawbut Road and Hallen Avenue.

MPO staff will analyze crash data for the segment and present the results to the study's task force.

- Check for the posted speed limits on Route 28 (Brook Road and Reedsdale Road) where the land uses are mixed-residential intermixed with schools, park and playground, hospital, and a public library.
- High speeds of vehicles is a safety concern for residents in the corridor, especially on Route 28 between Chickatawbut Road and Reedsdale Road.
- Sidewalks on Route 28 (Randolph Avenue segment) are too close to the travel lanes and there are no grass buffers to provide comfort and safety for pedestrians.
- Consider reducing speed limits on Route 28 (Randolph Avenue segment) to improve safety for motorists, pedestrians, and bicycles.
- Consider consolidating the two crosswalks at St Mary's of the Hills School


## Complete Streets Issues

- Consider a Road Diet for the segment of Brook Road between Central Avenue and Blue Hill Parkway. Milton's Complete Streets Prioritization Plan includes a road diet option for the segment to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles safely.
- Consider a Lane Diet for the segment of Brook Road between Central Avenue and Blue Hill Parkway. Milton's Complete Streets Prioritization Plan includes a lane diet option for the segment to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles safely.


## Corridor Analysis and Improvements

- Evaluation of the Route 28 and Chickatawbut Road intersection would be excluded from this study to avoid duplication, but the recommendations will be included in the study report to make the corridor study complete.
- The task force agreed to conduct a community survey for the study.

MPO staff would design the survey questionnaire and submit it to MassDOT and Milton for comments.

- Analysis of future traffic conditions as part of the study was raised. MPO staff would use the regional model to project 2040 traffic for evaluation of future conditions.
- MPO staff were asked to consider northbound double left-turn lanes at Reedsdale Road and Randolph Avenue intersection.
- Milton would be installing a HAWK signal on Route 28 (Reedsdale Road) at the driveway to Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital to address high pedestrian crossings, ADA issues, and bus transit issues.

Town Engineer will provide MPO staff with details to incorporate into the study

- Consider extending the two southbound lanes on Route 28 south of the Chickatawbut intersection to reduce the impact of a traffic queue backing up into the intersection.

This improvement should be considered in the ongoing design work for the Chickatawbut intersection to avoid duplication.

- Study should show benefits of coordinating traffic signals.


## Follow-Up Task

- Milton will provide details of the proposed HAWK signal and improvements at the intersection of Reedsdale Avenue and driveway to Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital to MPO staff.
- Milton will provide Complete Street Prioritization projects on Route 28 (Brook Road and Reedsdale Road) to MPO staff to incorporate into the study.
- MPO staff will update turning movement counts to incorporate school closing and recreational trips nearby Pierce Middle School and John Kelly Field/Playground.
- MPO staff will design the survey questionnaire and submit it to study advisory task force for comments.

Any further feedback is welcome throughout the course of the study.

## Route 28 Priority Corridor Study in Milton

Zoom Virtual Meeting \#2
January 27, 2021

## ATTENDANCE

| Senator Walter Timilty | Massachusetts Senate |
| :--- | :--- |
| Hannah Buntich | Massachusetts Senate |
| Representative William Driscoll | Massachusetts House |
| Representative Brandy Fluker Oakley | Massachusetts House |
| Chris Westfall | Massachusetts House |
| Melinda Collins | Town of Milton |
| Chase Berkeley | Town of Milton |
| Michael Dennehy | Town of Milton |
| Mark Alba | MassDOT—Planning |
| Makaela Niles | MassDOT—Planning |
| Benjamin Muller | MassDOT—District 6 |
| Raj Kulen | MassDOT—District 6 |
| Erin Kinahan | MassDOT—District 6 |
| Bryan Sutherland | MassDOT—District 6 |
| Hameed Pervez | Boston Region MPO |
| Sylvia Costa | Boston Region MPO |
| Mark Abbott |  |

## MEETING SUMMARY

## Improvement Concepts

The meeting began with introductions. Seth Asante, MPO staff, presented the improvement concepts for the corridor. The corridor was divided into three segments: Brook Road, Reedsdale Road, and Randolph Avenue. Each of the Brook Road and Reedsdale Road segments had three improvement concepts and one improvement concept for the Randolph Avenue segment. Participants and
stakeholders provided feedback after the presentation. The presentation was sent to participants, who were given two weeks to provide any further comments.

## Feedback on the Improvement Concepts

- Representative Brandy Fluker Oakley: What is the community outreach of the study? At the planning stage, the outreach involves MassDOT, Town of Milton, and State Legislators. MPO staff also conducted a community survey to solicit input from Milton residents. After the planning study, if MassDOT or Town of Milton advance any of the concepts into projects, there would be public hearings at various stages of the project. It will be similar to what was done for the Route 138 project in Canton and Milton.
- Representative Brandy Fluker Oakley: What is the status of the Route 138 project? I have other questions and will send them to you by email. MassDOT has advanced the concepts from that study into a project. A public hearing was held on October 22, 2019 in Milton for the project.
- Melinda Collins, Milton Select Board: How does the study relates to the project at Chickatawbut Road intersection? Going forward, the question residents will have is how the two solutions be married together? Typically what we do, when we are doing our studies and we know that there is another project going on at one end or the other, in this case the Chickatawbut Road intersection project, we would not design or recommend anything for that location, so we can marry into their project. However, we would mention the recommendations from that project in the current study.

Melinda Collins, Milton Select Board: There is real interest in making the Skyline Trail crossing located south of the study area safer for pedestrians and hikers? Yes, this request has been brought to the attention of the MPO and MassDOT. The Skyline Trail crossing is outside the study limits.

- Chase Berkeley, Milton DPW: We did implement a road diet on the northern portion of the quarter, very recently. The project was done through a grant from Shared Streets and Open Spaces program. Thank you to all the elected officials and MassDOT who supported that funding. We send you details of that project. Thank you for sharing the project information.
- Raj Kulen, MassDOT: Brook Road Concept 3 does not have a shoulder and that could affect traffic operations if there is a breakdown or incident. We will review the concept and make necessary changes.
- Raj Kulen, MassDOT: Reducing the speed limit on Randolph Avenue from 45 mph to 35 mph would be difficult to enforce and would not accomplish the desired results, unless the roadway is designed to calm traffic. We will
review this recommendation and design in some traffic calming measures to reduce traffic speeds.
- Mark Alba, Milton Police: In the northerly section down by St Mary's School, the road has curves, kind of a winding road, so lam not sure a median is perfect for that location, a winding road with children crossing, pedestrian traffic, and turning traffic. Thank you, we will review that concept.
- Representative William Driscoll: One of the issues on Randolph Avenue is turning in and out of the neighborhoods. The roadway width in this segment is just not wide enough to include kind of a center turn lane. However, it would be an ideal type of roadway to have that center turn lane to improve safety. The concepts we developed, we tried to stay within the existing right-of-way, but we can include in the report that future process look at possible land takings to include turn lanes at the at the major intersections on that segment
- Representative William Driscoll: The other thing I hear you know from residents a lot in terms of constituent feedback, I don't know if this is reflected in the comments that you received as part of the study, but just the fact that it goes from two lanes on Route 28 to four lanes and then back to two lane. The cut through traffic that we see there is the additional 10,000 cars. So I don't know if there's any additional thoughts there in terms of looking at going down to two lanes of travel and some other improvements. Yes, this idea was reflected in the comments from the community survey. We will review this concept further and include it in the report.
- Representative William Driscoll: A new bond bill allocated $\$ 10$ million to try to improve the multiuse lanes on that section of Randolph Avenue. It is meant to connect the Milton MBTA stops with and high speed line to the Houghton's Pond recreation area, so if you follow that kind of trajectory of the streets mentioned Randolph Avenue in segment three do fall into this project so just point that out as something that's out there for the can be capitalized on. Okay thank you.

Mr. Dennehy: For the Hallen Avenue intersection, obviously the safest path of travel for anyone is a signaling the intersection but just having been in Milton for a long time, taking that left turn away on Randolph Avenue put an abundance of pressure onto specific neighborhoods. Residents are already feeling some of the heat of cut through traffic in the Hillside Street and Highland Street neighborhoods. We are getting a lot of traffic through them now and in the PM commute. I am all for the safest left hand turn, because that was a location of one of the fatalities in the reports two summers ago a tragic accident.

In addition, Hallen Avenue is used by many people to get to the hospital. I think you can corroborate this is part of the destination, to the hospital, which is becoming a regional hospital. To include ambulances as well, so some points coming from the other way. Possible signalization at Hallen Avenue, we would look at the traffic signal warrants there, but some of the volumes are just a bit short right now, we have to wait until after the pandemic when traffic volumes return to normal.

Senator Walter Timilty: I thank you very much a couple of points-number one, a couple years back, I filed an amendment and I have had some talks with MassDOT on this to fund an additional traffic light on Randolph Avenue somewhere around the side streets that are across from the Pepsi plantation or new Wollaston Golf Club. At the determination of the Town Administrator in Milton and with conversations with MassDOT, I was told that if we do that, we would have to regrade the road. However, it's something that I believe there's a great deal worth and exploring because it is one way to slow down traffic, I would also like to point out that anytime we talked about land takings, whether it be for a roundabout or to widened Randolph Avenue, you are going to engender pushback. Yes, that's why, when we do our studies we try to stay on with existing right away as much as possible, we understand that anytime you propose land takings whether it's empty space or someone's yard does become a contentious issue.

Raj Kulen, MassDOT: Yes, this is to make the Senator Timilty's point. Did you take a traffic count at that at that location? The second question is about the golf course entrance. In order to install the traffic signal we need to do a traffic signal warrant analysis. No, we did take a traffic count at Hallen Avenue, not at the Golf Course entrance. Maybe we'll put in a request to for a traffic count, but the volume will be low due to the pandemic.

Raj Kulen, MassDOT: Knowing the intersection, probably it would not meet many of the warrants for signalization, but we could look at other ones such as systems warrants or other ones. Okay thank you.

Mark Alba, Milton Police: Just real quickly to revisit the Hallen Avenue, some of those side streets are one-way leading up to Randolph Avenue or are time restricted, so the one way would not work well. Okay, thank you.

## Closing comments

Mark Abbott, Boston Region MPO: MPO staff will be trying to wrap up the draft report, shortly after receiving feedback. Once the draft ready we will send it to all of you once again for your comments and questions on that before we finalize it. Any further feedback is welcome throughout the course of the study. All your questions and comments are greatly appreciated, especially people from Milton that travel the roadway and see it all the time. You provided some valuable input
into our reports as well, and thank you, Senator Walter Timilty, Representative William Driscoll, and Representative Brandy Fluker Oakley for attending. Thank you Town of Milton and MassDOT representatives and legislative staff.

## Appendix B

## Brook Road: Road Diet Project

## Shared Streets and Spaces Grant Application

Brook Road, Milton - Road Diet

August 7, 2020
Prepared for:


Prepared by:
Stantec Consulting Services Inc.
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### 1.0 APPUCANTINFORMATION

DATE

MUNICIPALITY

NAME OF OFFICIAL MUNICIPAL SIGNATORY

OTHER MUNICIPALITY INVOLVED AND ROLES

DESCRIPTION OF ROLES AND
RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE APPLICANT AND ANY PARTNERING MUNICIPALITIES

Friday, August 7, 2020

Town of Milton

Michael Dennehy, Town Administrator

N/A

Town of Milton, project proponent \& jurisdiction of proposed project, responsible for installation

Chase Berkeley, P.E. - Director Public Works

629 Randolph Avenue, Milton MA 02186
cberkeley@townofmilton.org

617-898-4971

## SHARED STREETS AND SPACES GRANT APPLICATION

### 2.0 PROJ ECTINFORMATION

### 2.1 PROJ ECTGOALS

The Brook Road - Road Diet aims to provide additional space for pedestrians and bicyclists by reallocating existing road-widths from wide travel lanes and shoulders along the corridor. By reallocating space, Brook Road becomes a safer environment for all users - including vehicle motorists, bus passengers, bicycle riders, and people on foot. Parking protected bike lanes connecting neighborhood roads to the St. Mary's School and Peirce Middle School give students a safer route to school; painted buffers increase the perception of safety for pedestrians and bicyclists who are now separated from moving vehicles; and designated pick-up and drop-off spaces at the schools ease tensions resulting from a demand for road space.

### 2.2 PROJ ECTDESCRIPIION

The existing four-lane Brook Road has wide travel lanes, sub-standard bicycle facilities, and dilapidated sidewalks. To maintain CDC-recommended social distances, pedestrians and bicyclists find themselves venturing into the road, unprotected from oncoming traffic (see Appendix for photographs taken on a site visit in July 2019). As the public continues to practice social distancing and maintains space between others, the need for safe spaces beyond the limits of the sidewalks is needed on Brook Road.

The existing 55 -foot right-of way will be restriped with paint funded by the grant to include a protected bicycle lane in both directions, painted buffers, one travel lane in both directions, and a parking lane south of the St. Mary's School to operate as parking and school pick-up and drop-off at the St. Mary's School and the Pierce Middle School.

## Bike Lanes

Creating parking protected, buffered bicycle lanes on Brook Road will increase safety and the ability for social distancing for all users, especially students walking and biking to school. By adding a bicycle lane and buffered area on existing roadway, vehicle traffic will have less space to drive, and therefore slow down. This is particularly important on Brook Road, as the majority of the corridor is adjacent to schools or a park, both popular destinations for pedestrians and bicyclists.

## Pick-Up / Drop-Off School Zone and Parking

The John L. Kelly Field and Playground on the western side of Brook Road requires parking for park goers, and the schools need dedicated space for parents to drop children off in the morning and pick students up in the afternoon and evenings. This plan acknowledges these needs and provides parking along the fence and a pick-up / drop-off zones for the schools. These zones will be clearly marked by signs purchased with grant awarded funds.

North of the St. Mary's School, the Town does not feel the need for on-street parking and is opting to paint wider buffers in this space.

## SHARED STREETS AND SPACES GRANT APPLICATION

## St. Mary's Street Intersection

At St. Mary's Street and Brook Road, the existing intersection will be narrowed by adjusting curb radii with paint and planting barrels to shorten the pedestrian crossing and slow turning vehicles. The paint and planters will be funded with grant funds.

## Connection to Blue Hills Avenue

To better connect the new bicycle facilities on Brook Road to the bicycle lane on Blue Hill Avenue, the road will be marked with Sharrows from Columbia Park to the intersection with Blue Hill Avenue. Continuing the bike lane is not realistic given the existing vehicle volumes and roadway width.

See Appendix for the road diet plan view and cross section diagrams.

### 2.2.1 ProjectLocation

The project extends along the Brook Road Corridor, from Thatcher Street to Central Street.

### 2.2.2 G PS C oordinates for Project Location

The northwestern terminus of the project is at the Thatcher Street - Brook Road intersection (42.262576, 71.092706). The southeastern terminus of the project is the intersection of Central Street and Brook Road (42.258299, -71.081248).

A map showing the extent of the project is included as part of the appendix.

### 2.2.3 Dedicated Bus Lane Inclusion

The Project does not include a dedicated bus lane.

### 2.3 PROJ ECTIMPLEMENTATION

The improvements will be in place for the fall while Town staff monitor the changes. After the initial period, the Town of Milton will reassess the effectiveness and consider changes or more permanent solutions for Brook Road.

Project components will comply with safety and accessibility-related regulations (ADA and MAAB). In locations where these standards are not met, a temporary variance will be required while accessibility improvements are designed for future implementation.

### 2.3.1 Required Materials

Paint for restriping the road is primary required material - with barrels and cones needed to increase visibility of the new roadway configuration. Two LED signs at either end of the corridor alerting drivers of the changes are also needed for the first few weeks of the project's implementation.

## SHARED STREETS AND SPACES GRANT APPLICATION

### 2.4 PROJ ECTBUDGET

The Project budget covers the purchase and installation of all materials. The funding request entails $\$ 57,731.32$ of equipment and materials.

| Items for Reimbursement | Cost per Unit | Units | Unit Type | Total Cost |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pavement Arrows and Legends <br> refl. White (Thermoplastic) | $\$ 14$ | 1,030 | SF | $\$ 14,420.00$ |
| 4 inch Reflectorized White Line <br> (Thermoplastic) | $\$ 0.27$ | 17,288 | FT | $\$ 4,667.76$ |
| 12 inch Reflectorized White Line <br> (Thermoplastic) | $\$ 1.65$ | 2,150 | FT | $\$ 3,547.50$ |
| 4 inch Reflectorized Yellow Line <br> (Thermoplastic) | $\$ 0.27$ | 6,170 | FT | $\$ 4,667.76$ |
| High Friction Green Surface <br> Treatment | $\$ 8.50$ | 1,080 | SF | $\$ 9,180.00$ |
| Grinding for Paint Removal | $\$ 0.75$ | 10,000 | SF | $\$ 7,500.00$ |
| Signage | $\$ 50$ | 25 | Sign | $\$ 1,250.00$ |
| Signage Installation | $\$ 250$ | 25 | Sign | $\$ 6,250.00$ |
| Planters for St. Mary's Street | $\$ 500$ | 2 | Planter | $\$ 1,000$ |
| Contingency and Construction <br> Management | $10 \%$ | - | - | $\$ 5,248.30$ |
| Total |  |  |  | $\$ 57,731.32$ |

### 2.5 PROJ ECTTIMEINE AND MILESTONES

The changes to Brook Road outlined in this application require approval through the Town Traffic Commission, although the project is strongly supported by Town administration, staff and residents. Delay due to opposition is not likely. Understanding the desire for implementation within 15-30 days after award and for the project to be completely installed by October, the Town staff is bringing the proposed plan to the Commission when submitting the application to MassDOT for review. Approval will take no longer than one week.

The Town of Milton has an existing contract with Markings Inc. They will coordinate with the provider to restripe the road within one month of award.

Following the striping, the Town will closely monitor the traffic impacts of the restriping, including analyzing crash data, monitoring queues along the North of Brook Road, collecting bicycle and vehicle counts, monitoring speed through the corridor, and general observations of the school drop-off zones when schools reopen.

The observations will inform any future design considerations.

### 2.5.1 Project's Alignment with Program Goals

The Brook Road - Road Diet aligns with the Shared Streets and Spaces Grant Program by providing safer spaces for bicyclists and pedestrians, while ensuring the roadway provides the same service for

## SHARED STREETS AND SPACES GRANT APPLICATION

transit and vehicle traffic as it does today. Dedicated space for bicyclists is provided by using the excess of vehicle space along the corridor - thereby creating safer paths for bicyclists throughout the neighborhood heading to the John L. Kelley Field and Park, Pierce Middle School, or St. Mary's School. On-street parking is preserved to provide needed parking for residents and park-goers and designated drop-off lanes at the schools provide safe arrivals and pick-ups for parents dropping off children. The additional space not needed for travel lanes, parking, drop-off, and bike lanes is converted to buffer space to slow traffic and create a pedestrian-friendly environment.

## SHARED STREETS AND SPACES GRANT APPLICATION

## STIE INFORMATION

Proof of ownership/control of the relevant municipal infrastructure is attached as an appendix.

| 1. Is this project entirely on municipally owned infrastructure? | Yes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. Indicate whether any MassDOT-owned infrastructure is integral to | Yes |
| the proposed project? |  |

## SHARED STREETS AND SPACES GRANT APPLICATION

### 3.0 EUG IBLE PROJ ECTTYPES

Project type(s) and elements included in this project proposal are highlighted below.

| PROJECT TYPE <br> (MINIMUM 1) | PROJECT ELEMENTS (MINIMUM 2) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Converted neighborhood streets for exclusive and/or shared use by <br> people walking and/or biking <br> Expanded sidewalks <br> Safety, traffic calming, and speed reduction measures <br> Modified traffic signals to support safe walking and biking <br> Shared Streets and <br> Spaces |
| Protected bike lanes, bike parking, signage, pavement markings <br> New and/or expanded infrastructure and capital start-up (non-operating) costs <br> for bicycle and scooter sharing networks <br> Accessibility upgrades to curb-ramps, crosswalks, and/or related <br> facilities <br> Contiguous walking and/or biking corridors among neighborhoods <br> and/or destinations |  |
| Outdoor Dining and <br> Commerce | Repurposed and/or expanded potions of streets, curbs, and/or sidewalks to <br> create more safe space for pedestrians, retail activity, dining, and community <br> programming <br> Repurposed parking areas (on/off street) for walking, recreation, outdoor <br> seating, retail and/or dining |
| Better Buses | Dedicated lanes <br> Transit signal priority <br> Bus stops and related facilities and infrastructure |
| Safe Routes to | Converted neighborhood streets for exclusive and/or shared use by <br> people walking and/or biking <br> Signage, crosswalks <br> Delineated areas for safe child drop-off and pick-up |
| Innovation | School |
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# Appendix C: Traffic and Signal Timing Data 

Part 1: Turning Movement Count (TMC) Data
Part 2: Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) Data
Part 3: Speed Data
Part 4: Signal Timing and Layout Information

## Part 1: Turning Movement Count (TMC) Data

## 207528 (1) Blue Hills Pkway @ Brook Rd) TMC - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
Full Length (6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
ID: 791910, Location: 42.262527, -71.093513, Site Code: 207528
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Blue Hill Parkway (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Blue Hills Parkway <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L U | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U |  | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 6:00AM | 0 | 68 | 137 | 1 | 206 | 0 | 636 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 636 | 7 | 13 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 321 | 2 | 3 | 58 | 8 | 0 | 69 | 1 | 1232 |
| 7:00AM | 0 | 161 | 282 | 1 | 444 | 1 | 614 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 614 | 10 | 40 | 372 | 0 | 0 | 412 | 4 | 6 | 111 | 10 | 0 | 127 | 9 | 1597 |
| 8:00AM | 0 | 193 | 308 | 1 | 502 | 0 | 517 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 517 | 22 | 39 | 331 | 0 | 0 | 370 | 3 | 12 | 160 | 14 | 0 | 186 | 8 | 1575 |
| 3:00PM | 0 | 582 | 526 | 2 | 1110 | 0 | 546 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 546 | 20 | 40 | 280 | 0 | 1 | 321 | 1 | 24 | 191 | 9 | 0 | 224 | 9 | 2201 |
| 4:00PM | 0 | 543 | 558 | 0 | 1101 | 0 | 565 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 565 | 12 | 39 | 282 | 0 | 0 | 321 | 0 | 21 | 164 | 9 | 0 | 194 | 5 | 2181 |
| 5:00PM | 0 | 492 | 542 | 5 | 1039 | 0 | 537 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 537 | 17 | 71 | 288 | 0 | 0 | 359 | 7 | 17 | 142 | 16 | 0 | 175 | 12 | 2110 |
| 2020-10-17 11:00AM | 0 | 211 | 350 | 1 | 562 | 0 | 416 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 416 | 13 | 48 | 196 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 10 | 9 | 134 | 7 | 0 | 150 | 6 | 1372 |
| 12:00PM | 0 | 256 | 425 | 0 | 681 | 0 | 475 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 475 | 21 | 43 | 224 | 0 | 1 | 268 | 6 | 14 | 148 | 7 | 0 | 169 | 10 | 1593 |
| 1:00PM | 0 | 297 | 505 | 0 | 802 | 0 | 525 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 526 | 7 | 32 | 278 | 0 | 0 | 310 | 5 | 14 | 128 | 11 | 0 | 153 | 6 | 1791 |
| Total | 0 | 2803 | 3633 |  | 6447 | 1 | 4831 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4832 | 129 | 365 | 2559 | 0 | 2 | 2926 | 38 | 120 | 1236 | 91 | 0 | 1447 | 66 | 15652 |
| \% Approach | 0\% | 43.5\% 5 | 56.4\% | 0.2\% | - |  | 100.0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 12.5\% | 87.5\% 0 |  | 0.1\% | - |  | 8.3\% | 85.4\% | 6.3\% 0\% |  | - |  | - |
| \% Total | 0\% | 17.9\% 2 | 23.2\% | 0.1\% 4 | 41.2\% | - | 30.9\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 3 | 30.9\% |  | 2.3\% | 16.3\% 0 |  |  | 18.7\% |  | 0.8\% | 7.9\% | 0.6\% 0\% |  | 9.2\% |  | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 18 | 11 | 0 | 29 | - | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |  | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |  | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 51 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0.4\% |  | 0.2\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 0.4\% 0 |  | 0\% | 0.3\% |  | 0.8\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.2\% |  | 0.3\% |
| Lights | 0 | 2704 | 3509 |  | 6223 | - | 4684 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4685 |  | 346 | 2478 | 0 | 2 | 2826 |  | 109 | 1183 | 88 | 0 | 1380 |  | 15114 |
| \% Lights | 0\% | 96.5\% 9 | 96.6\% | 90.9\% 9 | 96.5\% |  | 97.0\% | 100\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 9 | 97.0\% |  | 94.8\% | 96.8\% 0 | 0\% | 100\% | 96.6\% |  | 90.8\% | 95.7\% | 96.7\% 0\% | \% 9 | 95.4\% |  | 96.6\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 18 | 64 | 1 | 83 | - | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |  | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 23 |  | 2 | 26 | 2 | 0 | 30 |  | 221 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0.6\% | 1.8\% | 9.1\% | 1.3\% | - | 1.8\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.8\% |  | 1.9\% | 0.6\% 0 |  | 0\% | 0.8\% |  | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.2\% 0\% |  | 2.1\% |  | 1.4\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 8 | - | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 23 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0.2\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0.3\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | 0.1\% |  | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.3\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 18 | 43 | 0 | 61 | - | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |  | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 9 |  | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 15 |  | 122 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.6\% | 1.2\% | 0\% | 0.9\% | - | 0.8\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.8\% |  | 0.3\% | 0.3\% 0 |  | 0\% | 0.3\% |  | 1.7\% | 1.1\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 1.0\% |  | 0.8\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 42 | 1 | 0 | 43 | - | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | 10 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 56 |  | 6 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 14 |  | 121 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 1.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | - | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 2.7\% | 1.8\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 1.9\% |  | 5.0\% | 0.6\% | 1.1\% 0\% |  | 1.0\% |  | 0.8\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 111 | - | - | - | - | - | 36 | - | - | - | - | - | 55 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - |  | 86.0\% | - | - | - | - |  | 94.7\% | - | - | - | - |  | 83.3\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 18 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 11 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - 1 | 100\% | - |  | - | - | - | 14.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 5.3\% | - | - | - | - |  | 16.7\% | - |

[^17]
## 207528 (1) Blue Hills Pkway @ Brook Rd) TMC - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
AM Peak (Oct 15 2020 7:30AM - 8:30 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
ID: 791910, Location: 42.262527, -71.093513, Site Code: 207528
Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Blue Hill Parkway (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Blue Hills Parkway <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  | Brook Road <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  | T | L U | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L U | U App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 7:30AM | 0 | 54 | 83 | 0 | 137 | 0 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 0 | 10 | 107 | 0 | $0 \quad 117$ | 1 | 3 | 34 | 4 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 457 |
| 7:45AM | 0 | 46 | 73 | 0 | 119 | 1 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 15 | 104 | 0 | 0119 | 1 | 1 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 34 | 3 | 423 |
| 8:00AM | 0 | 48 | 72 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 4 | 9 | 75 | 0 | 84 | 2 | 3 | 44 | 3 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 375 |
| 8:15AM | 0 | 48 | 77 | 1 | 126 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 7 | 8 | 73 | 0 | 081 | 0 | 4 | 48 | 1 | 0 | 53 | 1 | 398 |
| Total | 0 | 196 | 305 | 1 | 502 | 1 | 572 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 572 | 11 | 42 | 359 | 0 | $0 \quad 401$ | 4 | 11 | 158 | 9 | 0 | 178 | 4 | 1653 |
| \% Approach | 0\% | 39.0\% 6 | 60.8\% 0 | 0.2\% | - |  | 100\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - |  | 10.5\% | 89.5\% 0 | \% 0\% |  |  | 6.2\% 8 | 88.8\% | 5.1\% 0 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Total | 0\% 1 | 11.9\% 1 | 18.5\% 0 | 0.1\% 3 | 30.4\% |  | 34.6\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% 34 | 34.6\% |  | 2.5\% | 21.7\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 24.3\% |  | 0.7\% | 9.6\% | 0.5\% 0 | \% 10 | 0.8\% |  |  |
| PHF | - | 0.923 | 0.9190 | 0.250 | 0.922 | - | 0.880 | - | - - | 0 | 0.880 |  | 0.650 | 0.827 | - | 0.826 | - | 0.625 | 0.823 | 0.667 | 0 | 0.830 | - | 0.903 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.2\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% 0 | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 0.3\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 0 | 185 | 288 | 1 | 474 |  | 545 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 545 |  | 38 | 347 | 0 | $0 \quad 385$ | - | 9 | 152 | 8 | 0 | 169 |  | 1573 |
| \% Lights | 0\% 9 | 94.4\% 9 | 94.4\% 1 | 100\% 9 | 94.4\% |  | 95.3\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% 95 | 55.3\% |  | 90.5\% | 96.7\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% 96.0\% |  | 81.8\% 9 | 96.2\% | 88.9\% 0 | \% 9 | 94.9\% |  | 95.2\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 9 |  | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | - | 1 | 3 | 0 | $0 \quad 4$ | - | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 35 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.0\% | 2.3\% | 0\% | 1.8\% |  | 3.3\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | 3.3\% |  | 2.4\% | 0.8\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% 1.0\% |  | 0\% | 1.9\% | 0\% 0 | \% | 1.7\% | - | 2.1\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% 0\% | - | 0\% | 1.3\% | 0\% 0 | \% | 1.1\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Buses | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 13 |  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 23 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 2.0\% | 3.0\% | 0\% | 2.6\% | - | 0.9\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% 0 | 0.9\% | - | 0\% | 0.8\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% 0.7\% | - | 9.1\% | 0.6\% | 0\% 0 | \% | 1.1\% | - | 1.4\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 3 | 5 | 0 | $0 \quad 8$ | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | - | 16 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 2.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | - | 0.3\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% |  | 7.1\% | 1.4\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% 2.0\% |  | 9.1\% | 0\% | 11.1\% 0 |  | 1.1\% |  | 1.0\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | - | - | - | - - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 5.0\% |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 5.0\% | - |

[^18]
## 207528 (1) Blue Hills Pkway @ Brook Rd) TMC - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
PM Peak (Oct 152020 3:15PM - 4:15 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data
Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
ID: 791910, Location: 42.262527, -71.093513, Site Code: 207528
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Blue Hill Parkway (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Blue Hills Parkway Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | U | App |  |  | T | L U | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 3:15PM | 0 | 151 | 122 | 1 | 274 | 0 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 | 5 | 10 | 72 | 0 | 1 | 83 | 0 | 4 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 1 | 550 |
| 3:30PM | 0 | 138 | 133 | 1 | 272 | 0 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 | 1 | 8 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 1 | 4 | 46 | 2 | 0 | 52 | 2 | 537 |
| 3:45PM | 0 | 155 | 146 | 0 | 301 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 8 | 8 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 10 | 55 | 6 | 0 | 71 | 3 | 576 |
| 4:00PM | 0 | 140 | 128 | 0 | 268 | 0 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 2 | 13 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 11 | 50 | 2 | 0 | 63 | 4 | 540 |
| Total | 0 | 584 | 529 | 2 | 1115 | 0 | 532 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 532 | 16 | 39 | 278 | 0 | 1 | 318 | 1 | 29 | 199 | 10 | 0 | 238 | 10 | 2203 |
| \% Approach | 0\% | 52.4\% | 47.4\% | 0.2\% | - | - | 100\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 12.3\% | 87.4\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% | - |  | 12.2\% 8 | 83.6\% | 4.2\% 0\% |  | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 0\% | 26.5\% | 24.0\% | 0.1\% 5 | 50.6\% |  | 24.1\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 2 | 24.1\% |  | 1.8\% | 12.6\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 14.4\% |  | 1.3\% | 9.0\% | 0.5\% 0 | \% 1 | 10.8\% |  |  |
| PHF |  | 0.935 | 0.9060 | 0.500 | 0.923 |  | 0.948 | - | - | 0 | 0.948 |  | 0.731 | 0.965 |  | 0.250 | 0.954 |  | 0.675 | 0.905 | 0.417 | - 0 | 0.831 |  | 0.953 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 12 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0.6\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% |  | 0\% | 1.1\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.9\% |  | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.4\% | - | 0.5\% |
| Lights | 0 | 570 | 503 | 2 | 1075 |  | 508 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 508 |  | 37 | 269 | 0 | 1 | 307 |  | 26 | 186 | 9 | 0 | 221 |  | 2111 |
| \% Lights | 0\% | 97.6\% | 95.1\% 1 | 100\% | 96.4\% |  | 95.5\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 95 | 95.5\% |  | 94.9\% | 96.8\% 0\% | \% | 100\% 9 | 96.5\% |  | 89.7\% 9 | 93.5\% | 90.0\% 0\% | \% 9 | 92.9\% |  | 95.8\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 22 |  | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 10 | - | 46 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0.7\% | 3.4\% | 0\% | 2.0\% | - | 2.3\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 2.3\% |  | 2.6\% | 0.4\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.6\% |  | 3.4\% | 4.0\% | 10.0\% 0\% | \% | 4.2\% | - | 2.1\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 5 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.4\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% 0 | \% | 0.4\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Buses | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 |  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 17 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0.6\% | - | 1.1\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.1\% |  | 0\% | 0.4\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.3\% |  | 0\% | 1.5\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.3\% | - | 0.8\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 1 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 12 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% |  | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 2.6\% | 1.4\% 0 |  | 0\% | 1.6\% |  | 6.9\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.8\% |  | 0.5\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - |  | 62.5\% | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 40.0\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - |  | 37.5\% | , | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - |  | 60.0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 11:45AM - 12:45 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI)

46 Morton Street,
ID: 791910, Location: 42.262527, -71.093513, Site Code: 207528
46 Morton Street,

| Leg <br> Direction | Blue Hill Parkway (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Blue Hills Parkway Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U | App |  |  |  |  | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-17 11:45AM | 0 | 58 | 970 | 155 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 2 | 13 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 6 | 2 | 37 | 1 | 0 | 40 | 1 | 371 |
| 12:00PM | 0 | 62 | 1010 | 163 | 0 | 132 |  | 0 | 0 | 132 | 8 | 19 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 3 | 5 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 42 | 4 | 410 |
| 12:15PM | 0 | 56 | 1200 | 176 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 6 | 8 | 47 | 0 | 1 | 56 | 0 | 5 | 46 | 1 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 400 |
| 12:30PM | 0 | 79 | 1050 | 184 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 3 | 6 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 2 | 1 | 34 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 4 | 423 |
| Total | 0 | 255 | 4230 | 678 | 0 | 485 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 485 | 19 | 46 | 222 | 0 | 1 | 269 | 11 | 13 | 153 | 6 | 0 | 172 | 9 | 1604 |
| \% Approach | 0\% | 37.6\% 6 | 62.4\% 0\% | - | - | 100\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - |  | 17.1\% 8 | 82.5\% 0\% | \% 0 | 0.4\% | - |  | 7.6\% | 89.0\% | 3.5\% 0\% |  |  |  |  |
| \% Total | 0\% | 15.9\% 2 | 26.4\% 0\% 4 | 42.3\% |  | 30.2\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% 30 | 30.2\% |  | 2.9\% 1 | 13.8\% 0\% | \% 0 | 0.1\% 1 | 16.8\% |  | 0.8\% | 9.5\% | 0.4\% 0\% | \% 1 | 0.7\% |  |  |
| PHF |  | 0.826 | 0.881-0. | 0.931 | - | 0.924 | - | - - | 0 | 0.924 |  | 0.605 | 0.855 | -0 | . 250 | 0.924 |  | 0.550 | 0.8320 | . 500 | - 0 | 0.850 |  | 0.951 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 1 | 10 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0.2\% 0\% | 0.3\% |  | 0\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.5\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 0 | 249 | 4210 | 670 | - | 477 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 477 |  | 46 | 217 | 0 | 1 | 264 |  | 11 | 152 | 6 | 0 | 169 |  | 1580 |
| \% Lights | 0\% | 97.6\% 9 | 99.5\% 0\% 9 | 98.8\% |  | 98.4\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% 98 | 38.4\% |  | 100\% 9 | 97.7\% 0\% | \% 1 | 00\% 9 | 98.1\% |  | 84.6\% | 99.3\% | 00\% 0\% | \% 9 | 38.3\% |  | 98.5\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 1 | $0 \quad 0$ | 1 |  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 7 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.1\% |  | 1.0\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | 1.0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% |  | 0.4\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% 0\% | 0.1\% |  | 0.2\% 0 | \%\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.2\% 0 | \%\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 0.5\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 4 | $0 \quad 0$ | 4 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 10 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 1.6\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.6\% | - | 0.2\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 1.4\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 1.1\% |  | 15.4\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 1.2\% |  | 0.6\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 15 | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | - | - | - | - | - | 7 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 78.9\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | 77.8\% |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - - | - |  | - | - | - | - |  | 21.1\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - |  | 22.2\% |  |

[^19]PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI)

46 Morton Street,
ID: 791910, Location: 42.262527, -71.093513, Site Code: 207528
46 Morton Street,

| Leg <br> Direction | Blue Hill Parkway (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Blue Hills Parkway Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U |  | App |  | R | T |  | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L U |  | App | Ped* | R | T | L U | U |  | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-17 1:00PM | 0 | 85 | 122 | 0 | 207 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 11 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 3 | 0 | 40 | 3 | 447 |
| 1:15PM | 0 | 66 | 121 | 0 | 187 | 0 | 127 | 0 |  | 0 | 127 | 3 | 5 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 1 | 0 | 39 | 7 | 0 | 46 | 1 | 424 |
| 1:30PM | 0 | 69 | 134 | 0 | 203 | 0 | 144 | 0 |  | 0 | 144 | 4 | 10 | 77 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 3 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 1 | 465 |
| 1:45PM | 0 | 77 | 128 | 0 | 205 | 0 | 134 | 1 |  | 0 | 135 | 0 | 6 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 2 | 4 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 36 | 1 | 455 |
| Total | 0 | 297 | 505 | 0 | 802 | 0 | 525 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 526 | 7 | 32 | 278 | 0 | 0 | 310 | 5 | 14 | 128 | 11 | 0 | 153 | 6 | 1791 |
| \% Approach | 0\% | 37.0\% 6 | 63.0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 99.8\% 0 | 0.2\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 10.3\% 8 | 89.7\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  |  |  | 9.2\% | 83.7\% | 7.2\% 0\% |  |  |  |  |
| \% Total | 0\% 1 | 16.6\% 2 | 28.2\% 0\% | \% 4 | 44.8\% |  | 29.3\% 0 | 0.1\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 2 | 9.4\% |  | 1.8\% 1 | 15.5\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 17 | 7.3\% |  | 0.8\% | 7.1\% | 0.6\% 0\% | \% | 8.5\% |  |  |
| PHF | - | 0.875 | 0.942 | - 0 | 0.970 |  | 0.9110 | 0.250 | - | - 0 | 0.913 |  | 0.705 | 0.925 | - | - 0 | 0.907 |  | 0.500 | 0.816 | 0.393 | - | 0.828 |  | 0.965 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% 0\% | \% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.4\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 0 | 294 | 496 | 0 | 790 | - | 519 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 520 |  | 29 | 267 | 0 | 0 | 296 |  | 14 | 121 | 10 | 0 | 145 |  | 1751 |
| \% Lights | 0\% 9 | 99.0\% 9 | 98.2\% 0\% | \% 9 | 98.5\% |  | 98.9\% 1 | 100\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 9 | 88.9\% |  | 90.6\% 9 | 96.0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 95 | 55.5\% |  | 100\% 9 | 94.5\% | 90.9\% 0\% | \% 9 | 4.8\% |  | 97.8\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | - | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |  | 19 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 1.4\% 0\% | \% | 0.9\% | - | 1.1\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.1\% |  | 6.3\% | 0.4\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% | 1.0\% |  | 0\% | 1.6\% | 9.1\% 0\% | \% | 2.0\% |  | 1.1\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.4\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% |  | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.7\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% 0\% | \% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 9 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 16 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 1.0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.4\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 3.1\% | 2.9\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% | 2.9\% |  | 0\% | 3.1\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 2.6\% |  | 0.9\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 85.7\% | - | - | - | - |  | 60.0\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - |  | 14.3\% | - | - | - | - |  | 40.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  |
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## 207528 (2) Brook Rd @ Thatcher St - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
Full Length (6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
ID: 791912, Location: 42.262579, -71.092657, Site Code: S20-003

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street, Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Thatcher Street Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Driveway <br> Northeastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | T | BL | L | U | App | Ped* | R | L | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | BR | HL U | U | App | Ped* | HR | R | T | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-15 6:00AM | 583 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 588 | 0 | 7 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 31 | 177 | 1 | 209 | 4 | 852 |
| 7:00AM | 576 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 594 | 0 | 5 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 60 | 374 | 1 | 436 | 0 | 1073 |
| 8:00AM | 490 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 511 | 0 | 4 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 61 | 444 | 1 | 507 | 1 | 1063 |
| 3:00PM | 495 | 2 | 28 | 0 | 525 | 1 | 10 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 156 | 588 | 2 | 748 | 3 | 1344 |
| 4:00PM | 504 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 527 | 0 | 7 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 16 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 4 | 121 | 644 | 1 | 770 | 3 | 1362 |
| 5:00PM | 486 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 508 | 0 | 11 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 4 | 143 | 604 | 6 | 757 | 3 | 1335 |
| 2020-10-17 11:00AM | 366 | 2 | 13 | 1 | 382 | 0 | 6 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 87 | 426 | 2 | 519 | 1 | 956 |
| 12:00PM | 413 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 434 | 0 | 11 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 109 | 511 | 0 | 622 | 0 | 1121 |
| 1:00PM | 442 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 463 | 0 | 4 | 54 | 1 | 0 | 59 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 118 | 505 | 3 | 629 | 1 | 1156 |
| Total | 4355 | 9 | 166 | 2 | 4532 | 1 | 65 | 439 | 1 | 0 | 505 | 52 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 28 | 78 | 21 | 886 | 4273 | 17 | 5197 | 16 | 10262 |
| \% Approach | 96.1\% | 0.2\% | 3.7\% | 0\% | - | - | 12.9\% | 86.9\% | 0.2\% 0 | \% | - | - | 35.7\% 32 | 32.1\% | 32.1\% 0\% |  | - | - | 0.4\% 1 | 17.0\% | 82.2\% | 0.3\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 42.4\% | 0.1\% | 1.6\% | 0\% | .2\% | - | 0.6\% | 4.3\% | 0\% |  | 4.9\% | - | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% 0\% |  | 0.3\% | - | 0.2\% | 8.6\% | 1.6\% | 0.2\% | 0.6\% | - | - |
| Motorcycles | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | - | 25 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 4218 | 9 | 162 | 2 | 4391 | - | 62 | 429 | 1 | 0 | 492 | - | 10 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 27 |  | 20 | 875 | 4085 | 17 | 4997 | - | 9907 |
| \% Lights | 96.9\% | 100\% | 97.6\% | \% | 96.9\% | - | 95.4\% | 7.7\% | 100\% | \% 9 | 97.4\% | - | 100\% 88 | 88.9\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 96.4\% | - | 95.2\% | 98.8\% 9 | 95.6\% | 100\% | 6.2\% | - | 96.5\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 80 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 82 | - | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 7 | 85 | 0 | 93 | - | 179 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 1.8\% | 0\% | 1.2\% | 0\% | 1.8\% | - | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.6\% | - | 0\% 1 | 11.1\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 3.6\% | - | 4.8\% | 0.8\% | 2.0\% | 0\% | 1.8\% | - | 1.7\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 13 | - | 20 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.6\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Buses | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 58 | - | 94 |
| \% Buses | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | - | 1.5\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.4\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1.4\% | 0\% | 1.1\% | - | 0.9\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | - | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 23 | - | 37 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.2\% | 0\% | 1.2\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 3.1\% | 0.5\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.8\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0.4\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 50 | - | - | - | - | - | 75 | - | - | - | - | - | 15 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 96.2\% | - | - | - | - | - | 96.2\% | - | - | - | - | - | 93.8\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 3.8\% | - | - | - | - | - | 3.8\% | - | - | - | - | - | 6.3\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

## 207528 (2) Brook Rd @ Thatcher St - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
AM Peak (Oct 152020 7:30AM - 8:30 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
ID: 791912, Location: 42.262579, -71.092657, Site Code: S20-003
Provided by: Precision Data
Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,

| Leg <br> Direction | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Thatcher Street Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Driveway <br> Northeastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | T | BL | L U | U | App |  | R |  | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | BR | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | R | T | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 7:30AM | 159 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 167 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 109 | 0 | 128 | 0 | 302 |
| 7:45AM | 136 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - 1 | 15 | 104 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 270 |
| 8:00AM | 116 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 10 | 113 | 0 | 124 | 1 | 252 |
| 8:15AM | 137 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 120 | 1 | 134 | 0 | 289 |
| Total | 548 | 2 | 19 | 0 | 569 | 0 | 4 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 57 | 446 | 1 | 506 | 1 | 1113 |
| \% Approach | 96.3\% | 0.4\% | 3.3\% 0\% |  | - |  | 11.1\% | 88.9\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  |  | 50.0\% | 50.0\% 0 |  | - |  | 0.4\% | 11.3\% 8 | 88.1\% | 0.2\% |  |  |  |
| \% Total | 49.2\% | 0.2\% | 1.7\% 0\% | \% 51 | 51.1\% |  | 0.4\% | 2.9\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 3.2\% |  | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% 0 | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0.2\% | 5.1\% | 40.1\% | 0.1\% | 45.5\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.8600 | 0.5000 | 0.679 |  | 0.850 |  | 0.333 | 0.705 | - | - | 0.795 | - | - | 0.250 | 0.250 |  | 0.250 |  | 0.500 | 0.750 | 0.9260 | 0.250 | 0.942 |  | 0.916 |
| Motorcycles | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0.2\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 524 | 2 | $19 \quad 0$ | 0 | 545 |  | 4 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 34 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 2 | 57 | 417 | 1 | 477 |  | 1058 |
| \% Lights | 95.6\% 1 | 100\% 1 | 100\% 0\% | \% 95 | 35.8\% |  | 100\% | 93.8\% 0 | 0\% 0 | \% 9 | 94.4\% |  | 0\% | 100\% | 100\% 0 | \% 1 | 100\% | - | 100\% | 100\% | 93.5\% 1 | 100\% | 94.3\% |  | 95.1\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 18 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 18 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 |  | 29 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 3.3\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 3.2\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 2.5\% | 0\% | 2.2\% |  | 2.6\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 2 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0.4\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Buses | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 |  | 15 |
| \% Buses | 0.7\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.7\% | - | 0\% | 3.1\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 2.8\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 2.2\% | 0\% | 2.0\% |  | 1.3\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 1 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |  | 7 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 3.1\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 2.8\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1.1\% | 0\% | 1.0\% |  | 0.6\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

## 207528 (2) Brook Rd @ Thatcher St - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
PM Peak (Oct 152020 4:45PM - 5:45 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
ID: 791912, Location: 42.262579, -71.092657, Site Code: S20-003 MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Brook Road (Route 28) <br> Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Thatcher Street Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Driveway <br> Northeastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | T | BL | L U | U | App |  | R |  | HL U |  | App | Ped* | HR BR |  | HL U | U | App | Ped* | HR | R | T | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 4:45PM | 116 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 |  | 9 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 44 | 179 | 1 | 225 | 0 | 358 |
| 5:00PM | 139 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 31 | 161 | 3 | 197 | 1 | 361 |
| 5:15PM | 109 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 113 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 35 | 170 | 3 | 209 | 0 | 343 |
| 5:30PM | 129 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 135 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 42 | 139 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 336 |
| Total | 493 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 519 | 0 | 12 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 21 | 5 | 152 | 649 | 7 | 813 | 1 | 1398 |
| \% Approach | 95.0\% | 0.4\% | 4.6\% 0\% |  | - |  | 20.0\% 8 | 80.0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 83.3\% 0\% | \% 16 | 16.7\% 0\% |  | - | - | 0.6\% 1 | 18.7\% 7 | 79.8\% | 0.9\% |  |  |  |
| \% Total | 35.3\% | 0.1\% 1 | 1.7\% 0\% | \% 3 | 37.1\% |  | 0.9\% | 3.4\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 4.3\% |  | 0.4\% 0\% |  | 0.1\% 0\% | \% | 0.4\% | - | 0.4\% 1 | 10.9\% 4 | 46.4\% | 0.5\% 5 | 58.2\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.8830 | 0.5000 | 0.600 | 0 | 0.867 |  | 0.500 | 0.750 | - | - 0 | 0.789 | - | 0.625 | 0 | 0.250 |  | 0.750 | - | 0.625 | 0.864 | 0.9040 | 0.583 | 0.902 | - | 0.963 |
| Motorcycles | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 6 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.8\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0.2\% |  | 0.4\% |
| Lights | 477 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 503 |  | 12 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 60 |  | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | - | 5 | 151 | 626 | 7 | 789 |  | 1358 |
| \% Lights | 96.8\% | 100\% 1 | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 96.9\% |  | 100\% | 100\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 1 | 100\% |  | 100\% 0\% |  | 100\% 0\% | \% 1 | 100\% |  | 100\% 9 | 99.3\% 9 | 96.5\% 1 | 100\% 9 | 97.0\% |  | 97.1\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 |  | 13 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 1.4\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.3\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0.7\% |  | 0.9\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0.1\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 |  | 13 |
| \% Buses | 0.6\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1.5\% | 0\% | 1.2\% |  | 0.9\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |  | 7 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.4\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0.6\% | - | 0.5\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 16 | - | - | - | - | - | 21 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |  | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |
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## 207528 (2) Brook Rd @ Thatcher St - TMC

Sat Oct 17, 2020
Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 11:45AM - 12:45 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI)

46 Morton Street,
ID: 791912, Location: 42.262579, -71.092657, Site Code: S20-003
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

## 207528 (2) Brook Rd @ Thatcher St - TMC

Sat Oct 17, 2020
PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
ID: 791912, Location: 42.262579, -71.092657, Site Code: S20-003 Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Thatcher Street Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Driveway Northeastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | T | BL | L U | U | App |  | R | L | HL U | U | App | Ped* | HR | BR | HL U | U |  | Ped* | HR | R | T | U |  | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-17 1:00PM | 101 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 124 | 0 | 156 | 0 | 275 |
| 1:15PM | 111 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 35 | 120 | 0 | 156 | 0 | 287 |
| 1:30PM | 123 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 25 | 130 | 2 | 158 | 0 | 301 |
| 1:45PM | 107 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 27 | 131 | 1 | 159 | 1 | 293 |
| Total | 442 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 463 | 0 | 4 | 54 | 1 | 0 | 59 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 118 | 505 | 3 | 629 | 1 | 1156 |
| \% Approach | 95.5\% | 0.2\% | 4.3\% 0\% |  | - |  | 6.8\% | 91.5\% | 1.7\% 0\% |  | - |  | 20.0\% | 60.0\% | 20.0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0.5\% | 18.8\% 8 | 80.3\% | 0.5\% |  |  |  |
| \% Total | 38.2\% | 0.1\% | 1.7\% 0\% | \% 40 | 0.1\% |  | 0.3\% | 4.7\% | 0.1\% 0\% |  | 5.1\% |  | 0.1\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% 0\% | \% 0 | 0.4\% |  | 0.3\% | 10.2\% | 43.7\% | 0.3\% 5 | 5.4\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.8980 | 0.2500 | 0.714 |  | 0.919 |  | 0.500 | 0.794 | 0.250 | - | 0.738 | - | 0.250 | 0.750 | 0.250 |  | 0.625 |  | 0.750 | 0.843 | 0.969 | . 375 | 0.994 |  | 0.959 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 1.9\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 1.7\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0.2\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 437 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 458 | - | 4 | 53 | 1 | 0 | 58 |  | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 |  | 3 | 116 | 489 | 3 | 611 |  | 1132 |
| \% Lights | 98.9\% | 100\% 1 | 100\% 0\% | \% 98 | 8.9\% | - | 100\% 9 | 98.1\% | 100\% 0\% | \% | 98.3\% | - | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 1 | 100\% |  | 100\% | 98.3\% 9 | 96.8\% | 00\% | 97.1\% |  | 97.9\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 |  | 13 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 1.1\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 1.7\% | 1.2\% | 0\% | 1.3\% |  | 1.1\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0.2\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |  | 3 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% | 0.5\% |  | 0.3\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |  | 5 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1.0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% |  | 0.4\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  |

${ }^{*}$ Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

Thu Oct 15, 2020
Full Length (6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
All Movements
46 Morton Street,
ID: 792078, Location: 42.262544, -71.08996, Site Code: S20-003
46 Morton Street,

| Leg <br> Direction | Driveway Southbound |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | St Marys Road Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R T | L U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T |  | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 6:00AM | 0 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 580 | - 9 | 0 | 589 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 176 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 781 |
| 7:00AM | 0 0 | 20 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 583 | 34 | 0 | 617 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 14 | 367 | 0 | 0 | 381 | 3 | 1018 |
| 8:00AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 499 | 42 | 0 | 541 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 8 | 10 | 464 | 0 | 0 | 474 | 3 | 1043 |
| 3:00PM | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 510 | 45 | 0 | 555 | 8 | 16 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 21 | 576 | 0 | 0 | 597 | 3 | 1180 |
| 4:00PM | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 523 | 14 | 1 | 539 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 29 | 7 | 12 | 652 | 0 | 0 | 664 | 6 | 1232 |
| 5:00PM | 10 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 499 | 41 | 0 | 542 | 2 | 9 | 0 |  | 0 | 18 | 8 | 17 | 589 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 1167 |
| 2020-10-17 11:00AM | 0 | 20 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 376 | 17 | 1 | 394 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 16 | 4 | 17 | 428 | 0 | 0 | 445 | 2 | 857 |
| 12:00PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 418 | 19 | 1 | 438 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 13 | 502 | 0 | 0 | 515 | 2 | 967 |
| 1:00PM | 0 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 8 | 1 | 435 | 21 | 0 | 457 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 3 | 15 | 499 | 0 | 0 | 514 | 6 | 988 |
| Total | 10 | 40 | 5 | 63 | 4 | 4423 | 242 | 3 | 4672 | 24 | 114 | 1 | 63 | 0 | 178 | 35 | 125 | 4253 | 0 | 0 | 4378 | 29 | 9233 |
| \% Approach | 20.0\% 0\% 8 | 80.0\% 0\% | - |  | 0.1\% 9 | 94.7\% | 5.2\% | 0.1\% | - |  | 64.0\% | 0.6\% | 35.4\% 0\% |  | - |  | 2.9\% | 97.1\% 0 | 0\% 0 |  | - |  |  |
| \% Total | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.1\% |  | 0\% | 47.9\% | 2.6\% | 0\% | 50.6\% |  | 1.2\% | 0\% | 0.7\% 0\% |  | 1.9\% |  | 1.4\% | 46.1\% 0 | 0\% 0 | \% | 47.4\% |  |  |
| Motorcycles | $0 \quad 0$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 |  | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 9 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 |  | 20 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0 | \% | 0.3\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 10 | 40 | 5 |  | 4 | 4272 | 235 | 3 | 4514 |  | 110 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 172 |  | 123 | 4067 | 0 | 0 | 4190 |  | 8881 |
| \% Lights | 100\% 0\% | 100\% 0\% | 100\% |  | 100\% 9 | 96.6\% | 97.1\% | 100\% | 96.6\% |  | 96.5\% | 0\% | 98.4\% 0\% | \% 9 | 96.6\% |  | 98.4\% | 95.6\% 0 | 0\% 0 | \% | 95.7\% |  | 96.2\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | $0 \quad 0$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 89 | 4 | 40 | 93 | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 90 |  | 185 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 2.0\% | 1.7\% | 0\% | 2.0\% |  | 0.9\% | 0\% | 1.6\% 0\% | \% | 1.1\% |  | 0\% | 2.1\% | 0\% 0 |  | 2.1\% | - | 2.0\% |
| Articulated Trucks | $0 \quad 0$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 7 | 71 | 0 | 8 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 |  | 17 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% 0 | 0\% 0 |  | 0.2\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Buses | $0 \quad 0$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 |  | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 57 |  | 94 |
| \% Buses | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% |  | 0.9\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% |  | 0\% | 1.3\% 0 | 0\% 0 |  | 1.3\% | - | 1.0\% |
| Bicycles on Road | $0 \quad 0$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 10 | 2 | 20 | 12 | - | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 2 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 21 |  | 36 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 1.8\% | 100\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.7\% |  | 1.6\% | 0.4\% 0 | 0\% 0 |  | 0.5\% | - | 0.4\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - - | - | 54 | - |  | - - | - - | - | 21 | - | - | - | - | - | 31 | - | - | - | - | - | 27 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - - | - | - | 85.7\% | - |  | - - | - - |  | 87.5\% | - | - | - | - |  | 88.6\% | - | - | - | - |  | 93.1\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - - | - - | - |  | - |  | - - | - - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - - | - - | - | 14.3\% | - |  | - - | - - | - | 12.5\% | - | - |  | - | - | 11.4\% | - | - | - | - | - | 6.9\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

Thu Oct 15, 2020
AM Peak (Oct 152020 7:30AM - 8:30 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data
Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
MA, MA, 01702, US
ID: 792078, Location: 42.262544, -71.08996, Site Code: S20-003

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

PM Peak (Oct 152020 4:15PM - 5:15 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data
Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
MA, MA, 01702, US
ID: 792078, Location: 42.262544, -71.08996, Site Code: S20-003

| Leg <br> Direction | Driveway Southbound |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  | St Marys Road Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R $\quad$ T $\quad$ L U A | App Ped* | R | T | L U | App |  |  | T | L U | U |  | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-15 4:15PM | $\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $0 \quad 1$ | 0 | 141 | 50 | 146 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 1 | 315 |
| 4:30PM | $0 \begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $0 \quad 2$ | 0 | 140 | 20 | 142 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 5 | 293 |
| 4:45PM | $0 \begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | 0 | 1 | 123 | 20 | 126 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 184 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 0 | 319 |
| 5:00PM | 0 0 0000 | 0 | 1 | 147 | 80 | 156 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 0 | 322 |
| Total | $\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | $0 \quad 5$ | 2 | 551 | 170 | 570 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 25 | 7 | 13 | 641 | 0 | 0 | 654 | 6 | 1249 |
| \% Approach | 0\% 0\% 0\% 0\% | - - | 0.4\% 9 | 96.7\% | 3.0\% 0\% | - |  | 40.0\% 0\% | 0\% | 60.0\% 0\% |  |  |  | 2.0\% | 98.0\% 0 | \% 0\% |  |  |  | - |
| \% Total | 0\% 0\% 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% 4 | 44.1\% | 1.4\% 0\% | 45.6\% |  | 0.8\% 0\% |  | 1.2\% 0\% | \% 2 | 2.0\% |  | 1.0\% | 51.3\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% 5 | 52.4\% |  |  |
| PHF | - - - - | - - | 0.500 | 0.938 | 0.571 | 0.919 |  | 0.833 | - | 0.750 |  | 0.893 |  | 0.650 | 0.874 | - | - | 0.878 |  | 0.972 |
| Motorcycles | $\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 3 | $0 \quad 0$ | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 6 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% 0\% 0\% 0\% | - - | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.5\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.5\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% | 0.5\% | - | 0.5\% |
| Lights | 0 | 0 | 2 | 532 | 160 | 550 |  | 10 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 25 |  | 13 | 615 | 0 | 0 | 628 |  | 1203 |
| \% Lights | 0\% 0\% 0\% 0\% | - - | 100\% 9 | 96.6\% 9 | 94.1\% 0\% 9 | 96.5\% |  | 100\% 0\% | 0\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 1 | 100\% | - | 100\% | 95.9\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% | 96.0\% |  | 96.3\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | $0 \quad 0$ | 7 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |  | 15 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% 0\% 0\% 0\% | - - | 0\% | 1.3\% | 0\% 0\% | 1.2\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 1.2\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.2\% | - | 1.2\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | $0 \quad 0$ | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% 0\% 0\% 0\% | - - | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Buses | $\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ | 0 | 0 | 4 | $0 \quad 0$ | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | - | 17 |
| \% Buses | 0\% 0\% 0\% 0\% | - - | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.7\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 2.0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 2.0\% | - | 1.4\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 5 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% 0\% 0\% 0\% | - - | 0\% | 0.5\% | 5.9\% 0\% | 0.7\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.2\% |  | 0.4\% |
| Pedestrians | - - - - | - 4 | - | - | - - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | - | - | - | - | 5 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - - - - | -80.0\% | - | - | - - | - | - | - | - | - | $-$ |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | 83.3\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - - | 1 | - | - | - - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - - - - | - 20.0\% | - | - | - - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 16.7\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

## 207528 (3) Brook Road (Route 28) @ St Mary Rd - TMC

Sat Oct 17, 2020
Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 11:45AM - 12:45 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street, Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Driveway Southbound |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | St Marys Road Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R T | L U | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  | T | L U | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-17 11:45AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 5 | 0 | 98 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 123 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 230 |
| 12:00PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 102 | 4 | 1 | 107 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 240 |
| 12:15PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 114 | 6 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 137 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 266 |
| 12:30PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 113 | 4 | 0 | 117 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 117 |  | 0 | 118 | 0 | 239 |
| Total | $0 \quad 0$ | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 422 | 19 | 1 | 442 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 15 | 6 | 14 | 502 | 0 | 0 | 516 | 2 | 975 |
| \% Approach | 0\% 0\% | 100\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 95.5\% | 4.3\% | 0.2\% | - |  | 60.0\% 0\% | \% 4 | 40.0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 2.7\% | 97.3\% 0 | \% 0\% |  | - |  |  |
| \% Total | 0\% 0\% | 0.2\% 0\% | \% 0 | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 43.3\% | 1.9\% | 0.1\% 4 | 45.3\% |  | 0.9\% 0\% |  | 0.6\% 0\% | \% 1 | 1.5\% |  | 1.4\% 5 | 51.5\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 5 | 52.9\% |  |  |
| PHF | - | 0.250 |  | . 250 |  | - | 0.925 | 0.7920 | $0.250 \quad 0$ | 0.921 |  | 0.750 | - 0 | 0.500 |  | 0.938 |  | 0.750 | 0.916 | - | 0 | 0.918 | - | 0.921 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 415 | 19 | 1 | 435 | - | 9 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 15 |  | 12 | 499 | 0 | 0 | 511 |  | 963 |
| \% Lights | 0\% 0\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 10 | 00\% |  | 0\% 9 | 98.3\% 1 | 100\% | 100\% 9 | 98.4\% | - | 100\% 0\% | \% | 100\% 0\% | \% 10 | 100\% |  | 85.7\% | 99.4\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% 9 | 99.0\% |  | 98.8\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 7 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 1.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.1\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.4\% | - | 0.7\% |
| Articulated Trucks | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Buses | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| \% Buses | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Bicycles on Road | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 2 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 14.3\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.4\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 80.0\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - | -1 | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - - | - | - |  | 20.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data
Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US


[^22]207528 (4) Brook Road (Route 28) @ Standish ... - TMC
Thu Oct 15, 2020
Full Length (6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
ID: 791918, Location: 42.260055, -71.085545, Site Code: S20-003
Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

Thu Oct 15, 2020
AM Peak (Oct 152020 7:30AM - 8:30 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI)

46 Morton Street,
ID: 791918, Location: 42.260055, -71.085545, Site Code: S20-003

| Leg <br> Direction | Standish Road Southbound |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Kelly Field Access <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R T | L U | App |  | R | T |  |  | App | Ped* | R | T |  | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L U | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 7:30AM | 30 | $0 \quad 0$ | 3 | 0 | 4 | 166 |  | 0 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 2 | 0 | 106 | 3 | 279 |
| 7:45AM | 10 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 97 | 2 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 251 |
| 8:00AM | 0 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 110 | 3 | 0 | 115 | 1 | 230 |
| 8:15AM | 10 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 174 |  | 0 | 177 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 120 | 1 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 304 |
| Total | 50 | 30 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 596 |  | 0 | 609 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 431 | 8 | 0 | 443 | 4 | 1064 |
| \% Approach | 62.5\% 0\% | 37.5\% 0\% | - |  | 2.1\% | 97.9\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 50.0\% 50 | 50.0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  |  |  | 0.9\% | 97.3\% | 1.8\% 0\% |  | - | - |  |
| \% Total | 0.5\% 0\% | 0.3\% 0\% | 0.8\% |  | 1.2\% | 56.0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 5 | 57.2\% |  | 0.2\% | 0.2\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.4\% |  | 0.4\% | 40.5\% | 0.8\% 0\% | \% 4 | 41.6\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.417 - | $0.750-0$ | 0.667 |  | 0.813 | 0.853 |  | - 0 | 0.857 |  | 0.500 | - | - | 0 | 0.500 |  | 0.500 | 0.895 | 0.875 | - 0 | 0.903 |  | 0.875 |
| Motorcycles | $0 \quad 0$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 50 | 30 | 8 |  | 11 | 565 |  | 0 | 576 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 399 | 7 | 0 | 409 |  | 994 |
| \% Lights | 100\% 0\% | 100\% 0\% 1 | 100\% | - | 84.6\% | 94.8\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 9 | 94.6\% |  | 50.0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0 | \% 2 | 25.0\% |  | 75.0\% | 92.6\% 8 | 87.5\% 0\% | \% 9 | 92.3\% |  | 93.4\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | $0 \quad 0$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 22 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 13 |  | 35 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% |  | 15.4\% | 3.4\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 3.6\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 25.0\% | 2.8\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 2.9\% |  | 3.3\% |
| Articulated Trucks | $0 \quad 0$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 7 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.7\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.7\% |  | 50.0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 2 | 25.0\% |  | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.5\% | - | 0.7\% |
| Buses | $0 \quad 0$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 |  | 16 |
| \% Buses | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.7\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.7\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 2.8\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 2.7\% | - | 1.5\% |
| Bicycles on Road | $0 \quad 0$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 |  | 10 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.3\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% | 100\% 0 | 0\% 0 | \% 5 | 50.0\% |  | 0\% | 1.2\% 1 | 12.5\% 0\% | \% | 1.4\% |  | 0.9\% |
| Pedestrians | - - | - - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - - | - - | -1 | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  |

[^23]
## 207528 (4) Brook Road (Route 28) @ Standish ... - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
PM Peak (Oct 152020 4:15PM - 5:15 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
ID: 791918, Location: 42.260055, -71.085545, Site Code: S20-003
Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg Direction | Standish Road <br> Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Kelly Field Access <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L U | U | App | Ped* | R |  | L U | U |  | Ped* | R | T | L | U |  | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 4:15PM | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 145 | 3 | 0 | 150 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 159 | 2 | 0 |  | 5 | 316 |
| 4:30PM | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 143 | 1 | 0 | 149 | 8 | 310 |
| 4:45PM | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 116 | 3 | 0 | 119 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 2 | 174 | 5 | 0 |  | 6 | 305 |
| 5:00PM | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 153 | 4 | 0 | 163 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 154 | 2 | 1 |  | 0 | 328 |
| Total | 5 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 18 | 13 | 10 | 566 | 10 | 0 | 586 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 33 | 7 | 630 | 10 | 1 | 648 | 19 | 1259 |
| \% Approach | 27.8\% 2 | 22.2\% 5 | 50.0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 1.7\% | 96.6\% | 1.7\% 0\% |  | - |  | 57.1\% 1 | 14.3\% | 28.6\% 0\% |  | - | - | 1.1\% 9 | 97.2\% | 1.5\% | 0.2\% |  |  |  |
| \% Total | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.7\% 0\% | \% | 1.4\% |  | 0.8\% | 45.0\% | 0.8\% 0\% | \% 4 | 46.5\% |  | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 0.2\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% | - | 0.6\% 5 | 50.0\% | 0.8\% | 0.1\% | 51.5\% |  | - |
| PHF | 0.625 | 0.250 | 0.750 |  | 0.750 |  | 0.417 | 0.928 | 0.750 |  | 0.905 |  | 0.500 |  | - 0.500 | - 0 | 0.750 | - | 0.375 | 0.909 | 0.500 | 0.250 | 0.899 |  | 0.960 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 5 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.5\% |  | 0.4\% |
| Lights | 5 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 15 |  | 10 | 550 | 9 | 0 | 569 | - | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | - | 6 | 602 | 8 | 0 | 616 |  | 1206 |
| \% Lights | 100\% 2 | 25.0\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 83 | 83.3\% |  | 100\% | 97.2\% | 90.0\% 0\% | \% 9 | 97.1\% |  | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 85 | 85.7\% |  | 85.7\% 9 | 95.6\% | 80.0\% | 0\% | 55.1\% |  | 95.8\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |  | 17 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 1.2\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 1.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 1.6\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.5\% |  | 1.4\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \%\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 14 |  | 18 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 2.1\% | 0\% 1 | 100\% | 2.2\% |  | 1.4\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 |  | 11 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% 7 | 75.0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 16 | 16.7\% |  | 0\% | 0.4\% | 10.0\% 0\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | - | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 1 | 4.3\% |  | 14.3\% | 0.2\% | 20.0\% | 0\% | 0.6\% |  | 0.9\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | - | - - | - | - | 31 | - | - | - | - | - | 14 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - |  | 69.2\% | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - |  | - | - |  | 93.9\% | - | - | - | - |  | 73.7\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - |  | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - |  | 5 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - |  | 30.8\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 6.1\% | - | - | - | - |  | 26.3\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

Sat Oct 17, 2020
Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 11:45AM - 12:45 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
All Movements
ID: 791918, Location: 42.260055, -71.085545, Site Code: S20-003
46 Morton Street
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Standish Road Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Kelly Field Access Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  | T | L U | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-17 11:45AM | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 130 | 3 | 0 | 133 | 2 | 239 |
| 12:00PM | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 116 | 2 | 0 | 118 | 8 | 227 |
| 12:15PM | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 139 | 1 | 0 | 141 | 3 | 279 |
| 12:30PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 111 | 2 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 117 | 2 | 0 | 119 | 10 | 241 |
| Total | 3 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 13 | 9 | 447 | 2 | 0 | 458 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 1 | 502 | 8 | 0 | 511 | 23 | 986 |
| \% Approach | 27.3\% | 18.2\% 5 | 54.5\% 0\% |  | - | - | 2.0\% 9 | 97.6\% | 0.4\% 0 |  | - |  | 16.7\% 0\% | \% 8 | 83.3\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0.2\% | 98.2\% | 1.6\% 0\% |  | - | - |  |
| \% Total | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 0.6\% 0\% | \% | 1.1\% |  | 0.9\% 4 | 45.3\% | 0.2\% 0\% | \% 4 | 46.5\% |  | 0.1\% 0\% | \% | 0.5\% 0\% | \% 0 | 0.6\% |  | 0.1\% 50 | 50.9\% | 0.8\% 0\% | \% 51 | 51.8\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.375 | - | 0.500 |  | 0.750 | - | 0.563 | 0.836 | 0.250 | - 0 | 0.844 |  | 0.250 | - 0 | 0.250 |  | 0.250 |  | 0.250 | 0.903 | 0.750 |  | 0.902 | - | 0.878 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 9 | - | 8 | 438 | 2 | 0 | 448 |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | - | 1 | 499 | 6 | 0 | 506 |  | 969 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 8 | 1.8\% | - | 88.9\% 9 | 98.0\% | 100\% 0 | \% 9 | 97.8\% |  | 100\% 0\% | \% | 100\% 0\% | \% 10 | 100\% |  | 100\% 9 | 99.4\% 7 | 75.0\% 0\% | \% 99 | 99.0\% |  | 98.3\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 7 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 11.1\% | 1.1\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.3\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0.7\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | - | 6 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 1 | 8.2\% | - | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.4\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 25.0\% 0\% |  | 0.4\% | - | 0.6\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | - | - | - | - | - | 22 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - 9 | 92.3\% | - | - | - | - | - |  | - - | - | - | - |  | 73.3\% | - | - | - | - |  | 95.7\% |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 7.7\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | - | - | 26.7\% | - | - | - | - | - | 4.3\% | - |

[^24]PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
ID: 791918, Location: 42.260055, -71.085545, Site Code: S20-003

| Leg <br> Direction | Standish Road Southbound |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Kelly Field Access Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L U |  | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-17 1:00PM | 2 | 0 | 30 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 118 | 5 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 5 | 251 |
| 1:15PM | 1 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 108 | 3 | 0 | 113 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 6 | 239 |
| 1:30PM | 2 | 0 | 40 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 130 | 2 | 0 | 132 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 129 | 1 | 0 | 130 | 4 | 268 |
| 1:45PM | 1 | 2 | 0 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 136 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 257 |
| Total | 6 | 2 | 80 | 16 | 14 | 6 | 467 | 10 | 0 | 483 | 3 | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | 14 | 10 | 505 | 1 | 0 | 516 | 16 | 1015 |
| \% Approach | 37.5\% | 12.5\% | 50.0\% 0\% | - |  | 1.2\% 9 | 96.7\% | 2.1\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | - | - | 1.9\% | 97.9\% | 0.2\% 0\% |  | - | - |  |
| \% Total | 0.6\% | 0.2\% | 0.8\% 0\% | 1.6\% |  | 0.6\% | 46.0\% | 1.0\% 0\% | \% | 47.6\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 1.0\% | 49.8\% | 0.1\% 0\% | \% 5 | 50.8\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.750 | 0.250 | 0.500 | 0.667 |  | 0.375 | 0.8980 | 0.500 | - | 0.915 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 0.625 | 0.9330 | 0.250 | - 0 | 0.932 | - | 0.946 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% |
| Lights | 5 | 2 | $7 \quad 0$ | 14 | - | 6 | 459 |  | 0 | 475 | - | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 |  | 10 | 486 | 1 | 0 | 497 |  | 986 |
| \% Lights | 83.3\% | 100\% | 87.5\% 0\% | 87.5\% |  | 100\% 9 | 98.3\% 1 | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 98.3\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 100\% 9 | 96.2\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 96.3\% |  | 97.1\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 1 | 0 | 10 | 2 | - | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | - | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |  | 19 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 16.7\% | 0\% | 12.5\% 0\% | 2.5\% | - | 0\% | 1.5\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.4\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 2.0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.9\% |  | 1.9\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.4\% |  | 0.3\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 2 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.4\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - | 5 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 1.0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.0\% | - | 0.5\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - - | - | 12 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | - | - | - | - | - | 13 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - - |  | 85.7\% | - | - | - | - |  | 66.7\% | - | - | - | - | - | 85.7\% | - | - | - | - |  | 81.3\% |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - |  | 14.3\% | - | - | - | - |  | 33.3\% | - | - | - | - | - | 14.3\% | - | - | - | - | - | 18.8\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

## 207528 (5) Central Ave @ Reedsdale Rd) - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
Full Length (6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
ID: 792240, Location: 42.258308, -71.081139, Site Code: 207528

Provided by: Precision Data
Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Central Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | BR | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | BL | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | HL | U | App | Ped* |
| 2020-10-15 6:00AM | 3 | 11 | 50 | 9 | 0 | 73 | 9 | 5 | 135 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 161 | 3 | 2 | 64 | 449 | 2 | 0 | 517 | 5 |
| 7:00AM | 5 | 37 | 92 | 24 | 0 | 158 | 3 | 20 | 211 | 46 | 4 | 0 | 281 | 4 | 3 | 96 | 408 | 4 | 0 | 511 | 8 |
| 8:00AM | 7 | 32 | 115 | 37 | 0 | 191 | 6 | 48 | 241 | 85 | 9 | 0 | 383 | 7 | 7 | 125 | 360 | 2 | 0 | 494 | 11 |
| 3:00PM | 8 | 84 | 274 | 36 | 0 | 402 | 5 | 47 | 291 | 123 | 6 | 0 | 467 | 8 | 3 | 98 | 257 | 6 | 0 | 364 | 4 |
| 4:00PM | 5 | 100 | 231 | 27 | 0 | 363 | 7 | 24 | 283 | 130 | 14 | 0 | 451 | 1 | 5 | 89 | 238 | 9 | 0 | 341 | 4 |
| 5:00PM | 12 | 77 | 242 | 36 | 0 | 367 | 12 | 39 | 282 | 132 | 4 | 0 | 457 | 4 | 10 | 109 | 274 | 2 | 1 | 396 | 8 |
| 2020-10-17 11:00AM | 11 | 58 | 132 | 20 | 1 | 222 | 8 | 27 | 168 | 80 | 5 | 0 | 280 | 7 | 4 | 80 | 199 | 1 | 0 | 284 | 6 |
| 12:00PM | 12 | 64 | 144 | 25 | 0 | 245 | 10 | 26 | 162 | 64 | 3 | 0 | 255 | 4 | 3 | 98 | 255 | 4 | 0 | 360 | 3 |
| 1:00PM | 6 | 49 | 154 | 23 | 0 | 232 | 4 | 37 | 217 | 90 | 10 | 0 | 354 | 4 | 8 | 103 | 279 | 5 | 0 | 395 | 5 |
| Total | 69 | 512 | 1434 | 237 | 1 | 2253 | 64 | 273 | 1990 | 769 | 57 | 0 | 3089 | 42 | 45 | 862 | 2719 | 35 | 1 | 3662 | 54 |
| \% Approach | 3.1\% | 22.7\% | 63.6\% 1 | 10.5\% | 0\% | - | - | 8.8\% | 64.4\% | 24.9\% | 1.8\% 0 |  | - | - | 1.2\% | 23.5\% | 74.2\% | 1.0\% | 0\% | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.5\% | 3.5\% | 9.9\% | 1.6\% | 0\% 1 | 15.5\% | - | 1.9\% | 13.7\% | 5.3\% | 0.4\% 0\% | 0\% | 21.2\% | - | 0.3\% | 5.9\% | 18.7\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 25.2\% |  |
| Motorcycles | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | - | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | - | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - |
| \% Motorcycles | 2.9\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 1.8\% 0 | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - |
| Lights | 64 | 502 | 1362 | 236 | 1 | 2165 | - | 269 | 1926 | 761 | 51 | 0 | 3007 | - | 43 | 806 | 2633 | 34 | 1 | 3517 | - |
| \% Lights | 92.8\% | 98.0\% | 95.0\% | 99.6\% | 0\% 9 | 96.1\% | - | 98.5\% | 96.8\% | 99.0\% 8 | 89.5\% 0\% | 0\% | 97.3\% | - | 95.6\% | 93.5\% | 96.8\% | 97.1\% | 0\% | 96.0\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 22 | - | 0 | 32 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 45 | - | 2 | 3 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 56 | - |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0.8\% | 1.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.0\% | - | 0\% | 1.6\% | 1.0\% | 8.8\% 0\% |  | 1.5\% | - | 4.4\% | 0.3\% | 1.8\% | 2.9\% | 0\% | 1.5\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | - |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - |
| Buses | 2 | 0 | 49 | 1 | 0 | 52 | - | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | - | 0 | 49 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 72 | - |
| \% Buses | 2.9\% | 0\% | 3.4\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 2.3\% | - | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.5\% | - | 0\% | 5.7\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2.0\% | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | - | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 1.4\% | 1.0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 1.1\% | 0.7\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.6\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 53 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 40 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 51 |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - |  | 82.8\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 95.2\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 94.4\% |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - |  | 17.2\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4.8\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.6\% |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

## 207528 (5) Central Ave @ Reedsdale Rd) - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
Full Length (6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI)

46 Morton Street,
ID: 792240, Location: 42.258308, -71.081139, Site Code: 207528 Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Central Avenue Northeastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | HR | BR | BL | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-15 6:00AM | 4 | 20 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 7 | 3 | 67 | 126 | 12 | 0 | 208 | 6 | 1000 |
| 7:00AM | 1 | 49 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 84 | 5 | 8 | 152 | 239 | 22 | 0 | 421 | 8 | 1455 |
| 8:00AM | 0 | 65 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 98 | 4 | 13 | 198 | 270 | 31 | 0 | 512 | 1 | 1678 |
| 3:00PM | 5 | 47 | 35 | 3 | 0 | 90 | 5 | 9 | 314 | 316 | 25 | 0 | 664 | 3 | 1987 |
| 4:00PM | 4 | 48 | 49 | 5 | 0 | 106 | 4 | 10 | 301 | 396 | 22 | 0 | 729 | 12 | 1990 |
| 5:00PM | 2 | 53 | 33 | 3 | 0 | 91 | 12 | 9 | 315 | 301 | 18 | 0 | 643 | 11 | 1954 |
| 2020-10-17 11:00AM | 4 | 39 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 70 | 7 | 8 | 186 | 292 | 13 | 0 | 499 | 6 | 1355 |
| 12:00PM | 6 | 49 | 25 | 4 | 0 | 84 | 5 | 10 | 253 | 295 | 25 | 0 | 583 | 9 | 1527 |
| 1:00PM | 0 | 33 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 63 | 4 | 6 | 246 | 281 | 19 | 0 | 552 | 4 | 1596 |
| Total | 26 | 403 | 269 | 29 | 0 | 727 | 53 | 76 | 2032 | 2516 | 187 | 0 | 4811 | 60 | 14542 |
| \% Approach | 3.6\% | 55.4\% | 37.0\% | 4.0\% | 0\% | - | - | 1.6\% | 42.2\% | 52.3\% | 3.9\% | 0\% | - | - |  |
| \% Total | 0.2\% | 2.8\% | 1.8\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 5.0\% | - | 0.5\% | 14.0\% | 17.3\% | 1.3\% | 0\% | 33.1\% | - |  |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 12 | - | 32 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 1.1\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 23 | 393 | 263 | 28 | 0 | 707 | - | 69 | 1961 | 2411 | 181 | 0 | 4622 | - | 14018 |
| \% Lights | 88.5\% | 97.5\% | 97.8\% | 96.6\% | 0\% | 97.2\% | - | 90.8\% | 96.5\% | 95.8\% | 96.8\% | 0\% | 96.1\% | - | 96.4\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 9 | - | 3 | 25 | 60 | 2 | 0 | 90 | - | 222 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.0\% | 1.9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.2\% | - | 3.9\% | 1.2\% | 2.4\% | 1.1\% | 0\% | 1.9\% | - | 1.5\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | 19 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 7.7\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 1.3\% | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 36 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 57 | - | 199 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 3.4\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0\% | 1.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 1.2\% | - | 1.4\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 3 | 3 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 22 | - | 52 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 3.8\% | 0.5\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.6\% | - | 3.9\% | 0.1\% | 0.6\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | - | 0.4\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 42 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 51 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 79.2\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 85.0\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 9 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 20.8\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 15.0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

Thu Oct 15, 2020
AM Peak (Oct 152020 8AM - 9 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data
Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
ID: 792240, Location: 42.258308, -71.081139, Site Code: 207528
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Central Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | BR | T | L |  | App | Ped* | R | T | BL | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | HL | U | App | Ped* |
| 2020-10-15 8:00AM | 1 | 8 | 29 | 9 | 0 | 47 | 1 | 5 | 45 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 1 | 0 | 26 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 3 |
| 8:15AM | 1 | 11 | 29 | 11 | 0 | 52 | 2 | 15 | 73 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 111 | 2 | 2 | 25 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 128 | 3 |
| 8:30AM | 3 | 7 | 31 | 11 | 0 | 52 | 2 | 20 | 70 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 110 | 2 | 3 | 40 | 103 | 2 | 0 | 148 | 4 |
| 8:45AM | 2 | 6 | 26 | 6 | 0 | 40 | 1 | 8 | 53 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 88 | 2 | 2 | 34 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 128 | 1 |
| Total | 7 | 32 | 115 | 37 | 0 | 191 | 6 | 48 | 241 | 85 | 9 | 0 | 383 | 7 | 7 | 125 | 360 | 2 | 0 | 494 | 11 |
| \% Approach | 3.7\% | 16.8\% | 60.2\% | 19.4\% 0\% |  | - | - | 12.5\% | 62.9\% | 22.2\% | 2.3\% 0 |  | - | - | 1.4\% | 25.3\% | 72.9\% | 0.4\% 0 |  | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.4\% | 1.9\% | 6.9\% | 2.2\% 0\% | \% 1 | 11.4\% | - | 2.9\% | 14.4\% | 5.1\% | 0.5\% 0 | 0\% | 22.8\% | - | 0.4\% | 7.4\% | 21.5\% | 0.1\% 0 | \% | 9.4\% | - |
| PHF | 0.583 | 0.727 | 0.919 | 0.841 |  | 0.913 | - | 0.600 | 0.818 | 0.885 | 0.450 | - | 0.858 | - | 0.583 | 0.781 | 0.874 | 0.250 | - | 0.834 | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - |
| Lights | 7 | 31 | 107 | 36 | 0 | 181 | - | 48 | 234 | 84 | 5 | 0 | 371 | - | 7 | 119 | 342 | 2 | 0 | 470 | - |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 96.9\% | 93.0\% | 97.3\% 0 | \% 9 | 94.8\% | - | 100\% | 97.1\% | 98.8\% | 55.6\% 0 | 0\% 9 | 96.9\% | - | 100\% | 95.2\% | 95.0\% | 100\% 0 | \% | 5.1\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 7 | - | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | - |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 3.1\% | 0.9\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.0\% | - | 0\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 44.4\% 0 | 0\% | 1.8\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 3.6\% | 0\% 0 | \% | 2.6\% |  |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% 0 | \% | 0.6\% | - |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 7 | - | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 5.2\% | 2.7\% 0\% | \% | 3.7\% | - | 0\% | 1.2\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.8\% | - | 0\% | 4.8\% | 0.6\% | 0\% 0 |  | 1.6\% |  |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0.9\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.5\% | - | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.5\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 66.7\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 33.3\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

Thu Oct 15, 2020
AM Peak (Oct 152020 8AM - 9 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street, Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

ID: 792240, Location: 42.258308, -71.081139, Site Code: 207528

| Leg <br> Direction | Central Avenue Northeastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | HR | BR | BL | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-15 8:00AM | 0 | 18 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 1 | 46 | 71 | 7 | 0 | 125 | 1 | 360 |
| 8:15AM | 0 | 20 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 44 | 67 | 5 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 435 |
| 8:30AM | 0 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 1 | 4 | 36 | 65 | 10 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 448 |
| 8:45AM | 0 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 1 | 8 | 72 | 67 | 9 | 0 | 156 | 0 | 435 |
| Total | 0 | 65 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 98 | 4 | 13 | 198 | 270 | 31 | 0 | 512 | 1 | 1678 |
| \% Approach | 0\% | 66.3\% | 32.7\% | 1.0\% | 0\% | - | - | 2.5\% | 38.7\% | 52.7\% | 6.1\% | 0\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 0\% | 3.9\% | 1.9\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 5.8\% | - | 0.8\% | 11.8\% | 16.1\% | 1.8\% | 0\% | 30.5\% | - | - |
| PHF | - | 0.813 | 0.667 | 0.250 | - | 0.875 | - | 0.375 | 0.688 | 0.964 | 0.775 | - | 0.818 | - | 0.934 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 1.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 0 | 62 | 30 | 1 | 0 | 93 | - | 12 | 183 | 258 | 30 | 0 | 483 | - | 1598 |
| \% Lights | 0\% | 95.4\% | 93.8\% | 100\% | 0\% | 94.9\% | - | 92.3\% | 92.4\% | 95.6\% | 96.8\% | 0\% | 94.3\% | - | 95.2\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 9 | - | 33 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 6.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2.0\% | - | 0\% | 0.5\% | 2.6\% | 3.2\% | 0\% | 1.8\% | - | 2.0\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Buses | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | - | 35 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 3.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2.0\% | - | 0\% | 7.1\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2.9\% | - | 2.1\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - | 8 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 7.7\% | 0\% | 1.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.0\% | - | 0.5\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

## 207528 (5) Central Ave @ Reedsdale Rd) - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
PM Peak (Oct 152020 4:15PM - 5:15 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data
Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
ID: 792240, Location: 42.258308, -71.081139, Site Code: 207528
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Central Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | BR | T | L U | App | Ped* | R | T | BL |  | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | HL | U | App | Ped* |
| 2020-10-15 4:15PM | 1 | 26 | 73 | 20 | 102 | 1 | 2 | 65 | 35 | 2 | 0 | 104 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 67 | 1 | 0 | 87 | 2 |
| 4:30PM | 2 | 27 | 47 | 70 | 83 | 4 | 6 | 76 | 31 | 4 | 0 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 68 | 4 | 0 | 97 | 1 |
| 4:45PM | 1 | 22 | 49 | 90 | 81 | 1 | 4 | 70 | 27 | 5 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 49 | 2 | 0 | 74 | 0 |
| 5:00PM | 5 | 14 | 70 | 60 | 95 | 3 | 16 | 75 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 115 | 2 | 3 | 28 | 83 | 1 | 0 | 115 | 4 |
| Total | 9 | 89 | 239 | 240 | 361 | 9 | 28 | 286 | 115 | 13 | 0 | 442 | 3 | 7 | 91 | 267 | 8 | 0 | 373 | 7 |
| \% Approach | 2.5\% | 24.7\% | 66.2\% | 6.6\% 0\% | - | - | 6.3\% | 64.7\% | 26.0\% | 2.9\% 0\% | \% | - | - | 1.9\% | 24.4\% | 71.6\% | 2.1\% 0 |  | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.4\% | 4.4\% | 11.8\% | 1.2\% 0\% | 17.8\% | - | 1.4\% | 14.1\% | 5.7\% | 0.6\% 0\% | \% | 21.8\% | - | 0.3\% | 4.5\% | 13.2\% | 0.4\% 0 |  | 18.4\% | - |
| PHF | 0.500 | 0.815 | 0.818 | 0.667 | 0.889 | - | 0.438 | 0.947 | 0.821 | 0.650 | - | 0.957 | - | 0.583 | 0.813 | 0.811 | 0.500 | - | 0.816 | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 2.2\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0 |  | 1.1\% | - |
| Lights | 7 | 88 | 230 | $24 \quad 0$ | 349 | - | 27 | 279 | 113 | 13 | 0 | 432 | - | 7 | 84 | 258 | 8 | 0 | 357 | - |
| \% Lights | 77.8\% | 98.9\% | 96.2\% | 100\% 0\% | 96.7\% | - | 96.4\% | 97.6\% | 98.3\% | 100\% 0\% | \% | 97.7\% | - | 100\% | 92.3\% | 96.6\% | 100\% 0 |  | 95.7\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 4 | $0 \quad 0$ | 4 | - | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 1.7\% | 0\% 0\% | 1.1\% | - | 0\% | 0.7\% | 1.7\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.9\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1.1\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.8\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.5\% | - |
| Buses | 1 | 0 | 5 | $0 \quad 0$ | 6 | - | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | - |
| \% Buses | 11.1\% | 0\% | 2.1\% | 0\% 0\% | 1.7\% | - | 3.6\% | 0.7\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.7\% | - | 0\% | 5.5\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0 |  | 1.6\% | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 1 | 1 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 2 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 11.1\% | 1.1\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.6\% | - | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.3\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 66.7\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - - | - | 33.3\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

## 207528 (5) Central Ave @ Reedsdale Rd) - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
PM Peak (Oct 152020 4:15PM - 5:15 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
ID: 792240, Location: 42.258308, -71.081139, Site Code: 207528
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Central Avenue Northeastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | HR | BR | BL | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-15 4:15PM | 0 | 13 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 29 | 2 | 3 | 78 | 113 | 5 | 0 | 199 | 3 | 521 |
| 4:30PM | 1 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 1 | 2 | 69 | 88 | 4 | 0 | 163 | 8 | 482 |
| 4:45PM | 1 | 12 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 2 | 88 | 97 | 6 | 0 | 193 | 1 | 482 |
| 5:00PM | 0 | 19 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 31 | 4 | 1 | 87 | 92 | 7 | 0 | 187 | 3 | 543 |
| Total | 2 | 55 | 47 | 6 | 0 | 110 | 7 | 8 | 322 | 390 | 22 | 0 | 742 | 15 | 2028 |
| \% Approach | 1.8\% | 50.0\% | 42.7\% | 5.5\% | 0\% | - | - | 1.1\% | 43.4\% | 52.6\% | 3.0\% | 0\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.1\% | 2.7\% | 2.3\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 5.4\% | - | 0.4\% | 15.9\% | 19.2\% | 1.1\% | 0\% | 36.6\% | - | - |
| PHF | 0.500 | 0.724 | 0.839 | 0.750 | - | 0.887 | - | 0.667 | 0.912 | 0.861 | 0.786 | - | 0.934 | - | 0.934 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 8 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0.4\% |
| Lights | 2 | 55 | 46 | 6 | 0 | 109 | - | 7 | 305 | 376 | 22 | 0 | 710 | - | 1957 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 100\% | 97.9\% | 100\% | 0\% | 99.1\% | - | 87.5\% | 94.7\% | 96.4\% | 100\% | 0\% | 95.7\% | - | 96.5\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 13 | - | 25 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 2.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.9\% | - | 12.5\% | 1.9\% | 1.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.8\% | - | 1.2\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 13 | - | 28 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 2.8\% | 1.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.8\% | - | 1.4\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 7 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0.3\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 86.7\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13.3\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 11:45AM - 12:45 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street, ID: 792240, Location: 42.258308, -71.081139, Site Code: 207528

Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Central Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | BR | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | BL |  | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | HL | U | App | Ped* |
| 2020-10-17 11:45AM | 4 | 11 | 36 | 3 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 6 | 43 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 74 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 0 |
| 12:00PM | 0 | 15 | 44 | 11 | 0 | 70 | 4 | 5 | 53 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 77 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 1 |
| 12:15PM | 9 | 20 | 34 | 7 | 0 | 70 | 3 | 2 | 39 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 55 | 1 | 2 | 28 | 86 | 3 | 0 | 119 | 0 |
| 12:30PM | 1 | 12 | 29 | 3 | 0 | 45 | 1 | 10 | 37 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 2 |
| Total | 14 | 58 | 143 | 24 | 0 | 239 | 8 | 23 | 172 | 70 | 7 | 0 | 272 | 3 | 3 | 93 | 259 | 3 | 0 | 358 | 3 |
| \% Approach | 5.9\% | 24.3\% | 59.8\% | 10.0\% 0 |  | - | - | 8.5\% | 63.2\% | 25.7\% | 2.6\% 0\% |  | - | - | 0.8\% | 26.0\% | 72.3\% | 0.8\% 0 |  | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.9\% | 3.8\% | 9.3\% | 1.6\% 0\% |  | 15.5\% |  | 1.5\% | 11.2\% | 4.5\% | 0.5\% 0\% |  | 17.7\% | - | 0.2\% | 6.0\% | 16.8\% | 0.2\% 0 |  | 23.2\% | - |
| PHF | 0.389 | 0.713 | 0.813 | 0.545 | - | 0.850 |  | 0.575 | 0.822 | 0.833 | 0.438 | - | 0.891 | - | 0.375 | 0.830 | 0.753 | 0.250 | - | 0.752 | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% |  |
| Lights | 14 | 56 | 138 | 24 | 0 | 232 | - | 23 | 168 | 69 | 7 | 0 | 267 | - | 2 | 89 | 256 | 3 | 0 | 350 | - |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 96.6\% | 96.5\% | 100\% 0 | 0\% 9 | 97.1\% | - | 100\% | 97.7\% | 98.6\% | 100\% 0 | \% | 98.2\% | - | 66.7\% | 95.7\% | 98.8\% | 100\% | \% | 97.8\% |  |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.7\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.8\% | - | 0\% | 1.7\% | 1.4\% | 0\% 0 |  | 1.5\% | - | 33.3\% | 1.1\% | 0.8\% | 0\% 0 |  | 1.1\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.3\% | - |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 2.8\% | 0\% 0 |  | 1.7\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 3.2\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.8\% | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 1.7\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.4\% | - | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.4\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 11:45AM - 12:45 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street, ID: 792240, Location: 42.258308, -71.081139, Site Code: 207528 Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Central Avenue <br> Northeastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | HR | BR | BL | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-17 11:45AM | 1 | 12 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 44 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 0 | 360 |
| 12:00PM | 1 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 3 | 2 | 60 | 83 | 8 | 0 | 153 | 3 | 392 |
| 12:15PM | 1 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 65 | 82 | 4 | 0 | 152 | 3 | 411 |
| 12:30PM | 2 | 14 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 3 | 65 | 70 | 7 | 0 | 145 | 2 | 377 |
| Total | 5 | 49 | 29 | 3 | 0 | 86 | 6 | 8 | 234 | 324 | 19 | 0 | 585 | 8 | 1540 |
| \% Approach | 5.8\% | 57.0\% | 33.7\% | 3.5\% | 0\% | - | - | 1.4\% | 40.0\% | 55.4\% | 3.2\% | 0\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.3\% | 3.2\% | 1.9\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 5.6\% | - | 0.5\% | 15.2\% | 21.0\% | 1.2\% | 0\% | 38.0\% | - | - |
| PHF | 0.625 | 0.839 | 0.604 | 0.750 | - | 0.778 | - | 0.667 | 0.900 | 0.918 | 0.594 | - | 0.954 | - | 0.934 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 5 | 46 | 29 | 3 | 0 | 83 | - | 8 | 234 | 320 | 19 | 0 | 581 | - | 1513 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 93.9\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 96.5\% | - | 100\% | 100\% | 98.8\% | 100\% | 0\% | 99.3\% | - | 98.2\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 13 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 2.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0.8\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 7 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.5\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 5 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 4.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2.3\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.3\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI)

46 Morton Street,
ID: 792240, Location: 42.258308, -71.081139, Site Code: 207528
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Central Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | BR | T | L |  | App | Ped* | R | T | BL | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | HL | U | App | Ped* |
| 2020-10-17 1:00PM | 4 | 14 | 39 | 7 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 9 | 63 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 4 | 30 | 60 | 2 | 0 | 96 | 0 |
| 1:15PM | 1 | 11 | 31 | 4 | 0 | 47 | 2 | 6 | 48 | 27 | 2 | 0 | 83 | 4 | 2 | 25 | 76 | 1 | 0 | 104 | 0 |
| 1:30PM | 1 | 12 | 41 | 5 | 0 | 59 | 2 | 10 | 52 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 78 | 1 | 0 | 102 | 1 |
| 1:45PM | 0 | 12 | 43 | 7 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 12 | 54 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 65 | 1 | 0 | 93 | 4 |
| Total | 6 | 49 | 154 | 23 | 0 | 232 | 4 | 37 | 217 | 90 | 10 | 0 | 354 | 4 | 8 | 103 | 279 | 5 | 0 | 395 | 5 |
| \% Approach | 2.6\% | 21.1\% | 66.4\% | 9.9\% 0 |  | - | - | 10.5\% | 61.3\% | 25.4\% | 2.8\% 0 |  | - | - | 2.0\% | 26.1\% | 70.6\% | 1.3\% 0 |  | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.4\% | 3.1\% | 9.6\% | 1.4\% 0 | \% 1 | 14.5\% | - | 2.3\% | 13.6\% | 5.6\% | 0.6\% 0\% |  | 22.2\% | - | 0.5\% | 6.5\% | 17.5\% | 0.3\% |  | 24.7\% | - |
| PHF | 0.375 | 0.875 | 0.895 | 0.821 | - | 0.906 | - | 0.771 | 0.849 | 0.833 | 0.625 | - | 0.895 | - | 0.500 | 0.858 | 0.894 | 0.625 | - | 0.950 | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.4\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 1.0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.3\% |  |
| Lights | 6 | 49 | 145 | 23 | 0 | 223 | - | 37 | 214 | 88 | 9 | 0 | 348 | - | 8 | 97 | 273 | 5 | 0 | 383 | - |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 100\% | 94.2\% | 100\% 0 | \% 9 | 96.1\% | - | 100\% | 98.6\% | 97.8\% | 90.0\% 0 | 0\% | 98.3\% | - | 100\% | 94.2\% | 97.8\% | 100\% |  | 97.0\% |  |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7 |  |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 1.9\% | 0\% 0 |  | 1.3\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 2.2\% | 10.0\% 0 | 0\% | 0.8\% | - | 0\% | 1.9\% | 1.8\% | 0\% |  | 1.8\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 3.2\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% | 2.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 2.9\% | 0.4\% | 0\% |  | 1.0\% | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 1.4\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.8\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street, Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

ID: 792240, Location: 42.258308, -71.081139, Site Code: 207528

| Leg <br> Direction | Central Avenue Northeastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Brook Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | HR | BR | BL | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-17 1:00PM | 0 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 53 | 60 | 5 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 394 |
| 1:15PM | 0 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 58 | 76 | 3 | 0 | 138 | 2 | 385 |
| 1:30PM | 0 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 3 | 2 | 59 | 74 | 5 | 0 | 140 | 2 | 406 |
| 1:45PM | 0 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 76 | 71 | 6 | 0 | 154 | 0 | 411 |
| Total | 0 | 33 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 63 | 4 | 6 | 246 | 281 | 19 | 0 | 552 | 4 | 1596 |
| \% Approach | 0\% | 52.4\% | 41.3\% | 6.3\% | 0\% | - | - | 1.1\% | 44.6\% | 50.9\% | 3.4\% | 0\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 0\% | 2.1\% | 1.6\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 3.9\% | - | 0.4\% | 15.4\% | 17.6\% | 1.2\% | 0\% | 34.6\% | - | - |
| PHF | - | 0.917 | 0.893 | 0.500 | - | 0.861 | - | 0.750 | 0.809 | 0.918 | 0.750 | - | 0.903 | - | 0.974 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 4 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0.3\% |
| Lights | 0 | 33 | 25 | 4 | 0 | 62 | - | 6 | 241 | 272 | 17 | 0 | 536 | - | 1552 |
| \% Lights | 0\% | 100\% | 96.2\% | 100\% | 0\% | 98.4\% | - | 100\% | 98.0\% | 96.8\% | 89.5\% | 0\% | 97.1\% | - | 97.2\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 8 | - | 21 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.8\% | 1.8\% | 5.3\% | 0\% | 1.4\% | - | 1.3\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 11 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0.7\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | - | 7 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 3.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.6\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | 5.3\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | - | 0.4\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 25.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50.0\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 75.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50.0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

## 207528 (6) Reedsdale Rd @Canton Ave - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
Full Length (6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data
Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
ID: 791931, Location: 42.254562, -71.077503, Site Code: S20-003
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Centre Street Southwestbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Canton Avenue Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | HL U | U | App | Ped* | HR | BR | BL | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |
| 2020-10-15 6:00AM | 5 | 112 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 124 | 20 | 0 | 146 | 5 |
| 7:00AM | 21 | 215 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 249 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 210 | 24 | 0 | 240 | 4 |
| 8:00AM | 32 | 290 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 334 | 1 | 0 | 37 | 30 | 3 | 0 | 70 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 223 | 43 | 0 | 276 | 6 |
| 3:00PM | 47 | 570 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 628 | 6 | 1 | 106 | 38 | 4 | 0 | 149 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 244 | 23 | 0 | 274 | 6 |
| 4:00PM | 54 | 504 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 567 | 2 | 4 | 129 | 38 | 3 | 0 | 174 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 287 | 31 | 0 | 326 | 6 |
| 5:00PM | 41 | 520 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 572 | 9 | 3 | 90 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 231 | 31 | 0 | 267 | 9 |
| 2020-10-17 11:00AM | 35 | 293 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 340 | 9 | 5 | 63 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 81 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 198 | 11 | 0 | 215 | 5 |
| 12:00PM | 37 | 371 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 431 | 3 | 2 | 59 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 178 | 11 | 0 | 204 | 3 |
| 1:00PM | 32 | 382 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 425 | 16 | 5 | 63 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 228 | 19 | 0 | 261 | 3 |
| Total | 304 | 3257 | 94 | 10 | 0 | 3665 | 48 | 20 | 621 | 199 | 11 | 0 | 851 | 41 | 7 | 66 | 1923 | 213 | 0 | 2209 | 47 |
| \% Approach | 8.3\% 8 | 88.9\% | 2.6\% | 0.3\% 0\% |  | - | - | 2.4\% | 73.0\% | 23.4\% | 1.3\% 0 |  | - |  | 0.3\% | 3.0\% | 87.1\% | 9.6\% |  | - | - |
| \% Total | 2.1\% | 22.1\% | 0.6\% | 0.1\% 0\% | \% | 24.8\% | - | 0.1\% | 4.2\% | 1.3\% | 0.1\% 0 |  | 5.8\% | - | 0\% | 0.4\% | 13.0\% | 1.4\% |  | 15.0\% | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% |  | 0.2\% | - |
| Lights | 299 | 3110 | 92 | 9 | 0 | 3510 | - | 20 | 609 | 195 | 11 | 0 | 835 | - | 7 | 64 | 1870 | 206 | 0 | 2147 | - |
| \% Lights | 98.4\% | 95.5\% | 97.9\% | 90.0\% 0\% | \% 9 | 95.8\% | - | 100\% | 98.1\% | 98.0\% | 100\% 0 | 0\% | 98.1\% | - | 100\% | 97.0\% | 97.2\% | 96.7\% | \% | 97.2\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 3 | 43 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 47 | - | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 1 | 26 | 7 | 0 | 34 | - |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 1.0\% | 1.3\% | 0\% | 10.0\% 0\% |  | 1.3\% | - | 0\% | 0.3\% | 1.0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.5\% | - | 0\% | 1.5\% | 1.4\% | 3.3\% | \% | 1.5\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% |  | 0.2\% | - |
| Buses | 0 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | - | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | - | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | - |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 2.7\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 2.4\% | - | 0\% | 1.1\% | 1.0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 1.1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% |  | 0.7\% | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.7\% | 0\% | 2.1\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 1.5\% | 0.1\% | 0\% |  | 0.1\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 42 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 40 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 44 |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 87.5\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 97.6\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 93.6\% |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 12.5\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.4\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6.4\% |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

## 207528 (6) Reedsdale Rd @Canton Ave - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
Full Length (6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street, Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Canton Avenue Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | BR | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | BL | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-15 6:00AM | 6 | 8 | 510 | 30 | 0 | 554 | 0 | 26 | 126 | 49 | 9 | 0 | 210 | 2 | 1056 |
| 7:00AM | 29 | 20 | 489 | 122 | 0 | 660 | 1 | 82 | 202 | 51 | 15 | 0 | 350 | 0 | 1573 |
| 8:00AM | 35 | 21 | 462 | 94 | 0 | 612 | 1 | 76 | 163 | 50 | 14 | 0 | 303 | 1 | 1595 |
| 3:00PM | 37 | 14 | 319 | 118 | 0 | 488 | 10 | 133 | 249 | 62 | 26 | 0 | 470 | 3 | 2009 |
| 4:00PM | 22 | 16 | 328 | 104 | 0 | 470 | 23 | 99 | 237 | 66 | 24 | 0 | 426 | 7 | 1963 |
| 5:00PM | 37 | 15 | 365 | 105 | 0 | 522 | 3 | 163 | 265 | 68 | 25 | 0 | 521 | 7 | 2001 |
| 2020-10-17 11:00AM | 16 | 9 | 278 | 74 | 0 | 377 | 8 | 126 | 189 | 45 | 19 | 0 | 379 | 3 | 1392 |
| 12:00PM | 15 | 10 | 318 | 112 | 0 | 455 | 2 | 104 | 194 | 48 | 30 | 0 | 376 | 2 | 1540 |
| 1:00PM | 15 | 8 | 359 | 98 | 0 | 480 | 1 | 123 | 174 | 55 | 27 | 0 | 379 | 10 | 1628 |
| Total | 212 | 121 | 3428 | 857 | 0 | 4618 | 49 | 932 | 1799 | 494 | 189 | 0 | 3414 | 35 | 14757 |
| \% Approach | 4.6\% | 2.6\% | 74.2\% | 18.6\% | 0\% | - | - | 27.3\% | 52.7\% | 14.5\% | 5.5\% | 0\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 1.4\% | 0.8\% | 23.2\% | 5.8\% | 0\% | 31.3\% | - | 6.3\% | 12.2\% | 3.3\% | 1.3\% | 0\% | 23.1\% | - | - |
| Motorcycles | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 11 | - | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | - | 30 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 207 | 114 | 3282 | 825 | 0 | 4428 | - | 902 | 1763 | 483 | 185 | 0 | 3333 | - | 14253 |
| \% Lights | 97.6\% | 94.2\% | 95.7\% | 96.3\% | 0\% | 95.9\% | - | 96.8\% | 98.0\% | 97.8\% | 97.9\% | 0\% | 97.6\% | - | 96.6\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 2 | 4 | 57 | 20 | 0 | 83 | - | 15 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 39 | - | 207 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0.9\% | 3.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.3\% | 0\% | 1.8\% | - | 1.6\% | 1.1\% | 0.8\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 1.1\% | - | 1.4\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 1 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 12 | - | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | - | 30 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Buses | 0 | 2 | 67 | 8 | 0 | 77 | - | 10 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 25 | - | 214 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 1.7\% | 2.0\% | 0.9\% | 0\% | 1.7\% | - | 1.1\% | 0.7\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | - | 1.5\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 7 | - | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | - | 23 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.5\% | 0.8\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0.4\% | 1.1\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 49 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 22 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 62.9\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 37.1\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

Thu Oct 15, 2020
AM Peak (Oct 152020 7:30AM - 8:30 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
ID: 791931, Location: 42.254562, -71.077503, Site Code: S20-003
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Centre Street <br> Southwestbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Canton Avenue Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | BR | BL | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |
| 2020-10-15 7:30AM | 9 | 60 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 63 | 4 | 0 | 70 | 0 |
| 7:45AM | 6 | 66 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 43 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 1 |
| 8:00AM | 5 | 60 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 16 | 0 | 76 | 2 |
| 8:15AM | 6 | 69 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 78 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 60 | 15 | 0 | 80 | 1 |
| Total | 26 | 255 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 299 | 1 | 0 | 48 | 24 | 3 | 0 | 75 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 226 | 40 | 0 | 276 | 4 |
| \% Approach | 8.7\% | 85.3\% | 5.0\% | 1.0\% 0 |  | - | - | 0\% | 64.0\% | 32.0\% | 4.0\% 0 | \% | - | - | 0.7\% | 2.9\% | 81.9\% | 14.5\% 0\% |  | - | - |
| \% Total | 1.5\% | 15.2\% | 0.9\% | 0.2\% 0 | \% | 17.8\% | - | 0\% | 2.9\% | 1.4\% | 0.2\% 0 |  | 4.5\% | - | 0.1\% | 0.5\% | 13.4\% | 2.4\% 0 |  | 16.4\% | - |
| PHF | 0.694 | 0.924 | 0.464 | 0.750 | - | 0.937 | - | - | 0.632 | 0.750 | 0.375 | - | 0.721 | - | 0.500 | 0.500 | 0.897 | 0.625 | - | 0.863 | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.3\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - |
| Lights | 25 | 235 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 275 | - | 0 | 47 | 23 | 3 | 0 | 73 | - | 2 | 7 | 223 | 39 | 0 | 271 | - |
| \% Lights | 96.2\% | 92.2\% | 86.7\% | 66.7\% 0 | \% | 92.0\% | - | 0\% | 97.9\% | 95.8\% | 100\% 0 | \% | 97.3\% | - | 100\% | 87.5\% | 98.7\% | 97.5\% 0 |  | 98.2\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | - |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.2\% | 0\% | 33.3\% 0 | \% | 1.3\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 4.2\% | 0\% 0 | \% | 1.3\% | - | 0\% | 12.5\% | 0.9\% | 2.5\% 0 |  | 1.4\% |  |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 | \% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% |  |
| Buses | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 5.9\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 5.0\% | - | 0\% | 2.1\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 1.3\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.4\% |  |
| Bicycles on Road | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 3.8\% | 0\% | 13.3\% | 0\% 0 |  | 1.0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

Thu Oct 15, 2020
AM Peak (Oct 152020 7:30AM - 8:30 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street, Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Canton Avenue Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | BR | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | BL | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-15 7:30AM | 8 | 1 | 144 | 49 | 0 | 202 | 1 | 25 | 45 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 460 |
| 7:45AM | 13 | 9 | 107 | 29 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 39 | 91 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 453 |
| 8:00AM | 9 | 6 | 99 | 18 | 0 | 132 | 1 | 18 | 44 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 372 |
| 8:15AM | 14 | 7 | 101 | 25 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 19 | 41 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 73 | 1 | 396 |
| Total | 44 | 23 | 451 | 121 | 0 | 639 | 2 | 101 | 221 | 57 | 13 | 0 | 392 | 1 | 1681 |
| \% Approach | 6.9\% | 3.6\% | 70.6\% | 18.9\% | 0\% | - | - | 25.8\% | 56.4\% | 14.5\% | 3.3\% | 0\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 2.6\% | 1.4\% | 26.8\% | 7.2\% | 0\% | 38.0\% | - | 6.0\% | 13.1\% | 3.4\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 23.3\% | - | - |
| PHF | 0.786 | 0.639 | 0.781 | 0.617 | - | 0.790 | - | 0.647 | 0.607 | 0.750 | 0.542 | - | 0.645 | - | 0.911 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 43 | 21 | 422 | 117 | 0 | 603 | - | 98 | 212 | 57 | 13 | 0 | 380 | - | 1602 |
| \% Lights | 97.7\% | 91.3\% | 93.6\% | 96.7\% | 0\% | 94.4\% | - | 97.0\% | 95.9\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 96.9\% | - | 95.3\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 1 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 19 | - | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - | 33 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 4.3\% | 3.5\% | 1.7\% | 0\% | 3.0\% | - | 2.0\% | 1.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.3\% | - | 2.0\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 7 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 2.3\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.6\% | - | 1.0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | - | 0.4\% |
| Buses | 0 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 12 | - | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - | 34 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 4.3\% | 2.0\% | 1.7\% | 0\% | 1.9\% | - | 0\% | 2.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.3\% | - | 2.0\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 4 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

## 207528 (6) Reedsdale Rd @Canton Ave - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
PM Peak (Oct 152020 3PM - 4 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
ID: 791931, Location: 42.254562, -71.077503, Site Code: S20-003
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Centre Street Southwestbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Canton Avenue Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | BR | BL | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |
| 2020-10-15 3:00PM | 15 | 143 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 47 | 6 | 0 | 57 | 1 |
| 3:15PM | 19 | 126 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 1 | 0 | 33 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 78 | 1 | 0 | 81 | 1 |
| 3:30PM | 7 | 144 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 154 | 5 | 0 | 24 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 5 | 0 | 65 | 2 |
| 3:45PM | 6 | 157 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 59 | 11 | 0 | 71 | 2 |
| Total | 47 | 570 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 628 | 6 | 1 | 106 | 38 | 4 | 0 | 149 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 244 | 23 | 0 | 274 | 6 |
| \% Approach | 7.5\% | 90.8\% | 1.6\% | 0.2\% |  | - | - | 0.7\% | 71.1\% | 25.5\% | 2.7\% |  | - | - | 0\% | 2.6\% | 89.1\% | 8.4\% | 0\% | - | - |
| \% Total | 2.3\% | 28.4\% | 0.5\% |  |  | 31.3\% | - | 0\% | 5.3\% | 1.9\% | 0.2\% 0 |  | 7.4\% | - | 0\% | 0.3\% | 12.1\% | 1.1\% | 0\% | 13.6\% | - |
| PHF | 0.605 | 0.908 | 0.833 | 0.250 | - | 0.944 | - | 0.250 | 0.803 | 0.792 | 0.500 | - | 0.810 | - | - | 0.438 | 0.782 | 0.523 | - | 0.846 | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.3\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - |
| Lights | 44 | 544 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 599 | - | 1 | 105 | 38 | 4 | 0 | 148 | - | 0 | 7 | 238 | 22 | 0 | 267 | - |
| \% Lights | 93.6\% | 95.4\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 95.4\% | - | 100\% | 99.1\% | 100\% | 100\% 0\% |  | 99.3\% | - | 0\% | 100\% | 97.5\% | 95.7\% | 0\% | 97.4\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | - |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 4.3\% | 2.3\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 2.4\% | - | 0\% | 0.9\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.7\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1.2\% | 4.3\% | 0\% | 1.5\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.3\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% |  | 0.4\% | - |
| Buses | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 1.6\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 1.4\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% |  | 0.7\% | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 2.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 83.3\% |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 16.7\% |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

## 207528 (6) Reedsdale Rd @Canton Ave - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
PM Peak (Oct 152020 3PM - 4 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Canton Avenue Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | BR | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | BL | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-15 3:00PM | 15 | 5 | 89 | 30 | 0 | 139 | 3 | 37 | 69 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 521 |
| 3:15PM | 7 | 2 | 59 | 34 | 0 | 102 | 2 | 42 | 59 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 124 | 0 | 501 |
| 3:30PM | 9 | 7 | 92 | 29 | 0 | 137 | 5 | 29 | 60 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 109 | 0 | 499 |
| 3:45PM | 6 | 0 | 79 | 25 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 25 | 61 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 108 | 3 | 488 |
| Total | 37 | 14 | 319 | 118 | 0 | 488 | 10 | 133 | 249 | 62 | 26 | 0 | 470 | 3 | 2009 |
| \% Approach | 7.6\% | 2.9\% | 65.4\% | 24.2\% | 0\% | - | - | 28.3\% | 53.0\% | 13.2\% | 5.5\% | 0\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 1.8\% | 0.7\% | 15.9\% | 5.9\% | 0\% | 24.3\% | - | 6.6\% | 12.4\% | 3.1\% | 1.3\% | 0\% | 23.4\% | - | - |
| PHF | 0.617 | 0.500 | 0.867 | 0.868 | - | 0.878 | - | 0.792 | 0.902 | 0.969 | 0.893 | - | 0.909 | - | 0.965 |
| Motorcycles | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 5 |
| \% Motorcycles | 2.7\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 36 | 13 | 303 | 115 | 0 | 467 | - | 127 | 242 | 62 | 25 | 0 | 456 | - | 1937 |
| \% Lights | 97.3\% | 92.9\% | 95.0\% | 97.5\% | 0\% | 95.7\% | - | 95.5\% | 97.2\% | 100\% | 96.2\% | 0\% | 97.0\% | - | 96.4\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | - | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 30 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 2.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.4\% | - | 0\% | 1.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.6\% | - | 1.5\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 4 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Buses | 0 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 12 | - | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | 31 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 7.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 0\% | 2.5\% | - | 3.0\% | 1.6\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.7\% | - | 1.5\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | 2 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3.8\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 11:45AM - 12:45 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
ID: 791931, Location: 42.254562, -71.077503, Site Code: S20-003
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Centre Street Southwestbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Canton Avenue Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | BR |  | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |
| 2020-10-17 11:45AM | 11 | 80 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 5 | 0 | 64 | 1 |
| 12:00PM | 11 | 94 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 38 | 2 | 0 | 47 | 2 |
| 12:15PM | 8 | 87 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 42 | 4 | 0 | 52 | 1 |
| 12:30PM | 5 | 96 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 103 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 45 | 2 | 0 | 48 | 0 |
| Total | 35 | 357 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 410 | 2 | 2 | 71 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 184 | 13 | 0 | 211 | 4 |
| \% Approach | 8.5\% | 87.1\% | 3.9\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | - | - | 2.4\% | 83.5\% | 14.1\% | 0\% |  | - | - | 0\% | 6.6\% | 87.2\% | 6.2\% | 0\% | - | - |
| \% Total | 2.3\% | 23.2\% | 1.0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 26.6\% | - | 0.1\% | 4.6\% | 0.8\% |  |  | 5.5\% | - | 0\% | 0.9\% | 11.9\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 13.7\% | - |
| PHF | 0.795 | 0.930 | 0.571 | 0.500 | - | 0.932 | - | 0.250 | 0.807 | 0.600 | - | - | 0.817 | - | - | 0.500 | 0.780 | 0.650 | - | 0.824 | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1.1\% | 0\% |  | 0.9\% | - |
| Lights | 35 | 352 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 405 | - | 2 | 70 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 84 | - | 0 | 14 | 177 | 13 | 0 | 204 | - |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 98.6\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 98.8\% | - | 100\% | 98.6\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | 98.8\% | - | 0\% | 100\% | 96.2\% | 100\% | 0\% | 96.7\% |  |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 1.4\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 1.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 2.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.9\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - |
| Buses | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 1.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

Sat Oct 17, 2020
Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 11:45AM - 12:45 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street, Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US 46 Morton Street

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Canton Avenue Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | BR | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | BL | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-17 11:45AM | 4 | 3 | 67 | 21 | 0 | 95 | 3 | 46 | 57 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 399 |
| 12:00PM | 2 | 3 | 67 | 26 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 27 | 56 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 101 | 1 | 373 |
| 12:15PM | 2 | 1 | 93 | 25 | 0 | 121 | 1 | 28 | 47 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 98 | 1 | 394 |
| 12:30PM | 4 | 0 | 85 | 27 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 25 | 44 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 375 |
| Total | 12 | 7 | 312 | 99 | 0 | 430 | 4 | 126 | 204 | 49 | 26 | 0 | 405 | 2 | 1541 |
| \% Approach | 2.8\% | 1.6\% | 72.6\% | 23.0\% | 0\% | - | - | 31.1\% | 50.4\% | 12.1\% | 6.4\% | 0\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.8\% | 0.5\% | 20.2\% | 6.4\% | 0\% | 27.9\% | - | 8.2\% | 13.2\% | 3.2\% | 1.7\% | 0\% | 26.3\% | - | - |
| PHF | 0.750 | 0.583 | 0.839 | 0.917 | - | 0.888 | - | 0.685 | 0.895 | 0.857 | 0.542 | - | 0.856 | - | 0.967 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 12 | 6 | 305 | 97 | 0 | 420 | - | 123 | 202 | 47 | 26 | 0 | 398 | - | 1511 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 85.7\% | 97.8\% | 98.0\% | 0\% | 97.7\% | - | 97.6\% | 99.0\% | 95.9\% | 100\% | 0\% | 98.3\% | - | 98.1\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 6 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 15 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 14.3\% | 1.0\% | 2.0\% | 0\% | 1.4\% | - | 0.8\% | 0.5\% | 2.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | - | 1.0\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 2 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 10 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 1.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | - | 0.8\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | - | 0.6\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 2.0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street, Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Centre Street Southwestbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Canton Avenue Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | HL | U | App | Ped* | HR | BR | BL |  | U | App | Ped* | HR | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |
| 2020-10-17 1:00PM | 7 | 85 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 56 | 4 | 0 | 61 | 1 |
| 1:15PM | 8 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 6 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 47 | 4 | 0 | 54 | 1 |
| 1:30PM | 8 | 97 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 69 | 6 | 0 | 80 | 1 |
| 1:45PM | 9 | 106 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 5 | 1 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 56 | 5 | 0 | 66 | 0 |


| Total | 32 | 382 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 425 | 16 | 5 | 63 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 228 | 19 | 0 | 261 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Approach | 7.5\% | 89.9\% | 2.6\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - | - | 6.0\% | 75.9\% | 18.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | - | 0.8\% | 4.6\% | 87.4\% | 7.3\% | 0\% | - |  |
| \% Total | 2.0\% | 23.5\% | 0.7\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 26.1\% | - | 0.3\% | 3.9\% | 0.9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5.1\% | - | 0.1\% | 0.7\% | 14.0\% | 1.2\% | 0\% | 16.0\% | - |
| PHF | 0.889 | 0.901 | 0.550 | - | - | 0.900 | - | 0.417 | 0.829 | 0.750 | - | - | 0.798 | - | 0.500 | 0.550 | 0.831 | 0.792 | - | 0.816 | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.5\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - |
| Lights | 32 | 366 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 409 | - | 5 | 63 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 83 | - | 2 | 11 | 223 | 19 | 0 | 255 | - |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 95.8\% | 100\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 96.2\% | - | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% |  | 100\% | - | 100\% | 91.7\% | 97.8\% | 100\% | 0\% | 97.7\% | - |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.6\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 1.4\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | - |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - |
| Buses | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 1.8\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.6\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | - |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 8.3\% | 0.9\% | 0\% |  | 1.1\% | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 81.3\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 18.8\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street, Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

ID: 791931, Location: 42.254562, -71.077503, Site Code: S20-003
Fran

| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Leg } \\ \text { Direction } \end{array}$ | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Canton Avenue <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Int |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | BR | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | BL | L | U | App | Ped* |  |  |
| 2020-10-17 1:00PM | 5 | 1 | 84 | 33 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 19 | 34 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 77 | 0 |  | 384 |
| 1:15PM | 3 | 2 | 103 | 22 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 37 | 41 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 98 | 4 |  | 400 |
| 1:30PM | 0 | 3 | 99 | 17 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 23 | 44 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 84 | 2 |  | 412 |
| 1:45PM | 7 | 2 | 73 | 26 | 0 | 108 | 1 | 44 | 55 | 13 | 8 | 0 | 120 | 4 |  | 432 |


| Total | 15 | 8 | 359 | 98 | 0 | 480 | 1 | 123 | 174 | 55 | 27 | 0 | 379 | 10 | 1628 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Approach | 3.1\% | 1.7\% | 74.8\% | 20.4\% | 0\% | - | - | 32.5\% | 45.9\% | 14.5\% | 7.1\% | 0\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.9\% | 0.5\% | 22.1\% | 6.0\% | 0\% | 29.5\% | - | 7.6\% | 10.7\% | 3.4\% | 1.7\% | 0\% | 23.3\% | - | - |
| PHF | 0.536 | 0.667 | 0.871 | 0.742 | - | 0.923 | - | 0.699 | 0.786 | 0.917 | 0.722 | - | 0.792 | - | 0.944 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | - | 4 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1.8\% | 3.7\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 14 | 8 | 348 | 97 | 0 | 467 | - | 120 | 171 | 54 | 25 | 0 | 370 | - | 1584 |
| \% Lights | 93.3\% | 100\% | 96.9\% | 99.0\% | 0\% | 97.3\% | - | 97.6\% | 98.3\% | 98.2\% | 92.6\% | 0\% | 97.6\% | - | 97.3\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 1 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 10 | - | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 21 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 6.7\% | 0\% | 2.2\% | 1.0\% | 0\% | 2.1\% | - | 1.6\% | 1.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.1\% | - | 1.3\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 13 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.6\% | - | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0.8\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | - | 5 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% | 3.7\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | - | 0.3\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 60.0\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 40.0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: UTurn

Full Length (6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
ID: 791941, Location: 42.252491, -71.075425, Site Code: S20-003

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  | Driveway Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Beth Isreal Hospital Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U | App | Ped* | R | T | L U | U |  | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 6:00AM | 35 | 127 | 10 | 163 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 556 | 82 | 0 | 638 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 9 | 0 |  | 2 | 825 |
| 7:00AM | 39 | 313 | 10 | 353 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 644 | 94 | 0 | 738 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 14 | 0 |  | 7 | 1148 |
| 8:00AM | 48 | 392 | $0 \quad 0$ | 440 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 583 | 114 | 0 | 697 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 38 | 8 | 1175 |
| 3:00PM | 32 | 736 | 0 | 768 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 456 | 55 | 0 | 511 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 138 | 7 | 1418 |
| 4:00PM | 22 | 651 | 10 | 674 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 447 | 23 | 0 | 470 | 2 | 68 | 0 | 29 | 0 |  | 6 | 1241 |
| 5:00PM | 13 | 724 | $0 \quad 0$ | 737 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 470 | 22 | 0 | 492 | 3 | 66 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 95 | 7 | 1325 |
| 2020-10-17 11:00AM | 13 | 441 | 0 0 | 454 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 365 | 14 | 0 | 379 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 843 |
| 12:00PM | 12 | 490 | 0 | 502 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 446 | 11 | 0 | 457 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 983 |
| 1:00PM | 11 | 527 | 0 0 | 538 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 451 | 11 | 1 | 464 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 24 | 8 | 1026 |
| Total | 225 | 4401 | 30 | 4629 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 82 | 1 | 4418 | 426 | 1 | 4846 | 8 | 357 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 506 | 56 | 9984 |
| \% Approach | 4.9\% | 95.1\% | 0.1\% 0\% | - |  | 100\% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% 9 | 91.2\% | 8.8\% | 0\% | - |  | 70.6\% 0 | \% 2 | 29.4\% 0\% |  | - |  |  |
| \% Total | 2.3\% | 44.1\% | 0\% 0\% | 46.4\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 44.3\% | 4.3\% | 0\% | 48.5\% |  | 3.6\% 0 | \% | 1.5\% 0\% | \% | 5.1\% |  |  |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 7 | $0 \quad 0$ | 7 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 15 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 221 | 4201 | 30 | 4425 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 1 | 4224 | 386 | 1 | 4612 |  | 311 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 458 | - | 9498 |
| \% Lights | 98.2\% 9 | 95.5\% | 100\% 0\% | 95.6\% |  | 100\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 1 | 100\% | - | 100\% 9 | 95.6\% | 90.6\% 1 | 100\% | 95.2\% |  | 87.1\% 0 | 0\% 9 | 98.7\% 0\% | \% 9 | 90.5\% |  | 95.1\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 4 | 84 | $0 \quad 0$ | 88 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 86 | 2 | 0 | 88 |  | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 |  | 181 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 1.8\% | 1.9\% | 0\% 0\% | 1.9\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 1.9\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 1.8\% |  | 1.1\% 0 | 0\% | 0.7\% 0\% | \% | 1.0\% | - | 1.8\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 10 | $0 \quad 0$ | 10 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 15 | - | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | - | 28 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0.7\% | 0\% | 0.3\% |  | 0.6\% 0 | 0\% | 0.7\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% |  | 0.3\% |
| Buses | 0 | 98 | $0 \quad 0$ | 98 |  | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 79 | 35 | 0 | 114 |  | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |  | 252 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 2.2\% | 0\% 0\% | 2.1\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 1.8\% | 8.2\% | 0\% | 2.4\% | - | 11.2\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 7.9\% |  | 2.5\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 1 | $0 \quad 0$ | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 10 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 13 | - | - | - | - | - | 72 | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | 43 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 87.8\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 76.8\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 13 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - - | - |  | - | - | - | - |  | 12.2\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 23.2\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

## 207528 (7) Reedsdale Rd @ Beth Isreal Hospit... - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
AM Peak (Oct 152020 7:30AM - 8:30 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data
Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Driveway Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Beth Isreal Hospital Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U | U | App |  | R | T |  |  |  | Ped* | R | T | L U | U | App |  | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 7:30AM | 7 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 |  | 0 | 203 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 310 |
| 7:45AM | 6 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 164 |  | 0 | 200 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 327 |
| 8:00AM | 15 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 127 |  | 0 | 150 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 265 |
| 8:15AM | 14 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 157 |  | 0 | 185 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 297 |
| Total | 42 | 374 | 0 | 0 | 416 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 634 | 104 | 0 | 738 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 45 | 2 | 1199 |
| \% Approach | 10.1\% | 89.9\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - | - | 0\% | 85.9\% | 14.1\% 0\% |  | - | - | 86.7\% 0 | \% | 13.3\% 0 |  |  |  |  |
| \% Total | 3.5\% | 31.2\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 3 | 34.7\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  |  | 52.9\% | 8.7\% 0\% | \% | 61.6\% |  | 3.3\% 0 |  | 0.5\% 0\% |  | 3.8\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.700 | 0.842 | - | - 0 | 0.889 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | 0.849 | 0.722 | - | 0.906 | - | 0.696 | - | 0.750 | - | 0.703 |  | 0.921 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.3\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 41 | 346 | 0 | 0 | 387 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 594 |  | 0 | 691 | - | 32 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 37 |  | 1115 |
| \% Lights | 97.6\% | 92.5\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 9 | 93.0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - |  |  | 93.7\% | 93.3\% 0\% | \% 9 | 93.6\% | - | 82.1\% 0 | \% | 83.3\% 0 | \% | 32.2\% |  | 93.0\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 11 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 33 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 2.4\% | 2.7\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 2.6\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 3.5\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 3.0\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 2.8\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | 5 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.5\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.5\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | - |  | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% 0 | \% | 16.7\% 0\% | \% | 2.2\% | - | 0.4\% |
| Buses | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 21 | - | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | - | 43 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 4.0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 3.6\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 2.2\% | 6.7\% 0\% | \% | 2.8\% | - | 17.9\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 15.6\% | - | 3.6\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | - |  | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.3\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

## 207528 (7) Reedsdale Rd @ Beth Isreal Hospit... - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
PM Peak (Oct 152020 3PM - 4 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data
Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
ID: 791941, Location: 42.252491, -71.075425, Site Code: S20-003
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  | Driveway Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Beth Isreal Hospital Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U | App | Ped* |  |  | L U | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App |  | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-15 3:00PM | 7 | 176 | 0 | 183 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 121 | 19 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 13 | 0 |  | 0 | 361 |
| 3:15PM | 8 | 177 | 0 | 185 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 113 | 17 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  | 1 | 353 |
| 3:30PM | 12 | 172 | $0 \quad 0$ | 184 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 119 |  | 0 | 131 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 33 | 2 | 348 |
| 3:45PM | 5 | 211 | 0 | 216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 103 | 7 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 30 | 4 | 356 |
| Total | 32 | 736 | $0 \quad 0$ | 768 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 456 | 55 | 0 | 511 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 138 | 7 | 1418 |
| \% Approach | 4.2\% 9 | 95.8\% 0 | \% 0\% |  |  | 100\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  |  | 89.2\% | 10.8\% 0 |  | - |  | 76.1\% 0 | \% 2 | 23.9\% 0\% |  |  |  |  |
| \% Total | 2.3\% 5 | 51.9\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 54.2\% |  | 0.1\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.1\% |  |  | 32.2\% | 3.9\% 0\% | \% 3 | 36.0\% |  | 7.4\% 0\% | \% | 2.3\% 0\% |  | 9.7\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.667 | 0.872 | - - | 0.889 |  | 0.250 | - | - | - 0 | 0.250 |  |  | 0.942 | 0.724 | - 0 | 0.913 |  | 0.795 | - 0 | 0.635 |  | 0.908 |  | 0.982 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 2 | $0 \quad 0$ | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.3\% 0 | \% 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 32 | 698 | $0 \quad 0$ | 730 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 435 | 47 | 0 | 482 |  | 96 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 129 |  | 1342 |
| \% Lights | 100\% 9 | 94.8\% 0 | \% 0\% | 95.1\% |  | 100\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 1 | 100\% |  |  | 95.4\% | 85.5\% 0\% | \% 9 | 94.3\% |  | 91.4\% 0\% | \% | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 93.5\% |  | 94.6\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 23 | $0 \quad 0$ | 23 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 29 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 3.1\% 0 | \% 0\% | 3.0\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 1.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.2\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 2.0\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | $0 \quad 0$ | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 4 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.1\% 0 | \%\% 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.4\% |  | 1.0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.7\% | - | 0.3\% |
| Buses | 0 | 12 | $0 \quad 0$ | 12 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 20 |  | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | 40 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 1.6\% 0 | \% 0\% | 1.6\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 2.6\% | 14.5\% 0\% | \% | 3.9\% | - | 7.6\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 5.8\% | - | 2.8\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | 83.3\% | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - |  | 42.9\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 16.7\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | 57.1\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

## 207528 (7) Reedsdale Rd @ Beth Isreal Hospit... - TMC

Sat Oct 17, 2020
Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 12PM - 1 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data
Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
ID: 791941, Location: 42.252491, -71.075425, Site Code: S20-003
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Driveway Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Beth Isreal Hospital Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T |  | U | App | Ped* |  | T |  |  |  | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App |  | R T | L U | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-17 12:00PM | 2 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 93 | 3 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 30 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 233 |
| 12:15PM | 4 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 128 | 3 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 30 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 254 |
| 12:30PM | 2 | 128 |  | 0 | 130 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 2 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 20 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 249 |
| 12:45PM | 4 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 113 | 3 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 40 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 247 |
| Total | 12 | 490 | 0 | 0 | 502 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 446 |  | 0 | 457 | 0 | 120 | 12 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 983 |
| \% Approach | 2.4\% | 97.6\% | \% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0 | \% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 97.6\% | 2.4\% 0\% |  | - |  | 50.0\% 0\% | 50.0\% 0\% |  | - |  |  |
| \% Total | 1.2\% | 49.8\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 51.1\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  |  | 45.4\% | 1.1\% 0\% | \% 4 | 46.5\% |  | 1.2\% 0\% | 1.2\% 0\% | \% | 2.4\% | - |  |
| PHF | 0.750 | 0.957 | - | - | 0.965 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | 0.871 | 0.917 | - | 0.872 |  | 0.750 | 0.600 | - 0 | 0.750 | - | 0.968 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | \% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0\% |
| Lights | 11 | 484 | 0 | 0 | 495 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 435 |  | 0 | 446 |  | 120 | 12 | 0 | 24 |  | 965 |
| \% Lights | 91.7\% | 98.8\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 98.6\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | \% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 97.5\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 97.6\% |  | 100\% 0\% | 100\% 0\% | \% | 100\% |  | 98.2\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 9 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 8.3\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 1.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.3\% | - | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0.9\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | \%\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 8 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.8\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - | - | 0\% | 0.9\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.9\% | - | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0.8\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | - |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 4 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |  | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | - | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

## 207528 (7) Reedsdale Rd @ Beth Isreal Hospit... - TMC

Sat Oct 17, 2020
PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data
Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Driveway Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Beth Isreal Hospital Drive Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L U | U A | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-17 1:00PM | 5 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 118 | 3 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 238 |
| 1:15PM | 2 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 108 | 5 | 0 | 113 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 256 |
| 1:30PM | 3 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 118 | 2 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 243 |
| 1:45PM | 1 | 172 | 0 | 0 | 173 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 107 | 1 | 1 | 109 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 289 |
| Total | 11 | 527 | 0 | 0 | 538 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 451 | 11 | 1 | 464 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 24 | 8 | 1026 |
| \% Approach | 2.0\% | 98.0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  |  | 0\% 0 | \% 0\% |  | - | - | 0.2\% | 97.2\% | 2.4\% | 0.2\% |  |  | 50.0\% 0 | \% 5 | 50.0\% 0\% |  |  |  |  |
| \% Total | 1.1\% 5 | 51.4\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 5 | 52.4\% |  |  | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% | 44.0\% | 1.1\% | 0.1\% | 45.2\% |  | 1.2\% 0\% | \% | 1.2\% 0\% |  | 2.3\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.550 | 0.766 | - | - 0 | 0.777 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 0.250 | 0.951 | 0.5500 | 0.250 | 0.947 |  | 0.600 | - 0 | 0.750 |  | 0.857 | - | 0.886 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - 1 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  |  | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 11 | 508 | 0 | 0 | 519 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 439 | 11 | 1 | 452 |  | 12 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 23 |  | 994 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 96.4\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 9 | 96.5\% |  |  | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - | - | 100\% | 97.3\% | 100\% 1 | 100\% | 97.4\% |  | 100\% 0 | \% 9 | 91.7\% 0\% | \% 9 | 55.8\% |  | 96.9\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 17 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.9\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.9\% |  |  | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - | - | 0\% | 1.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.3\% |  | 0\% 0 | \% | 8.3\% 0\% |  | 4.2\% | - | 1.7\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  |  | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% |
| Buses | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 12 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 1.5\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.5\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - | - | 0\% | 0.9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.9\% |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 1.2\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  |  | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - | - | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |  | - | - | - | - | 70.0\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 50.0\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - | - | 30.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  | - | - | - |  | 50.0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

Thu Oct 15, 2020
Full Length ( 6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
ID: 791955, Location: 42.248591, -71.069222, Site Code: S20-003
Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 6:00AM | 4 | 83 | 3 | 0 | 90 | 6 | 4 | 46 | 48 | 0 | 98 | 1 | 7 | 479 | 593 | 0 | 1079 | 1 | 112 | 35 | 5 | 0 | 152 | 1 | 1419 |
| 7:00AM | 12 | 168 | 9 | 0 | 189 | 9 | 6 | 131 | 101 | 0 | 238 | 2 | 17 | 400 | 639 | 0 | 1056 | 8 | 242 | 114 | 10 | 0 | 366 | 0 | 1849 |
| 8:00AM | 19 | 221 | 9 | 0 | 249 | 8 | 5 | 156 | 125 | 0 | 286 | 0 | 7 | 365 | 600 | 0 | 972 | 6 | 320 | 136 | 11 | 0 | 467 | 0 | 1974 |
| 3:00PM | 20 | 323 | 2 | 0 | 345 | 6 | 4 | 144 | 255 | 0 | 403 | 3 | 10 | 276 | 365 | 0 | 651 | 5 | 630 | 194 | 10 | 0 | 834 | 4 | 2233 |
| 4:00PM | 9 | 337 | 9 | 0 | 355 | 8 | 7 | 152 | 205 | 0 | 364 | 2 | 19 | 277 | 352 | 0 | 648 | 5 | 570 | 198 | 4 | 1 | 773 | 3 | 2140 |
| 5:00PM | 9 | 313 | 2 | 0 | 324 | 7 | 5 | 143 | 170 | 0 | 318 | 2 | 20 | 344 | 369 | 0 | 733 | 7 | 594 | 234 | 8 | 0 | 836 | 2 | 2211 |
| 2020-10-17 11:00AM | 16 | 190 | 13 | 0 | 219 | 10 | 9 | 118 | 109 | 0 | 236 | 6 | 16 | 227 | 316 | 0 | 559 | 6 | 328 | 150 | 9 | 0 | 487 | 3 | 1501 |
| 12:00PM | 15 | 211 | 9 | 0 | 235 | 5 | 10 | 123 | 103 | 0 | 236 | 0 | 12 | 242 | 347 | 0 | 601 | 1 | 376 | 132 | 7 | 0 | 515 | 0 | 1587 |
| 1:00PM | 13 | 270 | 12 | 0 | 295 | 5 | 11 | 129 | 155 | 0 | 295 | 0 | 26 | 281 | 367 | 0 | 674 | 4 | 410 | 152 | 11 | 0 | 573 | 1 | 1837 |
| Total | 117 | 2116 | 68 | 0 | 2301 | 64 | 61 | 1142 | 1271 | 0 | 2474 | 16 | 134 | 2891 | 3948 | 0 | 6973 | 43 | 3582 | 1345 | 75 | 1 | 5003 | 14 | 16751 |
| \% Approach | 5.1\% | 92.0\% | 3.0\% 0\% |  | - | - | 2.5\% | 46.2\% | 51.4\% 0\% |  | - | - | 1.9\% | 41.5\% | 56.6\% |  | - | - | 71.6\% | 26.9\% | 1.5\% | 0\% | - | - |  |
| \% Total | 0.7\% 1 | 12.6\% | 0.4\% 0\% | \% 1 | 13.7\% | - | 0.4\% | 6.8\% | 7.6\% 0\% | \% 1 | 14.8\% | - | 0.8\% | 17.3\% | 23.6\% | 0\% 4 | 41.6\% | - | 21.4\% | 8.0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 29.9\% | - | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 15 | - | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | 30 |
| \% Motorcycles |  | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% 0 | \% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 113 | 2052 | 65 | 0 | 2230 | - | 60 | 1114 | 1233 | 0 | 2407 | - | 120 | 2805 | 3775 | 0 | 6700 | - | 3421 | 1318 | 70 | 1 | 4810 | - | 16147 |
| \% Lights | 96.6\% 9 | 97.0\% | 95.6\% 0\% | \% 9 | 96.9\% | - | 98.4\% | 97.5\% | 97.0\% 0 | \% 9 | 97.3\% | - | 89.6\% | 97.0\% | 95.6\% | 0\% 9 | 96.1\% | - | 95.5\% | 98.0\% | 93.3\% | 00\% | 96.1\% | - | 96.4\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 2 | 45 | 2 | 0 | 49 | - | 0 | 6 | 25 | 0 | 31 | - | 10 | 54 | 81 | 0 | 145 | - | 62 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 74 | - | 299 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.9\% 0\% |  | 2.1\% | - | 0\% | 0.5\% | 2.0\% 0 | \% | 1.3\% | - | 7.5\% | 1.9\% | 2.1\% 0 | 0\% | 2.1\% | - | 1.7\% | 0.7\% | 2.7\% | 0\% | 1.5\% | - | 1.8\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 | - | 1 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 19 | - | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 11 | - | 40 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.9\% | 0.1\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0.2\% 0 |  | 0.2\% | - | 0.7\% | 0.3\% | 0.2\% 0 | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 1.3\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Buses | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 12 | - | 0 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 18 | - | 2 | 16 | 73 | 0 | 91 | - | 85 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 97 | - | 218 |
| \% Buses | 0.9\% | 0.5\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.5\% | - | 0\% | 1.1\% | 0.5\% 0 |  | 0.7\% | - | 1.5\% | 0.6\% | 1.8\% 0 | 0\% | 1.3\% | - | 2.4\% | 0.7\% | 2.7\% | 0\% | 1.9\% | - | 1.3\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | - | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 9 | - | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 17 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 1.5\% 0\% |  | 0.1\% | - | 1.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.1\% 0 |  | 0.4\% | - | 0.7\% | 0.1\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 60 | - | - | - | - | - | 14 | - | - | - | - | - | 27 | - | - | - | - | - | 13 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - |  | 93.8\% | - | - | - | - |  | 87.5\% | - | - | - | - | - | 62.8\% | - | - | - | - | - | 92.9\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 16 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 6.3\% | - | - | - | - | - | 12.5\% | - | - |  | - | - | 37.2\% | - | - | - | - | - | 7.1\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

Thu Oct 15, 2020
AM Peak (Oct 152020 7:30AM - 8:30 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U |  | Ped* | R | T | L U | U | App |  |  |
| 2020-10-15 7:30AM | 4 | 41 | 2 | 0 | 47 | 4 | 2 | 55 | 25 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 1 | 105 | 158 | 0 | 264 | 3 | 61 | 42 | 3 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 499 |
| 7:45AM | 3 | 61 | 5 | 0 | 69 | 3 | 2 | 24 | 32 | 0 | 58 | 1 | 7 | 105 | 175 | 0 | 287 | 0 | 67 | 38 | 4 | 0 | 109 | 0 | 523 |
| 8:00AM | 7 | 54 | 2 | 0 | 63 | 2 | 1 | 36 | 35 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 3 | 102 | 142 | 0 | 247 | 1 | 70 | 44 | 1 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 497 |
| 8:15AM | 4 | 78 | 3 | 0 | 85 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 38 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 144 | 0 | 238 | 5 | 83 | 27 | 3 | 0 | 113 | 0 | 526 |
| Total | 18 | 234 | 12 | 0 | 264 | 10 | 7 | 165 | 130 | 0 | 302 | 1 | 11 | 406 | 619 | 0 | 1036 | 9 | 281 | 151 | 11 | 0 |  | 0 | 2045 |
| \% Approach | 6.8\% | 88.6\% | 4.5\% 0\% |  | - |  | 2.3\% | 54.6\% | 43.0\% 0 |  | - |  | 1.1\% | 39.2\% | 59.7\% 0\% |  | - |  | 63.4\% | 34.1\% | 2.5\% 0\% |  |  | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.9\% | 11.4\% | 0.6\% 0\% | \% 12 | 2.9\% |  | 0.3\% | 8.1\% | 6.4\% 0 | \% 1 | 14.8\% |  | 0.5\% | 19.9\% | 30.3\% 0\% | \% 5 | 50.7\% |  | 13.7\% | 7.4\% | 0.5\% 0\% | \% 21 | 21.7\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.643 | 0.7500 | 0.600 |  | 0.776 |  | 0.875 | 0.759 | 0.855 |  | 0.836 |  | 0.393 | 0.967 | 0.884 | - 0 | 0.902 |  | 0.843 | 0.858 | 0.688 | - 0 | 0.961 |  | 0.971 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.9\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.8\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 17 | 224 | 12 | 0 | 253 |  | 7 | 158 | 122 | 0 | 287 | - | 7 | 387 | 583 | 0 | 977 | - | 260 | 147 | 10 | 0 | 417 |  | 1934 |
| \% Lights | 94.4\% | 95.7\% 1 | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 95.8\% |  | 100\% | 95.8\% | 93.8\% 0 | \% 9 | 95.0\% | - | 63.6\% | 95.3\% | 94.2\% 0\% | 0\% 9 | 94.3\% |  | 92.5\% | 97.4\% | 90.9\% 0\% | \% 94 | 94.1\% |  | 94.6\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 4 | 12 | 23 | 0 | 39 |  | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 |  | 53 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 5.6\% | 1.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.5\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 1.5\% 0 | \% | 0.7\% |  | 36.4\% | 3.0\% | 3.7\% 0\% | \% | 3.8\% |  | 2.1\% | 1.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.8\% | - | 2.6\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 9 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 1.0\% | 0.5\% 0\% | 0\% | 0.7\% |  | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.5\% | - | 0.4\% |
| Buses | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 12 |  | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 13 | - | 13 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 15 | - | 45 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 2.1\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.9\% |  | 0\% | 3.6\% | 4.6\% 0 | 0\% | 4.0\% | - | 0\% | 0.7\% | 1.6\% 0\% | 0\% | 1.3\% |  | 4.6\% | 0.7\% | 9.1\% 0\% | \% | 3.4\% | - | 2.2\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 2 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% | 0.3\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.2\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

[^25]
## 207528 (8) Reedsdale Road (Route 28) @ Rando... - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
PM Peak (Oct 152020 3:15PM - 4:15 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
ID: 791955, Location: 42.248591, -71.069222, Site Code: S20-003
Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U |  | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U |  | Ped* | R | T | L | U |  | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 3:15PM | 6 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 1 | 39 | 64 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 73 | 91 | 0 | 165 | 0 | 168 | 51 | 4 | 0 |  | 2 | 572 |
| 3:30PM | 5 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 2 | 1 | 28 | 76 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 4 | 66 | 106 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 157 | 41 | 2 | 0 | 200 | 1 | 576 |
| 3:45PM | 1 | 88 | 20 | 0 | 91 | 4 | 1 | 26 | 63 | 0 | 90 | 3 | 4 | 76 | 79 | 0 | 159 | 5 | 164 | 53 | 1 | 0 | 218 | 0 | 558 |
| 4:00PM | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 3 | 2 | 44 | 81 | 0 | 127 | 2 | 6 | 79 | 92 | 0 | 177 | 2 | 147 | 49 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 593 |
| Total | 12 | 344 | 2 | 0 | 358 | 9 | 5 | 137 | 284 | 0 | 426 | 5 | 15 | 294 | 368 | 0 | 677 | 7 | 636 | 194 | 8 | 0 | 838 | 3 | 2299 |
| \% Approach | 3.4\% 9 | 96.1\% | 0.6\% 0\% |  | - |  | 1.2\% | 32.2\% | 66.7\% 0 |  |  |  | 2.2\% | 43.4\% | 54.4\% 0\% |  | - |  | 75.9\% | 23.2\% | 1.0\% 0\% |  |  |  | - |
| \% Total | 0.5\% | 15.0\% | 0.1\% 0\% | \% 1 | 15.6\% |  | 0.2\% | 6.0\% | 12.4\% 0 | \% 1 | 18.5\% |  | 0.7\% | 12.8\% | 16.0\% 0\% | \% 29 | 29.4\% |  | 27.7\% | 8.4\% | 0.3\% 0 | \% | 36.5\% |  | - |
| PHF | 0.500 | 0.9350 | 0.250 |  | 0.942 |  | 0.625 | 0.778 | 0.877 |  | 0.839 |  | 0.625 | 0.930 | 0.868 | - 0 | 0.956 |  | 0.946 | 0.928 | 0.500 |  | 0.938 |  | 0.969 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 8 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.3\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% 0 | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0.8\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% |  | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.2\% |  | 0.3\% |
| Lights | 12 | 329 | 2 | 0 | 343 |  | 5 | 134 | 272 | 0 | 411 |  | 13 | 288 | 354 | 0 | 655 |  | 604 | 191 | 6 | 0 | 801 |  | 2210 |
| \% Lights | 100\% 9 | 95.6\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 95.8\% |  | 100\% | 97.8\% | 95.8\% 0 | 0\% | 96.5\% |  | 86.7\% | 98.0\% | 96.2\% 0\% | \% 9 | 96.8\% |  | 95.0\% | 98.5\% | 75.0\% 0 | \% | 95.6\% |  | 96.1\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |  | 0 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 13 |  | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 7 |  | 19 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 21 |  | 55 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 4.1\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 3.9\% |  | 0\% | 1.5\% | 3.9\% 0 | \% | 3.1\% |  | 13.3\% | 0.3\% | 1.1\% 0\% | \% | 1.0\% |  | 3.0\% | 0.5\% | 12.5\% 0\% |  | 2.5\% | - | 2.4\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.1\% |  | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.1\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 10 |  | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12 | - | 23 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 1.0\% | 1.9\% 0\% | \% | 1.5\% |  | 1.6\% | 0.5\% | 12.5\% 0\% |  | 1.4\% | - | 1.0\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.1\% | - | 0\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - |  | 88.9\% | - | - | - | - |  | 80.0\% | - | - | - | - |  | 14.3\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - |  | 11.1\% | - | - | - | - |  | 20.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 85.7\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

207528 (8) Reedsdale Road (Route 28) @ Rando... - TMC
Sat Oct 17, 2020
Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 11:45AM - 12:45 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U |  | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L U | U | App |  |  |
| 2020-10-17 11:45AM | 3 | 61 | 40 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 35 | 0 | 64 | 3 | 6 | 68 | 83 | 0 |  | 2 | 108 | 42 | 3 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 442 |
| 12:00PM | 3 | 53 | 1 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 41 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 3 | 64 | 73 | 0 | 140 | 1 | 94 | 38 | 1 | 0 | 133 | 0 | 399 |
| 12:15PM | 4 | 59 | 20 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 19 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 4 | 56 | 104 | 0 |  | 0 | 90 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 396 |
| 12:30PM | 2 | 44 | 10 |  | 47 | 3 | 2 | 34 | 22 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 4 | 72 | 93 | 0 | 169 | 0 | 107 | 31 | 2 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 414 |
| Total | 12 | 217 | 80 | 0 | 237 | 3 | 9 | 117 | 117 | 0 | 243 | 3 | 17 | 260 | 353 | 0 | 630 | 3 | 399 | 133 | 9 | 0 | 541 | 0 | 1651 |
| \% Approach | 5.1\% | 91.6\% | 3.4\% 0\% |  | - |  | 3.7\% | 48.1\% | 48.1\% 0\% |  | - |  | 2.7\% | 41.3\% 5 | 56.0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 73.8\% 2 | 24.6\% | 1.7\% 0\% |  | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.7\% | 13.1\% | 0.5\% 0\% | \% 1 | 14.4\% |  | 0.5\% | 7.1\% | 7.1\% 0\% | \% 1 | 14.7\% |  | 1.0\% | 15.7\% | 21.4\% 0\% | \% 3 | 38.2\% |  | 24.2\% | 8.1\% 0 | 0.5\% 0\% | \% | 32.8\% |  | - |
| PHF | 0.750 | 0.8890 | 0.500 |  | 0.871 |  | 0.750 | 0.860 | 0.707 |  | 0.877 |  | 0.708 | 0.903 | 0.849 |  | 0.932 |  | 0.924 | 0.7920 | 0.750 |  | 0.884 | - | 0.933 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% |
| Lights | 11 | 214 | $8 \quad 0$ | 0 | 233 |  | 9 | 116 | 114 | 0 | 239 |  | 16 | 259 | 346 | 0 | 621 | - | 392 | 132 | 9 | 0 | 533 |  | 1626 |
| \% Lights | 91.7\% | 98.6\% 1 | 100\% 0\% | \% 98 | 88.3\% |  | 100\% | 99.1\% | 97.4\% 0\% | \% 9 | 98.4\% |  | 94.1\% | 99.6\% | 98.0\% 0\% | \% 9 | 98.6\% |  | 98.2\% 9 | 99.2\% 1 | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 88.5\% |  | 98.5\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 1 | 3 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 13 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 8.3\% | 1.4\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 1.7\% |  | 0\% | 0.9\% | 1.7\% 0\% | 0\% | 1.2\% |  | 5.9\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% 0\% | \% | 0.8\% |  | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.2\% |  | 0.8\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 2 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.2\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | - | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | - | 9 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% 0\% | \% | 0.5\% | - | 1.3\% | 0.8\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 1.1\% | - | 0.5\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.9\% 0\% | \% | 0.4\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 66.7\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  | - |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - |  | 33.3\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

[^26]207528 (8) Reedsdale Road (Route 28) @ Rando... - TMC
Sat Oct 17, 2020
PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
All Movements
46 Morton Street,
ID: 791955, Location: 42.248591, -71.069222, Site Code: S20-003 Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reedsdale Road (Route 28) Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U |  | App | Ped* | R | T |  |  | App |  | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U |  | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-17 1:00PM | 3 | 57 | 5 | 0 | 65 | 1 | 0 | 36 | 30 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 6 | 74 | 90 | 0 | 170 | 0 | 101 | 29 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 | 434 |
| 1:15PM | 3 | 54 | 4 | 0 | 61 | 3 | 1 | 30 | 38 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 9 | 70 | 107 | 0 | 186 | 1 | 91 | 41 | 2 | 0 |  | 1 | 450 |
| 1:30PM | 3 | 81 | 2 | 0 | 86 | 1 | 5 | 28 | 44 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 7 | 76 | 98 | 0 | 181 | 3 | 103 | 35 | 4 | 0 |  | 0 | 486 |
| 1:45PM | 4 | 78 | 1 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 5 | 35 | 43 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 4 | 61 | 72 | 0 | 137 | 0 | 115 | 47 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 467 |
| Total | 13 | 270 | 12 | 0 | 295 | 5 | 11 | 129 | 155 | 0 | 295 | 0 | 26 | 281 | 367 | 0 | 674 | 4 | 410 | 152 | 11 | 0 |  | 1 | 1837 |
| \% Approach | 4.4\% 9 | 91.5\% | 4.1\% 0\% |  | - | - | 3.7\% | 43.7\% | 52.5\% 0\% |  | - |  | 3.9\% | 41.7\% 5 | 54.5\% 0 |  | - |  | 71.6\% | 26.5\% | 1.9\% 0\% |  | - |  | - |
| \% Total | 0.7\% | 14.7\% | 0.7\% 0\% | \% 16 | 6.1\% | - | 0.6\% | 7.0\% | 8.4\% 0\% | \% 1 | 16.1\% |  | 1.4\% | 15.3\% | 20.0\% 0 | \% | 36.7\% |  | 22.3\% | 8.3\% | 0.6\% 0\% | \% | 1.2\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.813 | 0.833 | 0.600 |  | 0.858 | - | 0.550 | 0.896 | 0.881 | - 0 | 0.889 |  | 0.722 | 0.921 | 0.857 | - | 0.909 |  | 0.891 | 0.8090 | 0.688 | - | 0.873 |  | 0.944 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 3 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.6\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 | \% | 0\% |  | 0.2\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 13 | 266 | $11 \quad 0$ | 0 | 290 | - | 11 | 128 | 153 | 0 | 292 | - | 26 | 280 | 358 | 0 | 664 |  | 399 | 148 | 11 | 0 |  |  | 1804 |
| \% Lights | 100\% 9 | 98.5\% | 91.7\% 0\% | \% 98 | 8.3\% | - | 100\% | 99.2\% | 98.7\% 0\% | \% 9 | 99.0\% | - | 100\% | 99.6\% | 97.5\% 0 | \% | 98.5\% |  | 97.3\% | 97.4\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 7.4\% |  | 98.2\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | - | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |  | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 |  | 20 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.5\% | 8.3\% 0\% |  | 1.7\% | - | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0.6\% 0\% | \% | 0.7\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1.4\% 0 | \% | 0.7\% |  | 1.2\% | 2.0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.4\% |  | 1.1\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 9 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1.1\% 0 | \% | 0.6\% |  | 1.2\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.9\% |  | 0.5\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.1\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - |  | 60.0\% | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - |  | 40.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

## 207528 (9) Randolph Avenue (Route 28) @ Reed... - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
Full Length (6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI)

46 Morton Street,
ID: 791957, Location: 42.242814, -71.069414, Site Code: S20-003

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  | Access Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reed Street <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R T | L U | App | Ped* |  | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L U | U |  | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 6:00AM | 0220 | 0 | 220 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1247 | 35 | 0 | 1282 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1506 |
| 7:00AM | 8503 | 0 | 511 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1200 | 7 | 0 | 1207 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 1733 |
| 8:00AM | 6636 | 0 0 | 642 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1054 | 10 | 0 | 1064 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 52 | 1 | 1758 |
| 3:00PM | 121182 | $0 \quad 0$ | 1194 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 743 | 35 | 0 | 778 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 23 | 1 | 1995 |
| 4:00PM | 171074 | 10 | 1092 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 805 | 35 | 0 | 840 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 1964 |
| 5:00PM | 51057 | 0 | 1062 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 852 | 28 | 0 | 880 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 1956 |
| 2020-10-17 11:00AM | 5613 | $0 \quad 0$ | 618 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 676 | 21 | 0 | 697 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 1326 |
| 12:00PM | 4682 | 0 | 686 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 767 | 28 | 1 | 796 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1487 |
| 1:00PM | 5820 | 0 0 | 825 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 853 | 31 | 1 | 885 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 1722 |
| Total | 626787 | 10 | 6850 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 8197 | 230 | 2 | 8429 | 3 | 48 | 0 | 117 | 0 | 165 | 7 | 15447 |
| \% Approach | 0.9\% 99.1\% | 0\% 0\% | - | - - | 33.3\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 66 | 66.7\% | - |  | 0\% 9 | 97.2\% | 2.7\% | 0\% | - |  | 29.1\% 0\% | \%\% 70 | 70.9\% 0\% |  |  |  |  |
| \% Total | 0.4\% 43.9\% | 0\% 0\% 4 | 44.3\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% 5 | 53.1\% | 1.5\% | 0\% 5 | 54.6\% |  | 0.3\% 0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% 0\% |  | 1.1\% |  |  |
| Motorcycles | $0 \quad 12$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 12 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 28 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 586539 | $1 \quad 0$ | 6598 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | - | 0 | 7913 | 229 | 2 | 8144 |  | 48 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 160 |  | 14905 |
| \% Lights | 93.5\% 96.3\% | 100\% 0\% 9 | 96.3\% |  | 100\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 1 | 100\% 1 | 100\% |  | 0\% | 96.5\% | 99.6\% | 100\% 9 | 96.6\% |  | 100\% 0\% | \%\% 9 | 95.7\% 0\% | \% 9 | 97.0\% |  | 96.5\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | $4 \quad 112$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 116 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 139 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 256 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 6.5\% 1.7\% | 0\% 0\% | 1.7\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 1.7\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.6\% | - | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 0.9\% 0\% |  | 0.6\% |  | 1.7\% |
| Articulated Trucks | $0 \quad 11$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 11 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 35 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.9\% 0\% |  | 0.6\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Buses | $0 \quad 106$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 106 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 100 | 1 | 0 | 101 | - | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |  | 210 |
| \% Buses | 0\% 1.6\% | 0\% 0\% | 1.5\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 1.2\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 1.2\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 2.6\% 0\% |  | 1.8\% |  | 1.4\% |
| Bicycles on Road | $0 \quad 7$ | $0 \quad 0$ | 7 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 13 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% 0.1\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - - | - - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 5 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - - | - - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 56.3\% | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 71.4\% |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - - | - - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - - | - - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - |  | 43.8\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - |  | 28.6\% | - |

[^27]AM Peak (Oct 152020 7:30AM - 8:30 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Access Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reed Street <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U |  | App |  |  |  | T |  |  |  | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 7:30AM | 3 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 330 | 4 | 0 | 334 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 468 |
| 7:45AM | 5 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 1 | 0 | 301 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 471 |
| 8:00AM | 2 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275 | 2 | 0 | 277 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 452 |
| 8:15AM | 0 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 260 | 3 | 0 | 263 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 455 |
| Total | 10 | 626 | 0 | 0 | 636 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1165 | 10 | 0 | 1175 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 35 | 1 | 1846 |
| \% Approach | 1.6\% | 98.4\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  |  | \% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - | - |  | 99.1\% | 0.9\% 0\% |  | - | - | 37.1\% 0 | \% | 62.9\% 0 |  | - |  | - |
| \% Total | 0.5\% | 33.9\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 3 | 34.5\% |  |  | \% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  |  | 63.1\% | 0.5\% 0\% | \% | 63.7\% | - | 0.7\% 0\% |  | 1.2\% 0\% |  | 1.9\% |  | - |
| PHF | 0.500 | 0.860 | - | - 0 | 0.874 |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.882 | 0.625 | - | 0.879 | - | 0.650 | - | 0.611 | - | 0.625 |  | 0.981 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 3 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.5\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.5\% |  |  | \% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 7 | 586 | 0 | 0 | 593 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1108 | 10 | 0 | 1118 | - | 13 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 32 |  | 1743 |
| \% Lights | 70.0\% | 93.6\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 9 | 93.2\% |  |  | \% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 95.1\% | 100\% 0\% | \% | 95.1\% | - | 100\% 0\% | \% | 86.4\% 0 | \% | 91.4\% |  | 94.4\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 13 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 35 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 48 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 30.0\% | 1.6\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 2.0\% |  |  | \% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 3.0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 3.0\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 2.6\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 9 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.3\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% |  |  | \% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0.5\% |
| Buses | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 | - | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | - | 42 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 4.0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 3.9\% |  |  | \% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - | - | 0\% | 1.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.2\% | - | 0\% 0 | \% | 13.6\% 0 | \% | 8.6\% | - | 2.3\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  |  | \% 0 | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.1\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

PM Peak (Oct 152020 3:15PM - 4:15 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street, Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

ID: 791957, Location: 42.242814, -71.069414, Site Code: S20-003

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  | Access Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reed Street <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U | App |  |  |  | L U | U |  | Ped* | * | T | L U | U | App |  |  | T |  | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 3:15PM | 2 | 297 | 0 | 299 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 168 | 7 | 0 | 175 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 478 |
| 3:30PM | 6 | 325 | 0 | 331 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 209 | 11 | 0 | 220 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 558 |
| 3:45PM | 2 | 309 | 0 0 | 311 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 5 | 0 | 192 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 508 |
| 4:00PM | 4 | 319 | 10 | 324 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 0 | 203 | 7 | 0 | 210 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 543 |
| Total | 14 | 1250 | 10 | 1265 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 30 | 767 | 30 | 0 | 797 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 2087 |
| \% Approach | 1.1\% 9 | 98.8\% | 0.1\% 0\% | - | - | 100\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | - |  |  | 96.2\% | 3.8\% 0\% |  | - | - | 29.2\% 0\% | \% 7 | 70.8\% 0\% |  | - |  |  |
| \% Total | 0.7\% 5 | 59.9\% | 0\% 0\% | 60.6\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  |  | 36.8\% | 1.4\% 0\% | \% 3 | 38.2\% |  | 0.3\% 0\% |  | 0.8\% 0\% |  | 1.1\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.583 | 0.9640 | 0.250 | 0.958 |  | 0.250 | - | - |  | . 250 |  |  | - 0.919 | 0.682 |  | 0.908 |  | 0.875 | - | 0.708 | - 0 | 0.750 |  | 0.937 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 14 | 1196 | 10 | 1211 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 744 | 30 | 0 | 774 |  | 7 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 24 |  | 2010 |
| \% Lights | 100\% 9 | 95.7\% 1 | 100\% 0\% | 95.7\% | - | 100\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 10 | 00\% |  |  | 97.0\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 97.1\% |  | 100\% 0\% | \% | 100\% 0\% | \% 1 | 100\% |  | 96.3\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 38 | $0 \quad 0$ | 38 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 46 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 3.0\% | 0\% 0\% | 3.0\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 1.0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.0\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 2.2\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | $0 \quad 0$ | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 11 | $0 \quad 0$ | 11 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 20 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.9\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.9\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 1.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.1\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 1.0\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 4 | $0 \quad 0$ | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.3\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | \% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - - | - |  | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | , | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - |

[^28]Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 11:45AM - 12:45 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street, Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US
ID: 791957, Location: 42.242814, -71.069414, Site Code: S20-003

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Access RoadWestbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reed Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | U | App |  | R | T | L | U |  | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-17 11:45AM | 2 | 197 | 0 | 0 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 4 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 387 |
| 12:00PM | 1 | 190 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 187 | 6 | 0 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 385 |
| 12:15PM | 1 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 8 | 1 | 225 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 389 |
| 12:30PM | 2 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 196 | 6 | 0 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 371 |
| Total | 6 | 716 | 0 | 0 | 722 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 781 | 24 | 1 | 806 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1532 |
| \% Approach | 0.8\% | 99.2\% | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | - | - | 0\% | 96.9\% | 3.0\% | 0.1\% | - | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% | 100\% 0 |  | - |  |  |
| \% Total | 0.4\% | 46.7\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 47.1\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 51.0\% | 1.6\% | 0.1\% | 52.6\% |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0.3\% 0 |  | 0.3\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.750 | 0.907 | - | - | 0.906 |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.904 | 0.750 | 0.250 | 0.896 | - | - | - 0 | 0.500 | - | 0.500 |  | 0.986 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | - |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% |
| Lights | 6 | 703 | 0 | 0 | 709 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 770 | 24 | 1 | 795 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |  | 1508 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 98.2\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 9 | 98.2\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | - | - | 0\% | 98.6\% | 100\% | 100\% | 98.6\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% | 100\% 0 | \% | 100\% |  | 98.4\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | - 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 13 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 0.8\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | - |  | 0\% | 0.9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.9\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0.8\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | - |  | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 8 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | - |  | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0.5\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | - |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US
ID: 791957, Location: 42.242814, -71.069414, Site Code: S20-003

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Access Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Reed Street <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U | U | App |  | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App |  |  | T | L | U |  | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-17 1:00PM | 2 | 183 | 0 | 0 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 205 | 4 | 0 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 398 |
| 1:15PM | 0 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 | 14 | 1 | 227 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 422 |
| 1:30PM | 2 | 210 | 0 | 0 | 212 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 223 | 4 | 0 | 227 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 443 |
| 1:45PM | 1 | 234 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 | 9 | 0 | 222 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 459 |
| Total | 5 | 820 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 825 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 853 | 31 | 1 | 885 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 1722 |
| \% Approach | 0.6\% | 99.4\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - | - | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 1 | 00\% | - |  | 0\% | 96.4\% | 3.5\% | 0.1\% | - | - | 20.0\% 0\% | \% | 80.0\% 0\% |  |  |  | - |
| \% Total | 0.3\% | 47.6\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 47 | 47.9\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |  | 0\% | 49.5\% | 1.8\% | 0.1\% 5 | 51.4\% |  | 0.1\% 0\% |  | 0.5\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% |  | - |
| PHF | 0.625 | 0.876 | - - | - 0 | 0.878 |  | - | - | - 0 | . 500 | 0.500 | - | - | 0.9550 | 0.5540 | 0.250 | 0.974 |  | 0.500 | - | 0.667 | - 0 | 0.833 | - | 0.937 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 2 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.2\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | \% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 5 | 802 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 807 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | - | 0 | 843 | 31 | 1 | 875 |  | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 |  | 1694 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 97.8\% 0 | \% 0\% | \% 97 | 97.8\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 1 | 00\% | 100\% |  | 0\% | 98.8\% 1 | 100\% 1 | 100\% 9 | 98.9\% |  | 100\% 0\% |  | 100\% 0\% | \% 1 | 100\% | - | 98.4\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 9 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 9 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 14 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.1\% 0 | \%\% 0\% | \% | 1.1\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.6\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.8\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% |
| Buses | 0 | 7 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 7 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 11 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.9\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.8\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.5\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.6\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% 0 | \%\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | 0\% | - |

[^29]Thu Oct 15, 2020
Full Length (6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street, ID: 791960, Location: 42.238601, -71.06961, Site Code: S20-003 Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  | Hallen Avenue Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | U | App | Ped* | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-15 6:00AM | 1 | 237 | 0 | 238 | 0 | 1239 | 38 | 0 | 1277 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 1527 |
| 7:00AM | 1 | 541 | 0 | 542 | 0 | 1175 | 11 | 0 | 1186 | 0 | 25 | 2 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 1755 |
| 8:00AM | 1 | 658 | 0 | 659 | 0 | 1060 | 14 | 0 | 1074 | 0 | 32 | 3 | 0 | 35 | 1 | 1768 |
| 3:00PM | 5 | 1299 | 0 | 1304 | 0 | 783 | 46 | 0 | 829 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 2 | 2221 |
| 4:00PM | 4 | 1172 | 0 | 1176 | 0 | 793 | 47 | 0 | 840 | 0 | 82 | 5 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 2103 |
| 5:00PM | 3 | 1161 | 0 | 1164 | 0 | 875 | 46 | 0 | 921 | 0 | 72 | 1 | 0 | 73 | 2 | 2158 |
| 2020-10-17 11:00AM | 3 | 683 | 0 | 686 | 0 | 688 | 39 | 0 | 727 | 0 | 45 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 1 | 1463 |
| 12:00PM | 4 | 739 | 0 | 743 | 0 | 788 | 54 | 0 | 842 | 0 | 56 | 2 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 1643 |
| 1:00PM | 0 | 883 | 0 | 883 | 0 | 883 | 48 | 0 | 931 | 0 | 64 | 4 | 0 | 68 | 2 | 1882 |
| Total | 22 | 7373 | 0 | 7395 | 0 | 8284 | 343 | 0 | 8627 | 0 | 474 | 24 | 0 | 498 | 9 | 16520 |
| \% Approach | 0.3\% | 99.7\% | 0\% | - | - | 96.0\% | 4.0\% | 0\% | - | - | 95.2\% | 4.8\% | 0\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.1\% | 44.6\% | 0\% | 44.8\% | - | 50.1\% | 2.1\% | 0\% | 52.2\% | - | 2.9\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 3.0\% | - | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | - | 12 | 1 | 0 | 13 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 29 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.1\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 22 | 7130 | 0 | 7152 | - | 8021 | 339 | 0 | 8360 | - | 469 | 23 | 0 | 492 | - | 16004 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 96.7\% | 0\% | 96.7\% | - | 96.8\% | 98.8\% | 0\% | 96.9\% | - | 98.9\% | 95.8\% | 0\% | 98.8\% | - | 96.9\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 105 | 0 | 105 | - | 137 | 1 | 0 | 138 | - | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | - | 247 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.4\% | 0\% | 1.4\% | - | 1.7\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 1.6\% | - | 0.6\% | 4.2\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | - | 1.5\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | - | 8 | 1 | 0 | 9 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 23 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.1\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 105 | 0 | 105 | - | 100 | 1 | 0 | 101 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 207 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 1.4\% | 0\% | 1.4\% | - | 1.2\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 1.2\% | - | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 1.3\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | - | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 10 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 6 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 66.7\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 3 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 33.3\% | - |

[^30]Thu Oct 15, 2020
AM Peak (Oct 152020 7:30AM - 8:30 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
ID: 791960, Location: 42.238601, -71.06961, Site Code: S20-003
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

Thu Oct 15, 2020
PM Peak (Oct 152020 3:15PM - 4:15 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
ID: 791960, Location: 42.238601, -71.06961, Site Code: S20-003
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  | Hallen Avenue Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | U | App | Ped* | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-15 3:15PM | 2 | 321 | 0 | 323 | 0 | 177 | 10 | 0 | 187 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 2 | 526 |
| 3:30PM | 2 | 350 | 0 | 352 | 0 | 224 | 12 | 0 | 236 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 609 |
| 3:45PM | 1 | 341 | 0 | 342 | 0 | 202 | 13 | 0 | 215 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 582 |
| 4:00PM | 2 | 341 | 0 | 343 | 0 | 195 | 16 | 0 | 211 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 577 |
| Total | 7 | 1353 | 0 | 1360 | 0 | 798 | 51 | 0 | 849 | 0 | 83 | 2 | 0 | 85 | 2 | 2294 |
| \% Approach | 0.5\% | 99.5\% | 0\% | - | - | 94.0\% | 6.0\% | 0\% | - | - | 97.6\% | 2.4\% | 0\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.3\% | 59.0\% | 0\% | 59.3\% | - | 34.8\% | 2.2\% | 0\% | 37.0\% | - | 3.6\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 3.7\% | - | - |
| PHF | 0.875 | 0.966 | - | 0.966 | - | 0.893 | 0.797 | - | 0.902 | - | 0.820 | 0.250 | - | 0.840 | - | 0.942 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | - | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 8 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.3\% |
| Lights | 7 | 1299 | 0 | 1306 | - | 778 | 51 | 0 | 829 | - | 81 | 2 | 0 | 83 | - | 2218 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 96.0\% | 0\% | 96.0\% | - | 97.5\% | 100\% | 0\% | 97.6\% | - | 97.6\% | 100\% | 0\% | 97.6\% | - | 96.7\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 36 | 0 | 36 | - | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 42 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 2.7\% | 0\% | 2.6\% | - | 0.6\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.6\% | - | 1.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.2\% | - | 1.8\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 4 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Buses | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | - | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 20 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | - | 1.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.9\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 2 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 1.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1.2\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 2 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

Sat Oct 17, 2020
Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 11:45AM - 12:45 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
ID: 791960, Location: 42.238601, -71.06961, Site Code: S20-003
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  | Hallen Avenue Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T |  | App | Ped* | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-17 11:45AM | 2 | 211 | 0 | 213 | 0 | 187 | 12 | 0 | 199 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 425 |
| 12:00PM | 3 | 208 | 0 | 211 | 0 | 193 | 7 | 0 | 200 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 420 |
| 12:15PM | 0 | 181 | 0 | 181 | 0 | 222 | 10 | 0 | 232 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 437 |
| 12:30PM | 0 | 171 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 196 | 16 | 0 | 212 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 398 |
| Total | 5 | 771 | 0 | 776 | 0 | 798 | 45 | 0 | 843 | 0 | 58 | 3 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 1680 |
| \% Approach | 0.6\% | 99.4\% | 0\% | - | - | 94.7\% | 5.3\% | 0\% | - | - | 95.1\% | 4.9\% | 0\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 0.3\% | 45.9\% | 0\% | 46.2\% | - | 47.5\% | 2.7\% | 0\% | 50.2\% | - | 3.5\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 3.6\% | - | - |
| PHF | 0.417 | 0.912 | - | 0.910 | - | 0.899 | 0.703 | - | 0.908 | - | 0.604 | 0.375 | - | 0.635 | - | 0.963 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% |
| Lights | 5 | 760 | 0 | 765 | - | 787 | 45 | 0 | 832 | - | 58 | 3 | 0 | 61 | - | 1658 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 98.6\% | 0\% | 98.6\% | - | 98.6\% | 100\% | 0\% | 98.7\% | - | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | - | 98.7\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | - | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 10 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | - | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.7\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.6\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0.3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Buses | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | - | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 8 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% | 0.6\% | - | 0.4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.5\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

Sat Oct 17, 2020
PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
ID: 791960, Location: 42.238601, -71.06961, Site Code: S20-003
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  | Hallen Avenue Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T |  | App | Ped* | T | L |  | App | Ped* | R | L | U | App | Ped* | Int |
| 2020-10-17 1:00PM | 0 | 195 | 0 | 195 | 0 | 205 | 11 | 0 | 216 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 425 |
| 1:15PM | 0 | 212 | 0 | 212 | 0 | 244 | 10 | 0 | 254 | 0 | 25 | 2 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 493 |
| 1:30PM | 0 | 222 | 0 | 222 | 0 | 212 | 11 | 0 | 223 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 457 |
| 1:45PM | 0 | 254 | 0 | 254 | 0 | 222 | 16 | 0 | 238 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 507 |
| Total | 0 | 883 | 0 | 883 | 0 | 883 | 48 | 0 | 931 | 0 | 64 | 4 | 0 | 68 | 2 | 1882 |
| \% Approach | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | - | - | 94.8\% | 5.2\% | 0\% | - | - | 94.1\% | 5.9\% | 0\% | - | - | - |
| \% Total | 0\% | 46.9\% | 0\% | 46.9\% | - | 46.9\% | 2.6\% | 0\% | 49.5\% | - | 3.4\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 3.6\% | - | - |
| PHF | - | 0.868 | - | 0.868 | - | 0.907 | 0.750 | - | 0.919 | - | 0.640 | 0.500 | - | 0.630 | - | 0.927 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 2.1\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 0 | 867 | 0 | 867 | - | 870 | 47 | 0 | 917 | - | 64 | 4 | 0 | 68 | - | 1852 |
| \% Lights | 0\% | 98.2\% | 0\% | 98.2\% | - | 98.5\% | 97.9\% | 0\% | 98.5\% | - | 100\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | - | 98.4\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | - | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 15 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | - | 0.9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.9\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.8\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% |
| Buses | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | - | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 11 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% | 0.8\% | - | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.6\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 2 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

## 207528 (11) Randolph Avenue (Route 28) @ Hil... - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
Full Length (6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Driveway Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Hillside Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T |  |  | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 6:00AM | 9 | 242 | 0 | 0 | 251 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1273 | 8 | 0 | 1281 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 1557 |
| 7:00AM | 24 | 513 | 0 | 0 | 537 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1124 | 28 | 0 | 1152 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 1765 |
| 8:00AM | 39 | 619 | 0 | 0 | 658 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 987 | 14 | 0 | 1001 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 1726 |
| 3:00PM | 51 | 1310 | 0 | 0 | 1361 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 764 | 26 | 1 | 791 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 55 | 1 | 76 | 0 | 2229 |
| 4:00PM | 56 | 1165 | 0 | 0 | 1221 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 816 | 41 | 0 | 857 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 59 | 1 | 70 | 0 | 2148 |
| 5:00PM | 47 | 1175 | 1 | 0 | 1223 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 847 | 32 | 0 | 879 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 71 | 1 | 2173 |
| 2020-10-17 11:00AM | 25 | 681 | 0 | 0 | 706 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 697 | 17 | 0 | 715 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 1478 |
| 12:00PM | 30 | 726 | 0 | 0 | 756 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 796 | 18 | 0 | 814 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 62 | 6 | 1633 |
| 1:00PM | 28 | 901 | 0 | 0 | 929 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 908 | 30 | 0 | 940 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 67 | 2 | 1938 |
| Total | 309 | 7332 | 1 | 0 | 7642 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 8212 | 214 | 1 | 8430 | 7 | 154 | 0 | 413 | 2 | 569 | 9 | 16647 |
| \% Approach | 4.0\% | 95.9\% | 0\% 0 |  | - |  | 33.3\% 0\% | 0\% | 66.7\% 0\% |  | - | - | 0\% 9 | 97.4\% | 2.5\% | 0\% | - |  | 27.1\% 0 | 0\% 7 | 72.6\% | 0.4\% |  | - | - |
| \% Total | 1.9\% | 44.0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 4 | 45.9\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% 4 | 49.3\% | 1.3\% | 0\% | 50.6\% | - | 0.9\% 0 | 0\% | 2.5\% | 0\% | 3.4\% |  |  |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 30 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% |  | 0.6\% 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 301 | 7081 | 1 | 0 | 7383 |  | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 |  | 2 | 7914 | 202 | 1 | 8119 | - | 144 | 0 | 405 | 2 | 551 |  | 16058 |
| \% Lights | 97.4\% | 96.6\% 1 | 100\% 0 | 0\% 9 | 96.6\% |  | 50.0\% 0 |  | 100\% 0\% | \% 8 | 33.3\% |  | 66.7\% 9 | 96.4\% | 94.4\% | 100\% | 96.3\% |  | 93.5\% 0 | 0\% 9 | 98.1\% | 100\% | 96.8\% |  | 96.5\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 4 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 119 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 155 | 7 | 0 | 163 | - | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | - | 292 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 1.3\% | 1.6\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% | 1.6\% |  | 50.0\% 0 | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 1 | 16.7\% |  | -33.3\% | 1.9\% | 3.3\% | 0\% | 1.9\% | - | 3.2\% 0 |  | 1.0\% | 0\% | 1.6\% |  | 1.8\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 19 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 22 | - | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | - | 44 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.2\% | 1.4\% | 0\% | 0.3\% | - | 0.6\% 0 |  | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | - | 0.3\% |
| Buses | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 102 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 104 | 2 | 0 | 106 | - | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 211 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 1.4\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% | 1.3\% |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 1.3\% | 0.9\% | 0\% | 1.3\% | - | 1.9\% 0 |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0.5\% | - | 1.3\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | - | 12 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 1.0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% | 0.1\% |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 0.5\% | 0\% | 0.4\% | - | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 7 |  | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | - | - | - | - | 9 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | \% | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | , | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |  |  |  | - | - | 0\% | , | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

[^31]Thu Oct 15, 2020
AM Peak (Oct 152020 7:30AM - 8:30 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
ID: 791963, Location: 42.231002, -71.071072, Site Code: S20-003
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Driveway Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Hillside Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U |  | App |  | R | T |  | U |  |  |  | R | T | L | U | App |  | R | T | L | U | App |  |  |
| 2020-10-15 7:30AM | 7 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 305 |  | 0 | 317 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 480 |
| 7:45AM | 5 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 173 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 264 |  | 0 | 274 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 475 |
| 8:00AM | 8 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 247 |  | 0 | 249 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 429 |
| 8:15AM | 11 | 180 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 252 | 5 | 0 | 257 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 469 |
| Total | 31 | 627 | 0 | 0 | 658 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1068 | 29 | 0 | 1097 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 1853 |
| \% Approach | 4.7\% | 95.3\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | \% 0 |  | - |  |  | \% 97 | 97.4\% | 2.6\% 0\% |  | - |  | 21.4\% 0\% | 0\% | 78.6\% 0 |  | - |  |  |
| \% Total | 1.7\% | 33.8\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 3 | 35.5\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | \%\% |  | 0\% |  |  | \% 5 | 57.6\% | 1.6\% 0\% | \% | 59.2\% |  | 1.1\% 0 |  | 4.2\% 0\% |  | 5.3\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.705 | 0.871 | - | - 0 | 0.861 |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | 0.875 | 0.604 | - | 0.864 |  | 0.583 | - | 0.864 | - | 0.836 |  | 0.964 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.5\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.5\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | \% 0 |  | - |  |  | \% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 31 | 592 | 0 | 0 | 623 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1014 | 25 | 0 | 1039 |  | 19 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 93 |  | 1755 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 94.4\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 9 | 94.7\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | \% 0 |  | - |  |  | \% 9 | 94.9\% | 86.2\% 0\% | \% | 94.7\% |  | 90.5\% 0\% | 0\% | 96.1\% 0 | \% | 94.9\% |  | 94.7\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 33 | 2 | 0 | 35 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 42 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.9\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0 |  | - |  |  | \% | 3.1\% | 6.9\% 0\% |  | 3.2\% | - | 0\% 0 |  | 1.3\% 0 |  | 1.0\% |  | 2.3\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 7 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 10 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.3\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0 |  | - |  | 0\% | \% | 0.5\% | 6.9\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% | - | 0\% 0 | 0\% | 1.3\% 0\% | \% | 1.0\% |  | 0.5\% |
| Buses | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 41 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 3.8\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 3.6\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | \%\% 0 |  | - | - | 0\% | \% | 1.4\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 1.4\% | - | 9.5\% 0 |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 2.0\% | - | 2.2\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | \% 0 |  | - |  |  | \% | 0.1\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.1\% |  | 0\% 0 |  | 1.3\% 0\% |  | 1.0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | - | - |  | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

PM Peak (Oct 152020 3:30PM - 4:30 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
ID: 791963, Location: 42.231002, -71.071072, Site Code: S20-003

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Driveway Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | Hillside Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U |  | App |  | R | T | L | U |  | ed* |  | R | T | L U | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-15 3:30PM | 14 | 359 | 0 | 0 | 373 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 222 |  | 0 | 229 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 621 |
| 3:45PM | 12 | 327 | 0 | 0 | 339 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 7 | 0 | 204 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 23 | 0 | 566 |
| 4:00PM | 22 | 286 | 0 | 0 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 210 | 13 | 0 | 223 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 546 |
| 4:15PM | 12 | 319 | 0 | 0 | 331 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 196 | 8 | 0 | 204 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 555 |
| Total | 60 | 1291 | 0 | 0 | 1351 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 825 | 35 | 0 | 860 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 77 | 0 | 2288 |
| \% Approach | 4.4\% | 95.6\% | 0\% 0\% |  | - | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  |  | \% 9 | 95.9\% | 4.1\% 0\% |  | - | - | 20.8\% | \% | 77.9\% | 1.3\% | - |  |  |
| \% Total | 2.6\% 5 | 56.4\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% 5 | 59.0\% | - |  | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  |  | \% 3 | 36.1\% | 1.5\% 0\% | \% | 37.6\% |  | 0.7\% |  | 2.6\% | 0\% | 3.4\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.682 | 0.899 | - | - | 0.905 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  | - 0 | 0.930 | 0.673 | - | 0.940 |  | 0.667 | - | 0.882 | 0.250 | 0.837 |  | 0.921 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.2\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  |  | \% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.3\% |
| Lights | 58 | 1259 | 0 | 0 | 1317 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 798 | 35 | 0 | 833 | - | 12 | 0 | 59 | 1 | 72 |  | 2222 |
| \% Lights | 96.7\% | 97.5\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 9 | 97.5\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  |  | \% 9 | 96.7\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 96.9\% | - | 75.0\% | \% | 98.3\% | 100\% | 93.5\% |  | 97.1\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 2 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 21 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 10 |  | 0 | 10 | - | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 35 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 3.3\% | 1.5\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.6\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  |  | \% | 1.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.2\% | - | 25.0\% | \% | 0\% | 0\% | 5.2\% | - | 1.5\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 5 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  |  | \% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | \% | 1.7\% | 0\% | 1.3\% | - | 0.2\% |
| Buses | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 17 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.6\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% | - | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  |  | \% | 1.1\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.0\% | - | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0.7\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% |  | - |  |  | \% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - |  | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - |  | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 11:45AM - 12:45 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  | Driveway Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Hillside Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U | App |  |  | T | L U | U | App | ed* | R | T | L | U | App |  |  | T | L U | U |  | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-17 11:45AM | 7 | 199 | 0 | - 206 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 197 | 6 | 0 | 204 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 420 |
| 12:00PM | 8 | 187 | 00 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 | 4 | 0 | 198 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 408 |
| 12:15PM | 11 | 177 | 0 | 188 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 223 | 5 | 0 | 228 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 434 |
| 12:30PM | 5 | 194 | $0 \quad 0$ | 199 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 7 | 0 | 189 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 402 |
| Total | 31 | 757 | $0 \quad 0$ | 788 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 796 |  | 0 | 819 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 55 | 3 | 1664 |
| \% Approach | 3.9\% | 96.1\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | \% |  | 50.0\% 0\% | \% 5 | 50.0\% 0\% |  | - | - | 0.1\% | 97.2\% | 2.7\% 0\% |  | - |  | 38.2\% 0\% | \% 6 | 61.8\% 0\% |  | - |  |  |
| \% Total | 1.9\% | 45.5\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 47.4\% |  | 0.1\% 0\% | \% | 0.1\% 0\% | \% 0 | 0.1\% |  | 0.1\% | 47.8\% | 1.3\% 0\% | \% | 49.2\% | - | 1.3\% 0\% |  | 2.0\% 0\% | \% 3 | 3.3\% |  | - |
| PHF | 0.750 | 0.951 | - - | 0.955 | - | 0.250 | - 0 | 0.250 |  | 0.500 |  | 0.250 | 0.892 | 0.786 | - | 0.898 | - | 0.525 | - | 0.850 |  | . 809 | - | 0.960 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0\% |
| Lights | 30 | 746 | $0 \quad 0$ | ) 776 | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 783 | 21 | 0 | 805 | - | 21 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 55 |  | 1638 |
| \% Lights | 96.8\% | 98.5\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 98.5\% | - | 100\% 0\% | \% | 100\% 0\% | \% 100 | 100\% |  | 100\% | 98.4\% | 95.5\% 0\% | \% | 98.3\% | - | 100\% 0\% |  | 100\% 0\% | \% 10 | 00\% |  | 98.4\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 5 | $0 \quad 0$ | 5 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 10 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 15 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0.7\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.6\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 1.1\% | 4.5\% 0\% | \% | 1.2\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0\% |  | 0.9\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | $0 \quad 0$ | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 2 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.1\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.1\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 5 | 00 | 5 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 8 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.7\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0.6\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.4\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.5\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 1 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 3.2\% | 0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | 0.1\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - - | - - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

[^32]
## 207528 (11) Randolph Avenue (Route 28) @ Hil... - TMC

Sat Oct 17, 2020
PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI) 46 Morton Street,
ID: 791963, Location: 42.231002, -71.071072, Site Code: S20-003
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  | Driveway Westbound |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) <br> Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Hillside Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U | App |  |  | T | L U | App | Ped* | R | T | L U | U | App |  |  | T | L | U |  | Ped* |  |
| 2020-10-17 1:00PM | 2 | 203 | 00 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 227 | 6 | 0 | 233 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 454 |
| 1:15PM | 6 | 213 | 0 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 227 | 8 | 0 | 235 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 472 |
| 1:30PM | 10 | 223 | 0 | 233 | 0 |  | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 234 | 11 | 0 | 246 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 496 |
| 1:45PM | 10 | 262 | $0 \quad 0$ | 272 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 220 | 5 | 0 | 226 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 516 |
| Total | 28 | 901 | $0 \quad 0$ | 929 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 908 | 30 | 0 | 940 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 67 | 2 | 1938 |
| \% Approach | 3.0\% | 97.0\% 0 | 0\% 0\% | - |  | 50.0\% 0\% | \% 50 | 50.0\% 0\% | - |  | 0.2\% | 96.6\% | 3.2\% 0\% |  | - |  | 40.3\% 0\% | \% 59 | 59.7\% 0\% |  |  |  | - |
| \% Total | 1.4\% | 46.5\% 0 | \% 0\% | 47.9\% |  | 0.1\% 0\% | \% 0 | 0.1\% 0\% | 0.1\% |  | 0.1\% | 46.9\% | 1.5\% 0\% | \% 4 | 48.5\% |  | 1.4\% 0\% | \% | 2.1\% 0\% | \% 3 | 3.5\% |  | - |
| PHF | 0.700 | 0.860 | - - | 0.854 |  | 0.250 | 0 | 0.250 | 0.250 |  | 0.500 | 0.9700 | 0.682 | - 0 | 0.955 |  | 0.750 | , | 0.769 |  | . 931 | - | 0.939 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 2 | $0 \quad 0$ | 2 | - |  | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.2\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0.2\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.1\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Lights | 28 | 881 | $0 \quad 0$ | 909 |  | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 |  | 1 | 890 | 30 | 0 | 921 |  | 27 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 67 |  | 1898 |
| \% Lights | 100\% 9 | 97.8\% 0 | \% 0\% | 97.8\% |  | 0\% 0\% | \% 1 | 100\% 0\% | 50.0\% |  | 50.0\% | 98.0\% 1 | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 98.0\% |  | 100\% 0\% | \% | 100\% 0\% | \% 1 | 00\% |  | 97.9\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 11 | $0 \quad 0$ | 11 |  | 1 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 1 |  | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 13 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 25 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.2\% 0 | \% 0\% | 1.2\% | - | 100\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | 50.0\% |  | 50.0\% | 1.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.4\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 1.3\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% |
| Buses | 0 | 7 | $0 \quad 0$ | 7 |  | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 12 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.8\% 0 | \% 0\% | 0.8\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.5\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.6\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  | - | - | - | - | 2 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - - | - | 0 | - | - | - - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - - | - |  |  | - | - - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - |

[^33]
## 207528 (12) Randolph Avenue (Route 28) @ Chi... - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
Full Length (6 AM-9 AM, 3 PM-6 PM, 11 AM-2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)
All Movements
ID: 791966, Location: 42.224238, -71.070676, Site Code: S20-003

Provided by: Precision Data Industries, LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US


[^34]
## 207528 (12) Randolph Avenue (Route 28) @ Chi... - TMC

## Thu Oct 15, 2020

AM Peak (Oct 152020 7:30AM - 8:30 AM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
All Movements
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Chickatawbut Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Chickatawbut Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | U | App |  | R | T | L | U | App |  | R | T | L U | U | App |  | R | T | L | U | App |  |  |
| 2020-10-15 7:30AM | 1 | 126 | 11 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 13 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 1 | 295 | 23 | 0 | 319 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 514 |
| 7:45AM | 5 | 152 | 20 | 0 | 177 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 254 | 16 | 0 | 271 | 0 | 10 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 500 |
| 8:00AM | 7 | 148 | 8 | 0 | 163 |  | 18 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 234 | 16 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 11 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 486 |
| 8:15AM | 5 | 161 | 15 | 0 | 181 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 2 | 239 | 21 | 0 | 262 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 504 |
| Total | 18 | 587 | 54 | 0 | 659 | 0 | 53 | 64 | 10 | 0 | 127 | 0 | 4 | 1022 | 76 | 0 | 1102 | 0 | 38 | 51 | 27 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 2004 |
| \% Approach | 2.7\% | 89.1\% | 8.2\% 0\% |  | - |  | 41.7\% 5 | 50.4\% | 7.9\% 0\% |  | - |  | 0.4\% | 92.7\% | 6.9\% 0\% |  | - |  | 32.8\% | 44.0\% | 23.3\% 0 |  | - |  |  |
| \% Total | 0.9\% | 29.3\% | 2.7\% 0\% | \% | 32.9\% |  | 2.6\% | 3.2\% | 0.5\% 0\% | \% | 6.3\% | - | 0.2\% 5 | 51.0\% | 3.8\% 0\% | \% 5 | 55.0\% |  | 1.9\% | 2.5\% | 1.3\% 0\% |  | 5.8\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.708 | 0.911 | 0.675 |  | 0.909 | - | 0.736 | 0.750 | 0.625 | - 0 | 0.733 |  | 0.500 | 0.866 | 0.826 | 0 | 0.864 |  | 0.864 | 0.833 | 0.675 |  | 0.958 |  | 0.973 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1.3\% 0\% | \% | 0.1\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 16 | 549 | 53 | 0 | 618 |  | 52 | 63 | 10 | 0 | 125 | - | 4 | 969 | 73 | 0 | 1046 |  | 38 | 49 | 25 | 0 | 112 |  | 1901 |
| \% Lights | 88.9\% | 93.5\% | 98.1\% 0\% | \% 9 | 93.8\% | - | 98.1\% | 98.4\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 98.4\% |  | 100\% 9 | 94.8\% | 96.1\% 0\% | \% 9 | 94.9\% |  | 100\% 9 | 96.1\% | 92.6\% 0 | \% 9 | 96.6\% |  | 94.9\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 9 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 33 |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |  | 46 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% 0\% | \% | 1.4\% | - | 1.9\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.8\% | - | 0\% | 3.1\% | 1.3\% 0\% | \% | 3.0\% |  | 0\% | 2.0\% | 7.4\% 0\% | \% | 2.6\% |  | 2.3\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 9 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 12 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.5\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.8\% | 1.3\% 0\% | \% | 0.8\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.6\% |
| Buses | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 26 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 39 |
| \% Buses | 5.6\% | 4.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 3.9\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 1.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.2\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 1.9\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 5.6\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 1.6\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.8\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 2.0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.9\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |

[^35]
## 207528 (12) Randolph Avenue (Route 28) @ Chi... - TMC

Thu Oct 15, 2020
PM Peak (Oct 152020 3:30PM - 4:30 PM) - Overall Peak Hour
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
46 Morton Street, Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Chickatawbut Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Chickatawbut Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | U | App |  | R | T | L | U | App |  | R | T | L | U | App |  | R | T | L | U | App |  |  |
| 2020-10-15 3:30PM | 3 | 289 | 22 | 0 | 314 | 0 | 22 | 26 | 66 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 3 | 176 | 9 | 0 | 188 | 0 | 44 | 21 | 15 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 696 |
| 3:45PM | 2 | 258 | 18 | 0 | 278 | 0 | 21 | 26 | 60 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 11 | 169 | 5 | 0 | 185 | 0 | 52 | 33 | 4 | 0 | 89 | 0 | 659 |
| 4:00PM | 0 | 277 | 20 | 0 | 297 | 0 | 36 | 49 | 40 | 0 | 125 | 0 | 4 | 164 | 5 | 0 | 173 | 0 | 62 | 36 | 4 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 697 |
| 4:15PM | 3 | 297 | 22 | 0 | 322 | 0 | 19 | 31 | 34 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 4 | 158 | 7 | 0 | 169 | 0 | 54 | 44 | 10 | 0 | 108 | 0 | 683 |
| Total | 8 | 1121 | 82 | 0 | 1211 | 0 | 98 | 132 | 200 | 0 | 430 | 0 | 22 | 667 | 26 | 0 | 715 | 0 | 212 | 134 | 33 | 0 | 379 | 0 | 2735 |
| \% Approach | 0.7\% | 92.6\% | 6.8\% 0\% |  | - |  | 22.8\% | 30.7\% | 46.5\% 0\% |  | - |  | 3.1\% | 93.3\% | 3.6\% 0\% |  | - |  | 55.9\% | 35.4\% | 8.7\% 0 |  |  |  | - |
| \% Total | 0.3\% | 41.0\% | 3.0\% 0 | \% 4 | 44.3\% |  | 3.6\% | 4.8\% | 7.3\% 0\% | \% | 15.7\% |  | 0.8\% | 24.4\% | 1.0\% 0 | \% | 26.1\% |  | 7.8\% | 4.9\% | 1.2\% 0 | \% 1 | 13.9\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.667 | 0.944 | 0.932 | - | 0.940 |  | 0.681 | 0.658 | 0.758 | 0 | 0.854 |  | 0.500 | 0.947 | 0.722 | - | 0.951 |  | 0.855 | 0.756 | 0.571 | - 0 | 0.873 |  | 0.981 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 13 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.2\% |  | 1.0\% | 3.0\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.2\% |  | 0\% | 0.4\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.4\% |  | 0.5\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.5\% |  | 0.5\% |
| Lights | 8 | 1089 | 80 | 0 | 1177 |  | 96 | 123 | 199 | 0 | 418 |  | 22 | 648 | 26 | 0 | 696 |  | 204 | 131 | 32 | 0 | 367 |  | 2658 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 97.1\% | 97.6\% 0\% | 0\% 9 | 97.2\% |  | 98.0\% | 93.2\% | 99.5\% 0\% | \% 9 | 97.2\% |  | 100\% | 97.2\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 97.3\% |  | 96.2\% | 97.8\% | 97.0\% 0\% | \% 9 | 96.8\% |  | 97.2\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 21 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 32 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.7\% | 2.4\% 0\% |  | 1.7\% |  | 1.0\% | 0\% | 0.5\% 0\% |  | 0.5\% |  | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.7\% |  | 1.4\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 1.1\% |  | 1.2\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 7 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.2\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0.3\% |  | 0.9\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.5\% |  | 0.3\% |
| Buses | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | - | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 20 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.6\% | - | 0\% | 1.5\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.5\% |  | 0\% | 1.3\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 1.3\% |  | 0.9\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.5\% |  | 0.7\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 5 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 2.3\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.7\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.7\% | 3.0\% 0\% |  | 0.5\% |  | 0.2\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  | - - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

*Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

## Sat Oct 17, 2020

Midday Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 12PM - 1 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
All Movements
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Chickatawbut Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Chickatawbut Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L U | U | App |  | R | T | L | U | App |  | R | T | L U | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App |  |  |
| 2020-10-17 12:00PM | 2 | 181 | $20 \quad 0$ | 0 | 203 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 22 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 12 | 170 | 13 | 0 | 195 | 0 | 27 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 478 |
| 12:15PM | 7 | 167 | 26 0 | 0 | 200 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 29 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 12 | 203 | 17 | 0 | 232 | 0 | 25 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 517 |
| 12:30PM | 3 | 178 | 140 | 0 | 195 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 18 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 11 | 176 | 18 | 0 | 205 | 2 | 30 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 472 |
| 12:45PM | 13 | 172 | 130 | 0 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 4 | 190 | 13 | 0 | 207 | 0 | 33 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 470 |
| Total | 25 | 698 | 730 | 0 | 796 | 0 | 17 | 22 | 84 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 39 | 739 | 61 | 0 | 839 | 2 | 115 | 16 | 48 | 0 | 179 | 0 | 1937 |
| \% Approach | 3.1\% 8 | 87.7\% | 9.2\% 0\% |  | - |  | -13.8\% | 17.9\% | 68.3\% 0 |  | - |  | 4.6\% | 88.1\% | 7.3\% 0\% |  | - |  | 64.2\% | 8.9\% | 26.8\% 0\% |  |  |  |  |
| \% Total | 1.3\% | 36.0\% | 3.8\% 0\% | \% 41 | 41.1\% |  | 0.9\% | 1.1\% | 4.3\% 0 | \% | 6.4\% |  | 2.0\% | 38.2\% | 3.1\% 0\% | \% 4 | 43.3\% |  | 5.9\% | 0.8\% | 2.5\% 0\% |  | 9.2\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.481 | 0.964 | 0.702 |  | 0.980 |  | 0.531 | 0.611 | 0.724 | - 0 | 0.732 |  | 0.813 | 0.910 | 0.847 | - 0 | 0.904 |  | 0.871 | 0.583 | 0.923 | - | 0.941 | - | 0.936 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1.6\% 0\% | \% | 0.1\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 25 | 692 | 730 | 0 | 790 | - | 17 | 21 | 84 | 0 | 122 | - | 39 | 727 | 60 | 0 | 826 | - | 114 | 14 | 48 | 0 | 176 |  | 1914 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 99.1\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 99 | 99.2\% |  | 100\% | 95.5\% | 100\% 0 | \% 9 | 99.2\% |  | 100\% | 98.4\% | 98.4\% 0\% | \% 98 | 98.5\% |  | 99.1\% 87 | 87.5\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 98.3\% |  | 98.8\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 9 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 0.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.3\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0.8\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.7\% |  | 0.9\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.6\% |  | 0.5\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 4.5\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.8\% | - | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.1\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Buses | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 9 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.5\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.7\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.5\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 2 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% 1 | 12.5\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 1.1\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 100\% | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - |  | - - | - | - - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

[^36]Sat Oct 17, 2020
PM Peak (WKND) (Oct 172020 1PM - 2 PM)
All Classes (Motorcycles, Lights, Single-Unit Trucks, Articulated Trucks, Buses, Pedestrians, Bicycles on Road, Bicycles on Crosswalk)

Provided by: Precision Data Industries,
LLC (PDI)
All Movements
46 Morton Street,
Framingham, MA, MA, 01702, US

| Leg <br> Direction | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Southbound |  |  |  |  |  | Chickatawbut Road Westbound |  |  |  |  |  | Randolph Avenue (Route 28) Northbound |  |  |  |  |  | Chickatawbut Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Int |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | R | T | L | U | App |  | R | T | L | U | App |  | R | T | L | U | App | Ped* | R | T | L | U | App |  |  |
| 2020-10-17 1:00PM | 7 | 179 | 16 | 0 | 202 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 20 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 8 | 214 | 18 | 0 | 240 | 1 | 22 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 512 |
| 1:15PM | 9 | 188 | 22 | 0 | 219 | 0 | 11 | 6 | 31 | 0 |  | 0 | 12 | 226 | 22 | 0 | 260 | 4 | 18 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 561 |
| 1:30PM | 4 | 206 | 15 | 0 | 225 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 23 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 14 | 206 | 24 | 0 | 244 | 0 | 34 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 557 |
| 1:45PM | 7 | 234 | 14 | 0 | 255 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 36 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 9 | 198 | 20 | 0 | 227 | 1 | 18 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 565 |
| Total | 27 | 807 | 67 | 0 | 901 | 0 | 32 | 21 | 110 | 0 | 163 | 0 | 43 | 844 | 84 | 0 | 971 | 6 | 92 | 21 | 47 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 2195 |
| \% Approach | 3.0\% | 89.6\% | 7.4\% 0\% |  | - | - | 19.6\% | 12.9\% | 67.5\% 0\% |  | - |  | 4.4\% | 86.9\% | 8.7\% 0\% |  | - |  | 57.5\% 1 | 13.1\% | 29.4\% 0 |  | - |  |  |
| \% Total | 1.2\% | 36.8\% | 3.1\% 0\% | \% 4 | 41.0\% | - | 1.5\% | 1.0\% | 5.0\% 0\% | \% | 7.4\% |  | 2.0\% | 38.5\% | 3.8\% 0\% | \% 4 | 44.2\% |  | 4.2\% | 1.0\% | 2.1\% 0 |  | 7.3\% |  |  |
| PHF | 0.750 | 0.8620 | 0.761 | 0 | 0.883 |  | 0.727 | 0.750 | 0.764 |  | 0.833 |  | 0.768 | 0.9340 | 0.875 | - 0 | 0.934 |  | 0.676 | 0.563 | 0.839 | - | 0.785 | - | 0.974 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0\% | 0.2\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Lights | 27 | 790 | 67 | 0 | 884 | - | 32 | 17 | 110 | 0 | 159 | - | 43 | 834 | 84 | 0 | 961 |  | 92 | 18 | 46 | 0 | 156 |  | 2160 |
| \% Lights | 100\% | 97.9\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 98 | 98.1\% |  | 100\% 81 | 81.0\% | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 97.5\% |  | 100\% | 98.8\% 1 | 100\% 0\% | \% 9 | 99.0\% | - | 100\% 8 | 85.7\% | 97.9\% 0 | \% 9 | 97.5\% |  | 98.4\% |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 14 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0\% | 1.0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.9\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.6\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.5\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 2.1\% 0 | \% | 0.6\% |  | 0.6\% |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0.1\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.1\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0 |  | 0\% | - | 0\% |
| Buses | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 12 |
| \% Buses | 0\% | 0.9\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0.8\% | - | 0\% | 4.8\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.6\% | - | 0\% | 0.5\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 0.4\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0.5\% |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 6 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 0\% | 14.3\% | 0\% 0\% | \% | 1.8\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% 0\% |  | 0\% |  | 0\% 1 | 14.3\% | 0\% 0 |  | 1.9\% |  | 0.3\% |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 83.3\% | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 16.7\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

[^37]Part 2: Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) Data



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { STA. } 2 N B \\
& \text { NV DATA }
\end{aligned}
$$



$$
N B=N O \text { DATA }
$$

## Mass Highway Department

## WEEKLY SUMMARY FOR LANE 1 Page: 1 Starting: 10/26/2020


ns

NB 5560
SB 5312
COMB FWD 10872
FAC $.93(.98)$
COMB AD 9,900

Mass Highway Department
WEEKLY SUMMARY FOR LANE $1 \quad$ Page: 1 Starting: 10/26/2020
STA, SSE File: D1026008.prn

City: Milton
Site ID: 000000000302
Location: Route 28 SB , north of Walnut St. Direction: SOUTH





$$
\begin{array}{r}
\text { NB } \\
\text { SB } 4986 \\
\text { COMB AWD } \frac{3579}{8565} \\
\text { FAC .93(.98) } \\
\text { COMB ADT } 7,800
\end{array}
$$



Mass Highway Department
WEEKLY SUMMARY FOR LANE 1 Page: 1
Starting: 10/26/2020


$$
\begin{aligned}
& 43 \\
& \text { NB } 20153 \\
& \text { SB } \frac{21201}{41354} \\
& \text { FWD } F A C \quad .93(.98)
\end{aligned}
$$

COMB A OT 37.700

Mass Highway Department
WEEKLY SUMMARY FOR LANE 1
Page: 1 Starting: $10 / 26 / 2020$
Station \#: 000000000122
Site ID: 000000000602,
Location: Route 28 SB, south of Pleasanst.

Direction: SOUTH




## Part 3: Speed Data

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { STA•2NB } \\
& \text { NO SPEED DATA }
\end{aligned}
$$



Statistical Information...


Mass Highway Department
SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 2

$$
\text { Tue } 10 / 27 / 2020
$$

Station \#: 000000000082
File: D1026006.prn
City: Milton
County: Speed
Location: Route 28 SB , south of Ridge Rd. Direction: SOUTH
Lane: 1

| TIME | <10 | <15 | <20 | <25 | <30 | <35 | $<40$ | <45 | <50 | <55 | <60 | <65 | $<70$ | <120 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 20 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 47 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 101 |
| 07:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 28 | 75 | 57 | 31 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 196 |
| 08:00 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 57 | 167 | 124 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 384 |
| 09:00 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 67 | 186 | 90 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 385 |
| 10:00 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 65 | 142 | 110 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 355 |
| 11:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 53 | 139 | 117 | 21 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 347 |
| 12:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 49 | 171 | 149 | 21 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 397 |
| 13:00 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 114 | 184 | 95 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 425 |
| 14:00 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 54 | 185 | 142 | 36 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 427 |
| 15:00 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 91 | 250 | 135 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 499 |
| 16:00 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 115 | 240 | 154 | 27 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 555 |
| 17:00 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 22 | 138 | 252 | 139 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 582 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 130 | 307 | 126 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 591 |
| 19:00 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 87 | 191 | 102 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 418 |
| 20:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 41 | 143 | 117 | 23 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 331 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 106 | 98 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 74 | 69 | 28 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 62 | 58 | 26 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 |
| 24:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 50 | 58 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 |
| DAY TOTAL | 8 | 21 | 27 | 123 | 1159 | 2997 | 2044 | 434 | 54 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6880 |
| PERCENTS | 0.1\% | 0.3\% | 0.4\% | 1.8\% | 16.8\% | 43.6\% | 29.7\% | 6.3\% | 0.8\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0 |

Statistical Information...
$\left.\begin{array}{lc}\text { 15th Percentile Speed } \\ 28.7 \mathrm{mph}\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\text { 85th Percentile Speed } \\ 38.7 \mathrm{mph}\end{array}\right)$

Mass Highway Department
SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 3
Wed 10/28/2020


Statistical Information...

| 15 th Percentile Speed <br> 28.7 mph | 85 th Percentile Speed <br> 38.7 mph |
| :---: | :---: |
| Median Speed | Average Speed |
| 33.6 mph | 33.7 mph |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed | Vehicles $>65 \mathrm{MPH}$ |
| 25 mph to 35 mph | 0 |
| 2852 vehicles in pace |  |
| Representing $42.8 \%$ of the total vehicles | $0.0 \%$ |

## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 4
Thu 10/29/2020


Statistical Information...


## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Fri 10/30/2020
Page: 5


Statistical Information...

15th Percentile Speed
85th Percentile Speed
27.3 mph
38.1 mph

Median Speed
32.7 mph

10 MPH Pace Speed
25 mph to 35 mph 1245 vehicles in pace
Representing $41.5 \%$ of the total vehicles

## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 1
Tue 10/27/2020

Station \#: 000000000141

$$
\text { STA. } 4 N B
$$

File: D1027002APPEND.prn
Site ID: 000000000401 Location: Route 28 NB , north of spafford st. SPEED City: Milton County: speed Direction: NORTH
Lane: 1

| TIME | $<10$ | $<15$ | $<20$ | $<25$ | <30 | $<35$ | $<40$ | $<45$ | $<50$ | $<55$ | $<60$ | $<65$ | $<70$ | $<120$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 17 | 18 | 21 | 26 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 104 |
| 07:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 18 | 45 | 67 | 52 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 227 |
| 08:00 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 16 | 42 | 100 | 80 | 37 | 13 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 305 |
| 09:00 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 49 | 89 | 73 | 25 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 269 |
| 10:00 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 6 | 27 | 60 | 33 | 17 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 166 |
| 11:00 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 23 | 48 | 40 | 11 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 154 |
| 12:00 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 43 | 49 | 40 | 21 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 180 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 37 | 49 | 35 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 158 |
| 14:00 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 24 | 50 | 42 | 20 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 162 |
| 15:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 35 | 83 | 67 | 18 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 225 |
| 16:00 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 40 | 47 | 62 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 216 |
| 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 6. | 27 | 70 | 35 | 18 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 186 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 44 | 58 | 31 | 18 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 201 |
| 19:00 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 31 | 44 | 36 | 17 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 156 |
| 20:00 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 23 | 34 | 30 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 25 | 14 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 68 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 12 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 47 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 49 |
| 24:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | - 1 | 26 |
| DAY TOTAL | 2 | 12 | 65 | 50 | 44 | 130 | 499 | 910 | 732 | 338 | 171 | 56 | 19 | 18 | 3046 |
| PERCENTS | 0.1\% | 0.4\% | 2.1\% | 1.6\% | 1.4\% | 4.3\% | 16.4\% | 29.9\% | 24.0\% | 11.1\% | 5.6\% | 1.8\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% |

Statistical Information...

| 15 th Percentile speed <br> 36.5 mph | 85th Percentile Speed <br> 51.9 mph <br> Median speed <br> 43.9 mph |
| :--- | :---: |
| MPH Pace speed <br> 35 mph to 45 mph <br> 910 vehicles in pace <br> Representing $30.1 \%$ of the total vehicles | Average Speed |
| 43.8 mph |  |

## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 2
Wed 10/28/2020

```
File: D1027002APPEND.prn
City: Milton
County: speed
```

Station \#: 000000000141
Site ID: 000000000401
Location: Route 28 NB , north of Spafford St.
Direction: NORTH
Lane: 1

Lane: 1

| TIME | $<10$ | $<15$ | $<20$ | $<25$ | $<30$ | $<35$ | $<40$ | $<45$ | $<50$ | <55 | $<60$ | $<65$ | $<70$ | $<120$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 25 | 20 | 15 | 16 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 91 |
| 07:00 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 26 | 44 | 62 | 39 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 215 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 72 | 113 | 63 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 288 |
| 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 15 | 53 | 113 | 45 | 16 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 267 |
| 10:00 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 29 | 53 | 36 | 16 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 177 |
| 11:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 33 | 55 | 38 | 15 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 168 |
| 12:00 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 45 | 44 | 30 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 161 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 36 | 59 | 53 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 182 |
| 14:00 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 23 | 59 | 37 | 17 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 164 |
| 15:00 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 30 | 46 | 43 | 17 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 173 |
| 16:00 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 44 | 73 | 45 | 16 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 216 |
| 17:00 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 28 | 70 | 46 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 190 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 46 | 58 | 33 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 178 |
| 19:00 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 36 | 41 | 32 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 163 |
| 20:00 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 27 | 31 | 23 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 119 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 14 | 17 | 24 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 89 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 20 | 18 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 14 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| 24:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 28 |
| DAY TOTAL | 2 | 8 | 84 | 41 | 37 | 170 | 572 | 945 | 680 | 289 | 127 | 47 | 8 | 11 | 3021 |
| PERCENTS | $0.1 \%$ | 0.3\% | $2.8 \%$ | 1. $4 \%$ | 1. $2 \%$ | 5. $6 \%$ | 18.9\% | 31.3\% | 22.5\% | 9.6\% | 4.2\% | 1.6\% | $0.3 \%$ | 0.4\% | 100.0\% |

Statistical Information...

| 15th Percentile Speed 36.0 mph | 85th Percentile Speed 50.4 mph |
| :---: | :---: |
| Median Speed | Average Speed |
| 43.1 mph | 42.9 mph |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed | Vehicles > 65 MPH |
| 35 mph to 45 mph | 8 |
| 945 vehicles in pace | 0.3\% |
| Representing 31.4\% of the total vehicles |  |

## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 3
Thu 10/29/2020

```
File: D1027002APPEND.prn
City: Milton
County: speed
```

Station \#: 000000000141
Site ID: 000000000401
Location: Route 28 NB , north of Spafford St. Direction: NORTH
Lane: 1


Statistical Information...

| 15th Percentile Speed 36.0 mph | 85th Percentile Speed 50.4 mph |
| :---: | :---: |
| Median Speed | Average Speed |
| 43.1 mph | 42.9 mph |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed | Vehicles > 65 MPH |
| 35 mph to 45 mph | 8 |
| 945 vehicles in pace | $0.3 \%$ |
| Representing 31.4\% of the total vehicles |  |

## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 4

$$
\text { Fri } 10 / 30 / 2020
$$

Station \#: 000000000141 File: D1027002APPEND.prn
Site ID: 000000000401
City: Milton
County: speed
Location: Route 28 NB, north of Spafford St. Direction: NORTH
Lane: 1


Statistical Information...


## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 5 Sat 10/31/2020


Statistical Information...


## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 6
Sun 11/1/2020

File: D1027002APPEND.prn<br>City: Milton<br>County: speed

Station \#: 000000000141
Site ID: 000000000401
Location: Route 28 NB , north of Spafford St.
Direction: NORTH
Lane: 1

| TIME | <10 | <15 | $<20$ | <25 | $<30$ | $<35$ | $<40$ | $<45$ | $<50$ | $<55$ | $<60$ | $<65$ | $<70$ | <120 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 36 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| '07:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| 09:00 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 48 |
| 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 22 | 26 | 13 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 95 |
| 11:00 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 17 | 35 | 40 | 14 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 131 |
| 12:00 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 37 | 33 | 17 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 143 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 53 | 35 | 21 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 155 |
| 14:00 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 18 | 41 | 50 | 17 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 156 |
| 15:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 45 | 48 | 32 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 164 |
| 16:00 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 34 | 57 | 15 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 150 |
| 17:00 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 33 | 43 | 31 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 141 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 31 | 44 | 16 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 126 |
| 19:00 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 20 | 33 | 27 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 107 |
| 20:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 31 | 25 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 90 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 18 | 21 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 19 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| 23:00 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| DAY TOTAL | 1 | 10 | 57 | 21 | 20 | 94 | 316 | 532 | 407 | 203 | 92 | 40 | 9 | 9 | 1811 |
| PERCENTS | $0.1 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | 3.1\% | 1.2\% | 1.1\% | 5.2\% | 17.4\% | 29.4\% | 22.5\% | 11.2\% | 5.1\% | $2.2 \%$ | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% |

Statistical Information...

| 15th Percentile Speed 36.1 mph | 85th Percentile Speed 51.8 mph |
| :---: | :---: |
| Median Speed | Average Speed |
| 43.6 mph | 43.3 mph |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed | Vehicles > 65 MPH |
| 35 mph to 45 mph | 9 |
| 532 vehicles in pace | 0.5\% |
| Representing 29.5\% of the total vehicles |  |

Mass Highway Department
SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 1
Mon 10/26/2020
$S T A \cdot 4 S B$
Station \#: 000000000023
Site ID: 000000000402
Location: Route 28 SB, north of Spafford Rd.
SPEED
File: D1026015.prn

Direction: SOUTH
Lane: 1

| TIME | $<10$ | $<15$ | <20 | $<25$ | $<30$ | $<35$ | $<40$ | $<45$ | $<50$ | $<55$ | $<60$ | $<65$ | $<70$ | $<120$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:00 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 21 | 73 | 80 | 43 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 72 | 104 | 55 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 273 |
| 14:00 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 15 | 44 | 92 | 55 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 241 |
| 15:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 30 | 97 | 123 | 70 | 16 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 354 |
| 16:00 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 20 | 96 | 180 | 100 | 31 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 450 |
| 17:00 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 23 | 103 | 157 | 80 | 20 | 6 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 406 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 29 | 109 | 132 | 70 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 367 |
| 19:00 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 73 | 102 | 51 | 19 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 271 |
| 20:00 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | $4^{\prime}$ | 26 | 72 | 54 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177 |
| 21:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 49 | 60 | 12 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 154 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 29 | 39 | 19 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 103 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 20 | 23 | 16 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 78 |
| 24:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 27 | 41 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| DAY TOTAL | 8 | 1 | 23 | 43 | 178 | 737 | 1167 | 741 | 226 | 50 | 29 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3212 |
| PERCENTS | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 1. $3 \%$ | 5.5\% | 22.9\% | 36.3\% | 23.1\% | 7.0\% | 1. $6 \%$ | 0.9\% | $0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | 100.0\% |

Statistical Information...


## Mass Highway Department

> SPEED SUMMARY
> Tue $10 / 27 / 2020$

Page: 2


Statistical Information...

| 15th Percentile Speed 31.9 mph | 85th Percentile Speed 44.3 mph |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Median Speed } \\ & 38.1 \mathrm{mph} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average Speed } \\ & 38.2 \mathrm{mph} \end{aligned}$ |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed <br> 30 mph to 40 mph <br> 1620 vehicles in pace <br> Representing $36.8 \%$ of the total vehicles | $\begin{gathered} \text { Vehicles }>65 \mathrm{MPH} \\ 3 \\ 0.1 \% \end{gathered}$ |

## Mass Highway Department

## SPEED SUMMARY <br> Wed 10/28/2020

Page: 3

> File: D1026015.prn
> City: Milton
> County: Speed
Station \#: 000000000023
Site ID: 000000000402
Location: Route 28 SB , north of Spafford Rd.
Direction: SouTh
Lane: 1

| TIME | $<10$ | <15 | <20 | $<25$ | $<30$ | $<35$ | $<40$ | $<45$ | $<50$ | $<55$ | $<60$ | $<65$ | $<70$ | <120 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| 07:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 38 | 23 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 42 | 82 | 54 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 |
| 09:00 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 16 | 42 | 74 | 57 | 16 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 220 |
| 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 65 | 59 | 35 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 203 |
| 11:00 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 23 | 70 | 59 | 34 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 209 |
| 12:00 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 | - 54 | 85 | 37 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 213 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 83 | 100 | 48 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 261 |
| 14:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 67 | 85 | 38 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 232 |
| 15:00 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 21 | 101 | 97 | 47 | 25 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 314 |
| 16:00 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 33 | 126 | 130 | 84 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 424 |
| 17:00 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 39 | 121 | 146 | 72 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 411 |
| 18:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 32 | 93 | 142 | 85 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 378 |
| 19:00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 81 | 123 | 56 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 298 |
| 20:00 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 62 | 100 | 47 | 15 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 251 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 59 | 34 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 147 |
| 22:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 40 | 44 | 13 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 27 | 24 | 16 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| 24:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 39 | 29 | 22 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 115 |
| DAY TOTAL | 47 | 6 | 19 | 65 | 283 | 1087 | 1519 | 881 | 275 | 82 | 26 | 9 | 2 | 9 | 4310 |
| PERCENTS | 1.1\% | $0.1 \%$ | 0.4\% | 1.5\% | 6. $6 \%$ | 25.2\% | 35. 2 \% | 20.4\% | 6.4\% | 1.9\% | 0.6\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | $0.2 \%$ | 100.0\% |

Statistical Information...

| 15th Percentile Speed 31.2 mph | 85th Percentile Speed 43.6 mph |
| :---: | :---: |
| Median Speed | Average Speed |
| 37.2 mph | 37.4 mph |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed | Vehicles > 65 MPH |
| 30 mph to 40 mph | 2 |
| 1519 vehicles in pace | 0.0\% |
| Representing 35.7\% of the total vehicles |  |

## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 1
Mon $10 / 26 / 2020$
1
STA. 6 NB
File: D1026020.prn
Station \#: 000000000153
Site ID: 000000000601
Location: Randolph Ave. NB, south of Pleasant St. Direction: NORTH
Lane: 1

| TIME | $<10$ | $<15$ | <20 | $<25$ | <30 | <35 | $<40$ | $<45$ | $<50$ | $<55$ | $<60$ | <65 | $<70$ | <120 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:00 | 10 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 36 | 77 | 101 | 51 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 315 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 18 | 57 | 131 | 73 | 26 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 315 |
| 14:00 | 2 | 3 | 0 | , 6 | 11 | 56 | 129 | 90 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 332 |
| 15:00 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 26 | 67 | 168 | 103 | 30 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 411 |
| 16:00 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 33 | 84 | 177 | 108 | 28 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 444 |
| 17:00 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 42 | 150 | 175 | 84 | 20 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 485 |
| 18:00 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 19 | 113 | 234 | 193 | 64 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 659 |
| 19:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 49 | 85 | 112 | 58 | 15 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 339 |
| 20:00 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 39 | 67 | 45 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 184 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | - 27 | 46 | 27 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 |
| 22:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 24 | 36 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 26 | 23 | 15 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| 24:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| DAY TOTAL | 22 | 22 | 27 | 63 | 350 | 900 | 1360 | 770 | 215 | 52 | 19 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 3814 |
| PERCENTS | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.7\% | 1. $7 \%$ | 9.2\% | 23.6\% | 35.7\% | 20.2\% | 5. $6 \%$ | 1. $4 \%$ | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | $0.1 \%$ | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |

Statistical Information,..

| 15 th Percentile speed <br> 30.6 mph | P5th Percentile Speed <br> 43.3 mph <br> Median speed <br> 37.0 mph |
| :--- | :---: |
| MPH Pace speed <br> 30 mph to 40 mph <br> 1360 vehicles in pace <br> Representing $35.9 \%$ of the total vehicles |  |

File: D1026020.prn
City: Milton
County: Speed

Station \#: 000000000153
Site ID: 000000000601
Location: Randolph Ave. NB, south of Pleasant St. Direction: NORTH
Lane: 1


Statistical Information...


85th Percentile Speed 43.8 mph

Average Speed
37.1 mph

Vehicles > 65 MPH
$0.0 \%$ 2088 vehicles in pace
Representing $33.9 \%$ of the total vehicles

## Mass Highway Department

> SPEED SUMMARY
> Wed $10 / 28 / 2020$

Page: 3


Statistical Information...


File: D1026020.prn
City: Milton
County: Speed


Statistical Information...


## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 5
Eri 10/30/2020



## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 2
Tue 10/27/2020


Statistical Information...

| 15th Percentile Speed |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| 37.4 mph | 8 th Percentile Speed <br> 50.3 mph |
| Median Speed | Average Speed |
| 43.6 mph | 44.1 mph |
|  | Vehicles $>65 \mathrm{MPH}$ |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed | 17 |
| 35 mph to 45 mph | $0.3 \%$ |
| 1854 vehicles in pace |  |
| Representing $35.3 \%$ of the total vehicles |  |

## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 3
Wed 10/28/2020

File: D1026024.prn
City: Milton
County: Speed


Statistical Information...

| 15th Percentile Speed |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 36.6 mph | 85th Percentile Speed <br> 49.3 mph |
| Median Speed | Average Speed |
| 42.7 mph | 43.0 mph |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed | Vehicles $>65 \mathrm{MPH}$ |
| 35 mph to 45 mph | 17 |
| 1728 vehicles in pace |  |
| Representing $35.9 \%$ of the total vehicles | $0.4 \%$ |

## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 4
Thu 10/29/2020
Station \#: 000000000127
Site ID: 000000000602
Location: Route 28 SB , south of PleasanSt.
Direction: SOUTH
Lane: 1

> File: D1026024.prn
> City: Milton County: Speed

Lane: 1


Statistical Information...

| 15th Percentile Speed 35.6 mph | 85th Percentile Speed 48.5 mph |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Median } \text { Speed } \\ & 41.9 \mathrm{mph} \end{aligned}$ | Average Speed 42.0 mph |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed <br> 35 mph to 45 mph <br> 1733 vehicles in pace <br> Representing $33.8 \%$ of the total vehicles | $\begin{gathered} \text { Vehicles }>65 \mathrm{MPH} \\ 8 \\ 0.2 \% \end{gathered}$ |

## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 5
Fri 10/30/2020

```
File: D1026024.prn
City: Milton
County: Speed
```



Statistical Information...


## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY Page: 1
Mon $10 / 26 / 2020$

$$
S T A, 7 N B
$$

Station \#: 000000000150
Site ID: 000000000701
Location: Route 28 NB , south of Hillside st. SPEED
File: D1026027.prn
City: Milton
Direction: NORTH
Lane: 1


Statistical Information...


## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 2
Tue 10/27/2020

> File: D1026027.prn
> City: Milton
> County: speed

| Station <br> Site ID: <br> Location: |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0150 \\ & 01 \\ & \text { NB, s } \end{aligned}$ | th o | Hill | ide S |  | File: D1026027.prn <br> City: Milton <br> County: speed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME | $<10$ | $<15$ | <20 | $<25$ | <30 | <35 | $<40$ | $<45$ | <50 | <55 | <60 | $<65$ | $<70$ | $<120$ | Total |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | , |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 35 | 97 | 53 | 27 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 248 |
| 07:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 34 | 82 | 184 | 162 | 62 | 22 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 569 |
| 08:00 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 22 | 49 | 106 | 167 | 106 | 38 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 515 |
| 09:00 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 25 | 107 | 139 | 100 | 26 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 431 |
| 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 26 | 87 | 115 | 60 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 330 |
| 11:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 18 | 29 | 96 | 109 | 48 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 340 |
| 12:00 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 30 | 74 | 102 | 53 | 15 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 308 |
| 13:00 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 16 | 53 | 100 | 71 | 23 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 288 |
| 14:00 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 17 | 69 | 120 | 71 | 27 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 334 |
| 15:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 13 | 29 | 91 | 159 | 83 | 20 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 420 |
| 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 35 | 109 | 134 | 81 | 25 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 422 |
| 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 14 | 38 | 115 | 120 | 65 | 20 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 396 |
| 18:00 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 21 | 46 | 132 | 134 | 59 | 17 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 430 |
| 19:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 28 | 98 | 112 | 59 | 21 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 346 |
| 20:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 49 | 87 | 49 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 222 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 28 | 50 | 34 | 21 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 149 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 29 | 29 | 13 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 103 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 20 | 21 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 81 |
| 24:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| DAY TOTAL | 7 | 7 | 33 | 87 | 172 | 423 | 1368 | 1949 | 1276 | 450 | 187 | 61 | 10 | 13 | 6043 |
| PERCENTS | 0.1 \% | 0.1\% | 0.5\% | 1.4\% | 2.8\% | 7.0\% | 22.6\% | 32.3\% | 21.1\% | 7.4\% | 3.1\% | 1.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 100.0 |

Statistical Information...
$\left.\begin{array}{lc}\text { 15th Percentile Speed } \\ 35.7 \mathrm{mph} & \text { 85th Percentile Speed } \\ 49.2 \mathrm{mph}\end{array}\right)$

Mass Highway Department
SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 3
Wed 10/28/2020

Station \#: 000000000150
Site ID: 000000000701
Location: Route 28 NB , south of Hillside St. Direction: NORTH
Lane: 1

| TIME | $<10$ | $<15$ | $<20$ | $<25$ | $<30$ | $<35$ | $<40$ | $<45$ | $<50$ | <55 | $<60$ | $<65$ | $<70$ | $<120$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 03:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 51 | 94 | 38 | 32 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 252 |
| 07:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 47 | 140 | 159 | 125 | 46 | 24 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 574 |
| 08:00 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 28 | 62 | 158 | 196 | 58 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 552 |
| 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 47 | 111 | 135 | 60 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 393 |
| 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 23 | 64 | 150 | 66 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 327 |
| 11:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 18 | 38 | 83 | 71 | 60 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 297 |
| 12:00 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 18 | 39 | 87 | 113 | 36 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 329 |
| 13:00 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 17 | 39 | 68 | 96 | 55 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 309 |
| 14:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 26 | 79 | 91 | 67 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 306 |
| 15:00 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 22 | 37 | 125 | 150 | 54 | 29 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 433 |
| 16:00 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 66 | 106 | 127 | 69 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 410 |
| 17:00 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 23 | 38 | 109 | 121 | 59 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 384 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 17 | 60 | 134 | 144 | 46 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 422 |
| 19:00 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 13 | 35 | 96 | 125 | 57 | 13 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 352 |
| 20:00 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 46 | 113 | 58 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 269 |
| 21:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 52 | 38 | 17 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 145 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 34 | 34 | 15 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 117 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 32 | 32 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 100 |
| 24:00 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 54 |
| DAY TOTAL | 21 | 20 | 38 | 87 | 236 | 592 | 1467 | 2003 | 1099 | 332 | 143 | 47 | 8 | 3 | 6096 |
| PERCENTS | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.6\% | 1. $4 \%$ | 3.9\% | 9.7\% | 24.1\% | 32.9\% | 18.0\% | 5.4\% | 2. $3 \%$ | 0.8\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |

Statistical Information...

15th Percentile Speed 34.5 mph

Median Speed 41.5 mph

10 MPH Pace Speed 35 mph to 45 mph 2003 vehicles in pace Representing $33.0 \%$ of the total vehicles

85th Percentile Speed
48.3 mph

Average speed
41.2 mph

Vehicles $>65 \mathrm{MPH}$
8
$0.1 \%$

File: D1026027.prn
City: Milton
County: speed

## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 4

## Thu 10/29/2020

Station \#: 000000000150
Site ID: 000000000701
Location: Route 28 NB, south of Hillside St. Direction: NORTH
Lane: 1


Statistical Information...

| 15th Percentile Speed 25.8 mph | 85th Percentile Speed 44.3 mph |
| :---: | :---: |
| Median Speed | Average Speed |
| 35.8 mph | 35.3 mph |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed | Vehicles > 65 MPH |
| 30 mph to 40 mph | 5 |
| 1360 vehicles in pace | 0.1\% |
| Representing $22.8 \%$ of the total vehicles |  |

Mass Highway Department
SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 5
Fri 10/30/2020

| Station \#: 000000000150 | File: D1026027.prn |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site ID: 000000000701 | City: Milton |
| Location: Route 28 NB, south of Hillside St. | County: speed |

Direction: NORTH
Lane: 1

| TIME | $<10$ | <15 | $<20$ | $<25$ | $<30$ | <35 | $<40$ | $<45$ | $<50$ | <55 | $<60$ | <65 | . $<70$ | $<120$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 06:00 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 29 | 42 | 29 | 33 | 44 | 27 | 11 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 237 |
| 07:00 | 3 | 5 | 19 | 71 | 77 | 76 | 106 | 62 | 28 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 455. |
| 08:00 | 11 | 10 | 27 | 54 | 66 | 113 | 114 | 58 | 20 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 481 |
| 09:00 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 21 | 45 | 88 | 89 | 68 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 352 |
| 10:00 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 28 | 49 | 82 | 77 | 38 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 317 |
| 11:00 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 53 | 60 | 88 | 62 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 306 |
| 12:00 | 0 | 11 | 25 | 44 | 67 | 97 | 47 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 308 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 18 | 66 | 83 | 72 | 25 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 288 |
| 14:00 | 13 | 11 | 25 | 40 | 81 | 99 | 90 | 46 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 419 |
| 15:00 | 12 | 3 | 16 | 51 | 75 | 73 | 72 | 72 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 394 |
| 16:00 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 42 | 52 | 67 | 99 | 60 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 373 |
| 17:00 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 43 | 40 | 71 | 102 | 44 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 333 |
| 18:00 | 13 | 12 | 15 | 23 | 55 | 86 | 129 | 67 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 415 |
| 19:00 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 36 | 44 | 66 | 91 | 48 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 324 |
| 20:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 28 | 46 | 69 | 44 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 207 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 46 | 62 | 32 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 166 |
| 22:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 42 | 34 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 125 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 36 | 42 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
| 24:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 31 | 28 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 94 |
| DAY TOTAL | 81 | 97 | 222 | 561 | 854 | 1195 | 1380 | 886 | 376 | 81 | 37 | 21 | 1 | 3 | 5795 |
| PERCENTS | 1. $4 \%$ | 1.7\% | 3. $8 \%$ | 9.7\% | 14.7\% | 20.6\% | 23.8\% | 15.3\% | 6.5\% | 1.4\% | 0.6\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | $0.1 \%$ | 100.0\% |

Statistical Information...


Mass Highway Department

> SPEED SUMMARY
> Sat $10 / 31 / 2020$

Page: 6

Station \#: 000000000150
File: D1026027.prn
Site ID: 000000000701
Location: Route 28 NB , south of Hillside St. Direction: NORTH
Lane: 1

| TIME | $<10$ | <15 | $<20$ | $<25$ | $<30$ | $<35$ | $<40$ | $<45$ | $<50$ | <55 | <60 | $<65$ | $<70$ | $<120$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | . 10 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| 07:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 32 | 37 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 102 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 31 | 32 | 14 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 31 | 60 | 45 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 175 |
| 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 36 | 74 | 35 | 17 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 206 |
| 11:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 14 | 33 | 74 | 83 | 40 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 277 |
| 12:00 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 18 | 33 | 61 | 82 | 84 | 49 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 360 |
| 13:00 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 26 | 47 | 106 | 73 | 45 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 330 |
| 14:00 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 15 | 42 | 63 | 106 | 69 | 35 | 14 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 373 |
| 15:00 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 30 | 34 | 71 | 116 | 106 | 50 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 451 |
| 16:00 | 2 | 11 | 12 | 23 | 57 | 62 | 90 | + 98 | 46 | 14 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 423 |
| 17:00 | 8 | 8 | 24 | 30 | 53 | 46 | 84 | 80 | 39 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 386 |
| 18:00 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 35 | 66 | 52 | 90 | 89 | 25 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 389 |
| 19:00 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 30 | 75 | 58 | 74 | 48 | 18 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 324 |
| 20:00 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 23 | 60 | 77 | 47 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 246 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 43 | 64 | 39 | 18 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 189 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 46 | 50 | 17 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 151 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 18 | 49 | 41 | 19 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 154 |
| 24:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 15 | 30 | 23 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 99 |
| DAY TOTAL | 26 | 45 | 108 | 218 | 438 | 581 | 1086 | 1233 | 728 | 251 | 106 | 35 | 5 | 8 | 4868 |
| PERCENTS | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 2. $2 \%$ | 4.5\% | 9.0\% | 11.9\% | 22.3\% | 25.3\% | 15.0\% | 5.2\% | 2. $2 \%$ | 0.7\% | $0.1 \%$ | 0.2\% | 100.0\% |

Statistical Information...


## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 7
Sun 11/1/2020


Statistical Information...



## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 2
Tue 10/27/2020

> File: D1026029.prn
> City: Milton
> County: speed

Station \#: 000000000068
Site ID: 000000000702
Location: Route 28 SB , south of Hillside. St. Direction: SOUTH
Lane: 1

| TIME | <10 | <15 | <20 | $<25$ | $<30$ | $<35$ | $<40$ | $<45$ | $<50$ | $<55$ | $<60$ | $<65$ | $<70$ | <120 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 24 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| 07:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 20 | 26 | 49 | 31 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 156 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 32 | 90 | 86 | 53 | 18 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 298 |
| 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 21 | 47 | 106 | 95 | 48 | 19 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 356 |
| 10:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - 13 | 35 | 43 | 83 | 58 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 259 |
| 11:00 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 20 | 50 | 87 | 54 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 253 |
| 12:00 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 27 | 57 | 90 | 84 | 20 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 306 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 29 | 65 | 90 | 77 | 39 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 313 |
| 14:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 57 | 105 | 96 | 35 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 333 |
| 15:00 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 19 | 65 | 145 | 158 | 63 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 477 |
| 16:00 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 63 | 148 | 231 | 134 | 44 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 662 |
| 17:00 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 56 | 113 | 182 | 136 | 51 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 569 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 40 | 80 | 153 | 146 | 41 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 480 |
| 19:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 53 | 136 | 91 | 51 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 356 |
| 20:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 27 | 68 | 71 | 46 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 229 |
| 21:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 50 | 78 | 43 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 199 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 44 | 54 | 24 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 26 | 35 | 23 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 111 |
| 24:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 31 | 30 | 28 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| DAY TOTAL | 12 | 10 | 35 | 85 | 362 | 891 | 1765 | 1578 | 724 | 207 | 56 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 5740 |
| PERCENTS | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.6\% | 1. $5 \%$ | 6. 3 \% | 15.5\% | 30.7\% | 27.5\% | 12.6\% | 3.6\% | 1.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |

Statistical Information...


Mass Highway Department
SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 3
Wed 10/28/2020

File: D1026029.prn
City: Milton
County: speed
Site ID: 000000000702
Location: Route 28 SB , south of Hillside St. Direction: SOUTH
Lane: 1

| TIME | $<10$ | $<15$ | <20 | $<25$ | $<30$ | $<35$ | $<40$ | $<45$ | $<50$ | $<55$ | $<60$ | $<65$ | $<70$ | <120 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 21 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 06:00 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| 07:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 18 | 54 | 34 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 9 | 69 | 100 | 75 | 27 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 312 |
| 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 33 | 75 | 123 | 60 | 26 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 327 |
| 10:00 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 18 | 51 | 82 | 75 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 261 |
| 11:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 42 | 66 | 90 | 57 | 26 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 292 |
| 12:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 24 | 69 | 94 | 67 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 279 |
| 13:00 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 37 | 75 | 112 | 71 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 347 |
| 14:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 31 | 82 | 105 | 83 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 337 |
| 15:00 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 35 | 104 | 146 | 94 | 24 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 424 |
| 16:00 | 107 | 14 | 16 | 26 | 51 | 116 | 131 | 82 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 565 |
| 17:00 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 39 | 106 | 190 | 123 | 30 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 524 |
| 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 118 | 179 | 126 | 40 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 492 |
| 19:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 26 | 62 | 125 | 90 | 35 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 350 |
| 20:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 26 | 71 | 103 | 38 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 268 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 40 | 65 | 37 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 167 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 24 | 44 | 38 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 127 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 35 | 27 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 97 |
| 24:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 41 | 32 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| DAY TOTAL | 116 | 20 | 50 | 126 | 385 | 1068 | 1734 | 1377 | 528 | 128 | 30 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 5571 |
| PERCENTS | 2.1\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 2. 3 \% | 6.9\% | 19.2\% | 31.1\% | 24.7\% | 9.5\% | 2.3\% | 0.5\% | $0.1 \%$ | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |

Statistical Information...

15th Percentile Speed
31.1 mph

Median Speed
38.1 mph

10 MPH Pace Speed 30 mph to 40 mph 1734 vehicles in pace Representing $31.8 \%$ of the total vehicles

85th Percentile Speed
44.6 mph

Average Speed
37.9 mph

Vehicles > 65 MPH
1
$0.0 \%$

Mass Highway Department
SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 4
Thu 10/29/2020

> File: D1026029.prn
> City: Milton
> County: speed

Station \#: 000000000068
Site ID: 000000000702
Location: Route 28 SB, south of Hillside St. Direction: SOUTH
Lane: 1

| TIME | <10 | $<15$ | $<20$ | $<25$ | <30 | <35 | $<40$ | <45 | $<50$ | $<55$ | $<60$ | $<65$ | $<70$ | $<120$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 14 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 06:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 11 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| 07:00 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 25 | 63 | 30 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 141 |
| 08:00 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 32 | 79 | 94 | 42 | 11 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275 |
| 09:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 67 | 116 | 98 | 39 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 347 |
| 10:00 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 23 | 58 | 58 | 53 | 21 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 239 |
| 11:00 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 25 | 69 | 98 | 55 | 23 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 285 |
| 12:00 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 21 | 108 | 74 | 57 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 288 |
| 13:00 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 49 | 116 | 100 | 53 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 338 |
| 14:00 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 71 | 130 | 80 | 25 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 326 |
| 15:00 | 6 | 5 | 18 | 47 | 131 | 166 | 65 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 454 |
| 16:00 | 2 | 2 | 44 | 102 | 194 | 160 | 78 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 598 |
| 17:00 | 3 | 6 | 46 | 107 | 224 | 122 | 50 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 565 |
| 18:00 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 59 | 207 | 165 | 44 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 510 |
| 19:00 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 26 | 129 | 134 | 68 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 382 |
| 20:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 41 | 89 | 80 | 21 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 242 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 68 | 66 | 25 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 37 | 57 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| 23:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 38 | 44 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
| 24:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 38 | 57 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
| DAY TOTAL | 26 | 21 | 167 | 493 | 1506 | 1709 | 1195 | 403 | 129 | 37 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5703 |
| PERCENTS | 0.5\% | 0.4\% | 2.9\% | 8. $6 \%$ | 26.4\% | 30.0\% | $21.0 \%$ | 7.1\% | 2. $3 \%$ | 0.6\% | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |

Statistical Information...

| 15 th Percentile speed <br> 25.6 mph | 85th Percentile Speed <br> 38.9 mph <br> Median speed <br> 31.9 mph |
| :--- | :---: |
| MPH Pace speed <br> 25 mph to 35 mph <br> 1709 vehicles in pace <br> Representing $30.1 \%$ of the total vehicles |  |

## Mass Highway Department

> SPEED SUMMARY
> Fri $10 / 30 / 2020$


Statistical Information...


## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 6
Sat $10 / 31 / 2020$

File: D1026029.prn
City: Milton
County: speed


Statistical Information...

| 15th Percentile Speed 27.8 mph | 85th Percentile Speed 42.3 mph |
| :---: | :---: |
| Median Speed | Average Speed |
| 34.8 mph | 35.0 mph |
| 10 MPH Pace Speed | Vehicles > 65 MPH |
| 25 mph to 35 mph | 0 |
| 1439 vehicles in pace | 0.0\% |
| Representing $29.1 \%$ of the total vehicles |  |

## Mass Highway Department

SPEED SUMMARY
Page: 7
Sun 11/1/2020


Statistical Information...


## Part 4: Signal Timing and Layout Information




## MAJOR ITEM

| MAJOR ITEMS |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| QUANTIT | DESCRIPTION |
| 1 | TRAFFIC SIGNAL CONTROLLER (TS2 - TYPE 1), LOCATED IN BASE MOUNTED CABINET (TYPE CD) W/FOUNDATION AND CONCRETE PAD |
| 2 | ORNAMENTAL 20' MASt ARM (STEEL) - TYPE II MONOLEVER W/ Foundation |
| 1 | ORNAMENTAL 30' MASt ARM (STEEL) - TYPE II MONOLEVER W/ Foundation |
| 1 | ORNAMENTAL 35' MASt ARM (STEEL) - TYPE II MONOLEVER W/ FOUNDATION |
| 5 | ORNAMENTAL TRAFFIC SIINAL POST AND BASE - 10' (STEEL) |
| 4 | ORNAMENTAL TRAFFIC SIINAL POST AND BASE - $8^{\prime}$ (STEEL) |
| 13 | SIGNAL HEAD - 1 -WAY, 3 -SECTION, 12" Lens w/ backplates (LOUVERED) |
| 10 | PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL HEAD, SINGLE SECTION, $12^{\prime \prime}$ LED |
| 10 | PEDESTRIAN PUSH Button w/ sign and sadole |
| 21 | PULL Box - $12^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1 | SERVICE CONNECTION (ELECTRIC) |
| 1 | SERVICE CONNECTION (telephone) |
| 15 | LOOP DETECTORS ( $6^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}$ ) TYPE Q WRE LOOP DETECTOR |
| 2 | LOOP DETECTORS (4'x4) TYPE D-Q BICYCLE DETECTOR |
| 5 | LOOP DETECTOR AMPLIFIER (DUAL CHANNEL) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| PLUS ALL MISCELLANEOUS EQUPMENT, LABOR AND MATERIAL NECESSARYTO PROVIDE A COMPLETE OPERATIG TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNAL to provide a complete operating traffic control signal. |  |

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL NOTES:

fife assigned right-of-way for any traffic movement is to remain in effect during THE NEXT CALLED PHASE, THE SIGNAL INDICATIONS FOR THAT TRAFFIC MOVEMENT WLL NOT
2. IF THE ASSIGNED RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR ANY TRAFFIC MOVEMENT IS TO CHANGE DURING THE NEXT
CALLED PHASE, THE SIGNAL INOICATION FOR THAT TRAFFIC MOVEMENT WLL DISPLAY THE appropriate clearance intervals.
3. FLASHING operation is for emergency only. the signal shall provide stop and go
operation 24 hours dally.
4. PAVEMENT MARKINGS (NOT SHOWN) AND WINDING DETALS FOR BICYCLE DETECTORS SHAL
CONFORM TO THE BICYCLE DETECTOR DETALL SHEET
. detector delay setting to be implemented at the controller only.
6. EAAH SERIES OF WRE LOOP DEtectors shall be connected to a single loop amplfier
 CALL PHASE 2. PUSH BUTTONS $\#, 4,9,10$ CALL PHASE 8. PUSH BUTTONS
PHAEE 2 AND 8 PEDESTRIAN MOVEMENTS SHALL BE OVERLAPS TO PHASE 9 .
8. THE CONTRoLler SHALL OPERATE IN THE Standard nema dual-RIng Configuration. $\phi 1, \phi 4$,
$\phi 5$, \& $\varnothing 7$ NOT USED.

ES: 1.) ALL SIGNAL Heads Shall have tunnel visors
2.) ALL VEHICLE SIGNAL LeNS SHALL bE $12^{\prime \prime}$ DIA.
3.) ALL PEDESTRAA SIGNAL HEADS SHALL DISPLAY
INTERNATONAL SYMBOLS - (HAND)/(PERSON WALKING),
) all pedestrian signal heads shall be single section
.) ALL RED, YELOW, GREEN, AND PEDESTRIAN SIGNALS SHALL BE LED TYPE.
6.) all signal housings on mast arms shall be fixed mounted.
$\frac{\text { SIGNAL HEAD DATA }}{\text { NOT TO SCALE }}$
NOT TO SCALE

MONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS $\therefore$ PARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS 00 NASHUA STREET BOSTON MASSACHUSETTS 02114

Brook Road and St. Mary's Road Milton
date: $12-14-78$ permit no. $B-1594$




Project:
City:
TRAFFIC SIGNAL INVENTORY
MILTON, MA
Sheet:

| $\frac{1}{\text { JMC }}$ |
| :---: |
| $7 / 9 / 2018$ |

## SIGNAL TIMING SHEET

PHASE TIMES

| PHASE | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EB/ <br> WB | NB | PED |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Min Green | 25 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extension | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green I | 25 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green II | 15 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yellow | 4 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Red | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walk |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Don't Walk |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lock/Non-Lock | NL | NL | NL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recall | MAX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SIGNAL OPERATION
Pretimed
Semi-Actuated
Fully-Actuated


Coordinated
Free

NOTES:


SIGNAL PHASING DIAGRAM


Project:
City:
TRAFFIC SIGNAL INVENTORY
MILTON, MA
Sheet:


SIGNAL TIMING SHEET

PHASE TIMES

| PHASE | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | NW/ <br> SE | PED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Min Green | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extension | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green I | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green II | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yellow | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Red | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walk |  | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Don't Walk |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lock/Non-Lock | NL | NL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recall | MAX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SIGNAL OPERATION
Pretimed
Semi-Actuated
Fully-Actuated

Coordinated
Free

NOTES:
Flashing Mid-Block Pedestrian Signal


SIGNAL PHASING DIAGRAM

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL PLAN

## COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS <br> Brook Road and Standish Road Milton

 100 NASHUA STREET BOSTON MASSACHUSETTS 02114PERM NO. $B-1596$



Project:
City:
TRAFFIC SIGNAL INVENTORY
MILTON, MA
Sheet:


SIGNAL TIMING SHEET

PHASE TIMES

| PHASE | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | NW/ <br> SE | SW | PED |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Min Green | 25 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extension |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green I | 25 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yellow | 4 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Red | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walk |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Don't Walk |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lock/Non-Lock | NL | NL | NL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recall | MAX | MIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SIGNAL OPERATION

| Pretimed |  |
| :--- | ---: |
|  |  |
| Semi-Actuated | $\mathbf{X}$ |
|  |  |

Coordinated
Free


NOTES:


SIGNAL PHASING DIAGRAM



| TRAFFIC SIGNAL INVENTORY |
| :--- |
| MILTON, MA |

Sheet:

| $\frac{1}{\text { JMC }}$ |
| :---: |
| $7 / 9 / 2018$ |

SIGNAL TIMING SHEET

PHASE TIMES

| PHASE | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | WBL | EB/ <br> WB | PED | NW | SB | NE |  |  |  |
| Min Green | 7 | 6 |  | 6 | 6 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Extension | 2 | 1.5 |  | 1.5 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Max Green I | 7 | 25 |  | 30 | 25 | 10 |  |  |  |
| Max Green II | 7 | 35 |  | 25 | 20 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Yellow | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |
| All Red | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Walk |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Don't Walk |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lock/Non-Lock | L | L | L | L | L | L |  |  |  |
| Recall |  | MIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SIGNAL OPERATION
Pretimed
Semi-Actuated
Fully-Actuated


Coordinated
Free


NOTES:


SIGNAL PHASING DIAGRAM
*PUSHBUTTON ACTUATED

Project:
City:


Sheet:

| $\frac{1}{\text { JMC }}$ |
| :---: |
| $7 / 10 / 2018$ |

## SIGNAL TIMING SHEET

PHASE TIMES

| PHASE | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | NWL | NW/ <br> SE | NE | SB | SW | PED |  |  |  |
| Min Green | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Extension | 2.5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green I | 10 | 35 | 35 | 20 | 35 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green II | 15 | 40 | 35 | 25 | 35 |  |  |  |  |
| Yellow | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| All Red |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Walk |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |
| Don't Walk |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |
| Lock/Non-Lock | L | L | NL | NL | NL | NL |  |  |  |
| Recall |  | SOFT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SIGNAL OPERATION
Pretimed
Semi-Actuated
Fully-Actuated


Coordinated
Free


NOTES:



* EACH D-2 BIKE LOOP DETECTOR wLIL be connected to a separate
CHANNEL OF LOOP DEIECTOR AMPLIFIER

SERIES/PARALLEL

| DETECTOR DATA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| detector | No. \& SIZE | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { TURNS } \end{array}\right.$ | CAALED | delar | TYPE OF DETECTION | COnNection |
| $\triangle$ | $4-6^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ | 3 | ${ }_{6} 1$ | 0 | PRESENCE | SERIES/PARALIEL |
| 22 20 | - ${ }^{1}-22^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ | 3 | ${ }^{96}$ | 0 | PRESENCE | SERIES/PARALEL |
| B 3 S | 1-144 $\times{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3 | 92 | 0 | PRESENCE | SERRES/PARALLEL |
| 4 | $4-6^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ | 3 | 88 | 0 | PRESENCE | SERIES/PARALLEL |
| B SA | $1-16^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ $3-6^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ | 3 | ${ }^{68}$ | 0 | PRESENCE | SERIES/PARALLEL |
|  | $4-6^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ | 3 | 87 | 0 | PRESENCE |  |
| $\triangle A$ |  | 3 | ${ }^{4} 4$ | - | Presence | SERIES/PARALLEL |
| (1) | 2-6' $\times 6^{\prime}$ | 3 | ${ }^{96}$ | 0 | PULSE | SERIES |
| Q | $2-6^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ | 3 | 96 | 0 | PULSE | SERIES |



NOTE: Signal heads shall have $5^{\prime \prime}$ Louvered backplate 1. ALL SIGNAL heAAS SHALL HAVE 5" LOUVERED BACRPLATE
2. ALL RED, YELIOW AND GREEN SIGAAL INOICATIONS SHALL BE LED TMPE 3. ALL SIGNAL HEADS ON MAST ARMS SHALL be filed mounted


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { As Built Drawing } \\
& 9-7-07 q V
\end{aligned}
$$



NS GREEN IF $\$ 1$ \& 86 ARE CALLED NEXI


* each d-2 bike loop detector will be connected to a separate

EACH D-2 BIIE LOOP DETECTOR WLL BE
CHANNEL OF LOOP DETECTOR AMPLFIER


TRAFFIC SIGNAL DATA
LOCATION \#3 RANDOLPH AVENUE (ROUTE 28)
As Built Drawing

VIGIL ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC. 72 PROVIDENCE STREET


1. After fire per-emption has terminated, the signal shall return to the
2. EMERGENCY VEHICLE PRE-EMPTION REFERS TO OPTCALLY TRANSMITTED CALLS SENT BY OPTICAL EMITERS MOUNTED ON EMERGENC
BY OPTICAL DETECTORS MOUNTED ON MAST ARMS
3. WHEN A CALL IS RECEIVED BY OPTICAL DETECTORS, THE CONTROLLER

$$
9.7-074^{2}
$$ SHALL ADVANCE TO THE EMERGENCY VE

THE PREFERENTAL PHASING SEQUENCE.
4. UPON CLEARANCE OF THE PRE-EMPTION PHASE THE CONTROLIER SHALL RESUME PRE-EMPTION SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM GREEN AND CIEARANCE INTERVAL PRIICR PRE-EMPTION SHAL
TO TERMINATION.

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL PHASING NOTES

1. TRAFFIC CONTROL SIIGNALS AT THIS LLCCATION WHEN COMPLETED UNDER THIS CONTRAC
IN ISOLATED MODE
2. IF THE ASSIGNED RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR ANY TRAFFIC MOVEMENT IS TO REMAN IN EFFECT DURING THE NEXT CALLED PHASE THE SIGNAL INDICATION
FOR THAT MOVEMENT WLL NOT CHANGE DURING THE CLEARANCE INTERVAL.
3. IF THE ASSIGNED RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR ANY TRAFFIC MOVEMENT IS TO CHANGE DURING THE NEXT CALLE DHASE THE SIGNAL NDICATION FOR THAT
TRAFFIC MOVEMENT WLL DISPLAY THE APPROPRIATE CLEAR ANCE INTERVAL.


NOTE:

1. All signal heads shall have $5^{" \prime}$ louvered backplate 3. ALL SIINAL heads on mast arm shall be fixed mounted




EACH D－2 BIEE LLOP DEGECTOR WLL BE CONNECTED TO A SEPARATE
CHANNEL OF LOOP DETECTOR AMPLIFIER

| DETECTOR DATA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| detector | NO．\＆SIIE | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { NO. OF } \\ \text { TURNS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { PHASE } \\ \text { CALLED } \end{array}$ | DEL | TYPE OF DETECTION | CONNECTION |
| $\wedge$ | 4－6＇$\times 6^{\prime}$ | 3 | 81 | 0 | PRESENCE | SERIES／PARALLEL |
| （2） 24 |  | 3 | ${ }^{66}$ | 0 | PRESENCE | SERIES／PARALLEL |
| Q | 4－6＇$\times 6^{\prime}$ | 3 | ${ }^{6} 5$ | 0 | Presence | SERIES／PARALLEL |
| $4{ }^{494}$ |  | 3 | ${ }^{2}$ | 0 | Presence | SERIES／PARALLEL |
| 䢒／5A |  | 3 | ${ }^{68}$ | 0 | PRESENCE | SERIES／PARALLEL |
| 会 | $\begin{aligned} & 1=7 \times \mathbf{6}^{\prime} \\ & 1=8^{\prime} \\ & 1=9^{\prime} \\ & 1-12 \times 6^{\prime} \\ & 1-12 \times 6^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | 3 | ${ }^{64}$ | 0 | PRESENCE | SERIES／PARALLEL |
| $\Delta$ | $2-6^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ | 3 | ${ }_{6} 6$ | 0 | PULSE | SERIES |
| 8 | $2-6^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ | 3 | ${ }^{9} 6$ | 0 | PULSE | SERIES |
| Q | $2-6^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ | 3 | 92 | 0 | PULSE | SERIES |
| d | $2-6^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ | 3 | 82 | 0 | PULSE | SERRIES |

PREFERENTAL PHASING DIAGRAM
（ALL TMMES OTHER THAN $3: 00$ PM－6：00 PM）

syform


|  |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{cc} \text { 小受 } \\ \text { 示 } & \text { 必 } \end{array}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 91 \＆ 96 | 62 \＆ 95 | 94 | 98 |



NOTE：
1．ALL SIGNaL heads should have $5^{\prime \prime}$ Louvered backplate 2．ALL GREEN，YELLOW AND RED SIGNAL INDICATONS SHALL BE LED TYPE

## PRE－EMPTION NOTES

1．AFTER FIRE PER－EMPTIOM HAS TERMINATED，the signal Shall return to the
2．EMERGENCY VEHICLE PRE－EMPTIIN REFERS TO OPTICALLY TRANSMITTED CALLS SENT BY OPTICAL EMITIERS MOUNTED ON EMEREENC
BY OPTICAL DETECTORS MOUNTED ON MAST ARMS．
3．．WHEN A CALL IS RECEIVED BY OPTICAL DETECTORS，THE CONTROLLER
SHALL ADVANCE TO THE EMERGENCY VEHICLE PRE－EMPTION AS SHOWN IN
SHALL ADVANCE TO THE EMERGENCY VEH
THE PREFERENTAL PHASING SEOUENCE．
4．UPon Clearance of the pre－empion phase the controller shall resume NORMAL OPERATION．PHASES THAT ARE TERMINATED BY AN EMERGEACY VESHCLE
PRE－EMPTION SHALL HAVE A MNIMUM GREEN AND CLEARANCE INTERVAL PRIOR

$$
\text { * Inhibit } \phi \text { ! after } \phi 2 \text { actirvated on } 8 / 12 / 12 \text { at } 4^{A m}
$$

$$
4 . \phi 54 \text { \& } \quad \text { 4 on } 8 / 17 / 12
$$

## IRAFFIC SIGNAL PHASING NOTES

．TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNALS AT THIS LOCATON MHEN COMPLETED UNDER THHS CONTRAC．
IN ISOLATED MODE．
2．If THE ASIIGNED RIGHT－OF－WAY FOR ANY TRAFFIC MOVEMENT IS TO REMAIN IS EFFECT DURING THE NEXT CCLLED PHASE THE SIINAL TAL INOCATIONS
FOR THAT MOVEMENT WLL NOT CHANGE DURING THE CLEARANCE INTERVALS
3．IF THE ASSIGNED RIGHT－OF－WAY FOR ANY TRAFFIC MOVEMENT IS TO


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { As Built Drawing } \\
& 9-7.07 \mathrm{qV}
\end{aligned}
$$

VIGIL ELECTRIC COMPANY，INC 72 PROVIDENCE STREET HYDE PARK，MA 02136


# Appendix D: Traffic Safety Data 

Part 1: Crash Diagrams
Part 2: Expected Crash Analysis

## Part 1: Crash Diagrams



| Collision ID | Crash Number | Crash Year | Crash Time | Crash Date | Crash Severity | Manner of Collision | Road <br> Surface <br> Condition | Ambient Light Condition | Weather Condition | Bike or Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3602037 | 2013 | 7:54 AM | 2013-09-19 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear |  |
| 2 | 3760033 | 2014 | 5:37 PM | 2014-01-03 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Ice | Dark - lighted roadway | Cloudy/Blowing sand, snow | -- |
| 3 | 3972153 | 2014 | 8:20 PM | 2014-10-07 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 4 | 3991997 | 2015 | 2:43 AM | 2015-01-01 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 5 | 4015427 | 2015 | 00:34 AM | 2015-02-16 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Snow | Dark - lighted roadway | Not Reported | -- |
| 6 | 4046436 | 2015 | 5:40 AM | 2015-05-13 N | Non-fatal injury | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dawn | Clear | -- |
| 7 | 4094653 | 2015 | 12:36 PM | 2015-07-21 N | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 8 | 4092788 | 2015 | 8:57 PM | 2015-08-02 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, opposite direction | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 9 | 4126018 | 2015 | 7:57 PM | 2015-12-06 N | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Cloudy | -- |
| 10 | 4175174 | 2016 | 2:30 PM | 2016-01-19 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Cloudy | -- |
| 11 | 4186163 | 2016 | 8:00 AM | 2016-03-22 N | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 12 | 4224583 | 2016 | 12:28 PM | 2016-07-09 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | cyc |
| 13 | 4417816 | 2016 | 7:31 PM | 2016-11-30 N | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Wet | Other | Rain/Cloudy | ped |
| 14 | 4523752 | 2017 | 7:14 AM | 2017-05-11 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 15 | 4400349 | 2017 | 11:46 PM | 2017-07-29 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 16 | 4409757 | 2017 | 4:00 PM | 2017-08-04 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 17 | 4451119 | 2017 | 10:47 PM | 2017-11-07 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Rain | -- |
| 18 | 4459283 | 2017 | 6:57 PM | 2017-11-17 N | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - unknown roadway lighting | Clear | -- |
| 19 | 4455154 | 2017 | 7:15 PM | 2017-11-17 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 20 | 3430746 | 2013 | 4:17 PM | 2013-05-10 N | Non-fatal injury | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 21 | 3728279 | 2013 | 7:37 AM | 2013-11-18 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Rain/Cloudy | -- |
| 22 | 3824836 | 2014 | 6:50 AM | 2014-03-20 N | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Wet | Dawn | Rain/Rain | -- |
| 23 | 4065586 | 2015 | 3:04 PM | 2015-05-07 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 24 | 4106082 | 2015 | 1:28 PM | 2015-08-06 N | Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 25 | 4195238 | 2016 | 5:19 PM | 2016-03-22 N | Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 26 | 4212359 | 2016 | 7:52 AM | 2016-06-22 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Cloudy | -- |
| 27 | 4210634 | 2016 | 8:51 AM | 2016-06-22 N | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | ped |
| 28 | 4417229 | 2016 | 2:31 PM | 2016-10-25 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 29 | 4349797 | 2017 | 9:08 AM | 2017-03-09 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 30 | 4385286 | 2017 | 2:03 PM | 2017-06-03 P | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Cloudy | -- |



Segment Between Thacher Street and St Mary's Road

| Collision ID2 | Crash Number | Crash Year | Crash Time | Crash Date | Crash_Severity | Manner of Collision | Road Surface Condition | Ambient Light Conditions | Weather Condition | Bike and Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3374009 | 2013 | 11:10 PM | 2013-01-25 | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Snow | Dark - lighted roadway | Snow | -- |
| 2 | 3372350 | 2013 | 12:00 PM | 2013-01-29 | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Snow | Dark - lighted roadway | Snow/Sleet, hail (freezing rain or drizzle) | -- |
| 3 | 3372336 | 2013 | 9:19 PM | 2013-02-05 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Snow | Dark - lighted roadway | Snow/Snow | -- |
| 4 | 3497531 | 2013 | 3:06 PM | 2013-06-21 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 5 | 3727139 | 2013 | 10:03 AM | 2013-12-15 | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Snow | Daylight | Snow/Rain | -- |
| 6 | 3710821 | 2013 | 10:36 AM | 2013-12-16 | Not Reported | Angle | Ice | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 7 | 3771954 | 2014 | 8:34 PM | 2014-01-04 | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Slush | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 8 | 3786125 | 2014 | 6:41 PM | 2014-02-13 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Ice | Dark - lighted roadway | Sleet, hail (freezing rain or drizzle) | -- |
| 9 | 3794973 | 2014 | 4:55 PM | 2014-03-07 | Non-fatal injury | Sideswipe, opposite direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 10 | 3894934 | 2014 | 1:20 PM | 2014-07-26 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 11 | 4032778 | 2015 | 12:02 AM | 2015-01-10 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 12 | 4032837 | 2015 | 5:36 PM | 2015-01-15 | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Snow | Dark - lighted roadway | Cloudy | -- |
| 13 | 4161930 | 2015 | 8:18 AM | 2015-12-29 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Snow | Daylight | Snow/Sleet, hail (freezing rain or drizzle) | -- |
| 14 | 4448336 | 2017 | 6:57 AM | 2017-10-29 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dawn | Clear | -- |



| Collision ID | Crash Number | Crash Time | Crash Date | Crash_Severity | Manner_of_Collision | Road Surface Condition | Ambient Light | Weather Condition | Bike and Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3374232 | 8:24 PM | 2013-01-21 | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Snow | Dark - lighted roadway | Snow | -- |
| 2 | 3396517 | 12:30 AM | 2013-03-20 | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Ice | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 3 | 3587389 | 12:00 AM | 2013-07-29 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Fog, smog, smoke/Fog, smog, smoke | -- |
| 4 | 3760131 | 3:01 PM | 2014-01-02 | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Snow | Daylight | Snow | -- |
| 5 | 3956122 | 2:41 PM | 2014-09-13 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 6 | 3981146 | 11:25 AM | 2014-11-22 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 7 | 4032149 | 2:27 PM | 2015-03-12 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 8 | 4033217 | 9:57 AM | 2015-03-24 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 9 | 4088016 | 8:38 AM | 2015-09-11 | Non-fatal injury | Not reported | Wet | Daylight | Rain | -- |
| 10 | 4149556 | 10:48 AM | 2015-11-28 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Rain | -- |
| 11 | 4173024 | 10:27 PM | 2016-01-09 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 12 | 4175180 | 2:49 PM | 2016-01-17 | Not Reported | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 13 | 4178533 | 12:22 PM | 2016-02-05 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Snow | Daylight | Blowing sand, snow/Snow | -- |
| 14 | 4181155 | 3:18 AM | 2016-03-13 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 15 | 4206084 | 6:46 PM | 2016-05-22 | Non-fatal injury | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 16 | 4522142 | 5:18 PM | 2017-02-12 | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Snow | Dusk | Snow/Sleet, hail (freezing rain or drizzle) | -- |
| 17 | 4525064 | 8:57 AM | 2017-04-04 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Rain/Cloudy | -- |
| 18 | 4392916 | 11:29 PM | 2017-07-18 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 19 | 4476732 | 8:37 AM | 2017-12-23 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Ice | Daylight | Sleet, hail (freezing rain or drizzle)/Rain | -- |



| Collision ID | Crash Number | Crash Year Crash Time | Crash Date Crash Severity | Manner of Collision | Road Surface Condition | Ambient Light | Weather Condition | Bike or Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3427533 | 2013 4:32 PM | 2013-04-20 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 2 | 3401947 | 2013 4:53 PM | 2013-04-26 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 3 | 3452134 | 2013 5:18 PM | 2013-05-29 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 4 | 3497431 | 2013 11:22 AM | 2013-06-24 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 5 | 3602789 | 2013 3:15 PM | 2013-09-16 Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 6 | 3665421 | 2013 1:30 PM | 2013-10-30 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 7 | 3714673 | 2013 10:39 AM | 2013-11-01 Not Reported | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Cloudy/Rain | -- |
| 8 | 3748761 | 2014 3:25 AM | 2014-02-20 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Ice | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Other | -- |
| 9 | 3827621 | 2014 10:32 PM | 2014-05-14 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 10 | 3861732 | 2014 11:29 PM | 2014-05-24 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 11 | 3878457 | 2014 10:19 PM | 2014-06-29 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 12 | 3981112 | 2014 8:21 AM | 2014-11-17 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Rain | -- |
| 13 | 4030501 | 2015 11:47 PM | 2015-02-20 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Ice | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Cloudy | -- |
| 14 | 4048693 | 2015 7:40 PM | 2015-04-16 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Dusk | Clear | -- |
| 15 | 4048606 | 2015 8:49 AM | 2015-05-04 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 16 | 4065580 | 2015 1:32 PM | 2015-05-06 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 17 | 4078483 | 2015 8:37 PM | 2015-06-18 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Dusk | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 18 | 4115772 | 2015 6:37 PM | 2015-09-10 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Dusk | Rain/Rain | -- |
| 19 | 4117102 | 2015 6:06 PM | 2015-09-20 Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 20 | 4145044 | 2015 11:20 PM | 2015-11-03 Property damage only (none injured) | Head-on | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 21 | 4162399 | 2015 5:16 PM | 2015-11-10 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 22 | 4125824 | 2015 5:08 PM | 2015-12-12 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 23 | 4181153 | 2016 1:56 PM | 2016-03-13 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 24 | 4208232 | 2016 11:57 PM | 2016-06-04 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 25 | 4218459 | 2016 8:10 AM | 2016-06-21 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Cloudy | -- |
| 26 | 4236640 | 2016 1:10 PM | 2016-06-29 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 27 | 4218326 | 2016 7:57 AM | 2016-07-06 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 28 | 4240020 | 2016 4:59 PM | 2016-08-16 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Cloudy | -- |
| 29 | 4417219 | 2016 5:12 PM | 2016-10-01 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Rain | -- |
| 30 | 4417254 | 2016 5:03 PM | 2016-11-23 Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 31 | 4417271 | 2016 9:01 AM | 2016-12-16 Property damage only (none injured) | Not reported | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 32 | 4523742 | 2017 4:33 PM | 2017-05-27 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 33 | 4385290 | 2017 2:52 PM | 2017-06-12 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 34 | 4385294 | 2017 6:02 PM | 2017-06-19 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 35 | 4389360 | 2017 2:20 AM | 2017-07-14 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 36 | 4394526 | 2017 11:05 PM | 2017-07-23 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 37 | 4432727 | 2017 3:24 PM | 2017-09-25 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 38 | 4443639 | 2017 10:19 PM | 2017-10-22 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 39 | 4449985 | 2017 00:04 AM | 2017-11-05 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 40 | 4453222 | 2017 6:08 PM | 2017-11-10 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 41 | 4466057 | 2017 11:34 PM | 2017-12-09 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Snow/Snow | -- |



Route 28 at Reedsdale Road, Canton Avenue, and Centre Street

| Collision ID | Crash Number | Crash Year | Crash Time | Crash Date | Crash Severity | Manner of Collision | Surface Conditi | Ambient Light | Weather Condition | Bike or Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3372353 | 2013 | 12:09 PM | 2013-01-28 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 2 | 3389823 | 2013 | 2:40 PM | 2013-02-28 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 3 | 3389808 | 2013 | 8:53 AM | 2013-03-05 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 4 | 3527032 | 2013 | 00:00 AM | 2013-06-26 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 5 | 3537412 | 2013 | 10:18 PM | 2013-07-19 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 6 | 3786124 | 2014 | 8:39 AM | 2014-02-19 | Non-fatal injury | Sideswipe, opposite direction | Wet | Daylight | Clear/Snow | -- |
| 7 | 3801614 | 2014 | 12:56 PM | 2014-04-01 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 8 | 3983033 | 2014 | 10:49 PM | 2014-11-08 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 9 | 3981142 | 2014 | 3:42 PM | 2014-11-17 | Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, opposite direction | Wet | Daylight | Rain/Cloudy | -- |
| 10 | 3998972 | 2014 | 10:22 PM | 2014-12-05 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Rain/Rain | -- |
| 11 | 4003516 | 2014 | 3:39 PM | 2014-12-19 | Not Reported | Head-on | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 12 | 4032816 | 2015 | 7:44 AM | 2015-01-10 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 13 | 4035186 | 2015 | 9:09 PM | 2015-02-10 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Slush | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 14 | 4055152 | 2015 | 8:04 AM | 2015-06-02 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Rain/Cloudy | -- |
| 15 | 4165801 | 2015 | 11:05 PM | 2015-10-24 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 16 | 4180492 | 2016 | 8:29 AM | 2016-02-15 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 17 | 4181158 | 2016 | 3:57 PM | 2016-03-07 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 18 | 4207847 | 2016 | 6:39 PM | 2016-06-08 | Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 19 | 4218438 | 2016 | 12:30 PM | 2016-06-26 | Not Reported | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 20 | 4226115 | 2016 | 11:15 AM | 2016-07-07 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 21 | 4239991 | 2016 | 1:29 PM | 2016-08-16 | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 22 | 4417231 | 2016 | 2:04 PM | 2016-10-27 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Rain | -- |
| 23 | 4417138 | 2016 | 8:46 AM | 2016-11-04 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 24 | 4417141 | 2016 | 2:17 PM | 2016-11-11 | Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 25 | 4417256 | 2016 | 9:39 PM | 2016-11-24 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 26 | 4417274 | 2016 | 10:37 AM | 2016-12-20 | Not Reported | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 27 | 4383915 | 2017 | 10:30 AM | 2017-03-23 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 28 | 4525526 | 2017 | 1:16 PM | 2017-04-12 | Not Reported | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Unknown | -- |
| 29 | 4418620 | 2017 | 8:25 AM | 2017-09-07 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Cloudy/Cloudy | -- |
| 30 | 4440335 | 2017 | 11:05 AM | 2017-10-13 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Cloudy | -- |
| 31 | 4440337 | 2017 | 3:34 PM | 2017-10-16 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 32 | 4444593 | 2017 | 5:42 AM | 2017-10-25 | Non-fatal injury | Angle | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Rain/Rain | -- |



| Collision ID | Crash Number | Crash Time | Crash Date Crash Severity | Manner of Collision | Road Surface Condition | Ambient Light | Weather Condition | Bike and Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3767838 | 3:58 PM | 2014-01-22 Not Reported | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
|  | 3782457 | 6:59 PM | 2014-01-27 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
|  | 3782455 | 5:21 PM | 2014-02-04 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Cloudy/Cloudy | -- |
|  | 3792124 | 6:31 AM | 2014-03-06 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
|  | 3794974 | 9:10 PM | 2014-03-07 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
|  | 3928434 | 2:07 PM | 2014-08-31 Non-fatal injury | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
|  | 3982996 | 10:31 AM | 2014-11-16 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
|  | 4139841 | 2:49 PM | 2015-11-15 Not Reported | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
|  | 4195981 | 2:15 PM | 2016-04-22 Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
|  | 4192879 | 1:47 PM | 2016-04-24 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
|  | 4212392 | 7:39 PM | 2016-06-09 Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
|  | 4226099 | 3:31 PM | 2016-07-11 Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
|  | 4522148 | 4:04 PM | 2017-02-24 Non-fatal injury | Head-on | Not reported | Daylight | Clear | -- |
|  | 4525160 | 8:15 PM | 2017-04-15 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Cloudy/Rain | -- |
|  | 4384378 | 5:21 PM | 2017-06-28 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
|  | 4418127 | 8:38 AM | 2017-09-06 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Cloudy | -- |
|  | 4432629 | 2:47 PM | 2017-09-28 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
|  | 4464727 | 8:23 AM | 2017-12-06 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Rain/Cloudy | -- |



Route 28 at Reedsdale Road, Randolph Avenue

| Collision ID | Crash <br> Number | Crash Year | Crash Time | Crash Date Crash Severity | Manner of Collision | Road Surface Condition | Ambient Light | Weather Condition | Bike or Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3368172 | 2013 | 8:23 AM | 2013-01-08 Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 2 | 3451631 | 2013 | 11:48 PM | 2013-06-06 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Rain/Rain | -- |
| 3 | 3584328 | 2013 | 11:30 AM | 2013-08-22 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 4 | 3728332 | 2013 | 1:44 PM | 2013-11-26 Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 5 | 3735106 | 2013 | 12:02 PM | 2013-12-08 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 6 | 3827614 | 2014 | 2:46 PM | 2014-05-13 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Cloudy | -- |
| 7 | 3827610 | 2014 | 4:00 PM | 2014-05-19 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 8 | 3867862 | 2014 | 2:09 PM | 2014-06-06 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 9 | 3878455 | 2014 | 9:43 PM | 2014-06-30 Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 10 | 3891932 | 2014 | 2:13 PM | 2014-07-11 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 11 | 4003444 | 2014 | 10:09 PM | 2014-12-17 Not Reported | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Cloudy | -- |
| 12 | 4003520 | 2014 | 9:01 PM | 2014-12-18 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 13 | 4033240 | 2015 | 2:25 PM | 2015-03-11 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 14 | 4066311 | 2015 | 6:37 AM | 2015-07-09 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 15 | 4066105 | 2015 | 5:06 PM | 2015-07-18 Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 16 | 4117395 | 2015 | 10:44 AM | 2015-07-24 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 17 | 4096432 | 2015 | 11:24 AM | 2015-07-26 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 18 | 4106619 | 2015 | 1:42 PM | 2015-08-09 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 19 | 4170300 | 2016 | 7:36 AM | 2016-01-04 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 20 | 4172349 | 2016 | 00:02 AM | 2016-01-05 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 21 | 4175920 | 2016 | 2:18 PM | 2016-02-06 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 22 | 4417283 | 2016 | 11:30 AM | 2016-09-26 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 23 | 4349821 | 2017 | 4:35 PM | 2017-02-26 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 24 | 4523751 | 2017 | 12:58 PM | 2017-05-10 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 25 | 4432725 | 2017 | 10:49 PM | 2017-09-24 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 26 | 4432729 | 2017 | 3:31 PM | 2017-09-30 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Cloudy/Rain | -- |
| 27 | 4453220 | 2017 | 3:19 PM | 2017-11-06 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 28 | 4458532 | 2017 | 8:29 AM | 2017-11-22 Non-fatal injury | Head-on | Wet | Daylight | Rain/Rain | -- |
| 29 | 4175177 | 2016 | 6:25 PM | 2016-01-19 Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dawn | Clear | -- |



Route 28 at Hallen Avenue

| Collision ID | Crash <br> Number | Crash Year | Crash Time | Crash Date | Crash Severity | Manner of Collision | Road Surface Condition | Ambient Light | Weather Condition | Bike or Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3374318 | 2013 | 3:44 PM | 2013-01-11 | Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Cloudy | -- |
| 2 | 3374268 | 2013 | 1:28 AM | 2013-01-20 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 3 | 3430721 | 2013 | 4:26 PM | 2013-05-20 | Non-fatal injury | Sideswipe, opposite direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 4 | 3727457 | 2013 | 4:55 PM | 2013-12-14 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Snow/Sleet, hail | -- |
| 5 | 3937031 | 2014 | 9:14 PM | 2014-08-06 | Property damage only (none injured) | Unknown | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 6 | 3950624 | 2014 | 4:56 PM | 2014-09-10 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 7 | 3963810 | 2014 | 4:28 PM | 2014-10-13 | Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 8 | 3999006 | 2014 | 5:45 PM | 2014-12-16 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Cloudy | -- |
| 9 | 4003562 | 2014 | 00:00 AM | 2014-12-28 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Cloudy | -- |
| 10 | 4048603 | 2015 | 9:55 AM | 2015-05-03 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 11 | 4092703 | 2015 | 11:47 AM | 2015-08-01 | Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 12 | 4139964 | 2015 | 5:39 PM | 2015-11-12 | Property damage only (none injured) | Head-on | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Rain | -- |
| 13 | 4175083 | 2016 | 10:32 AM | 2016-01-22 | Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 14 | 4180489 | 2016 | 3:00 PM | 2016-02-13 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 15 | 4417226 | 2016 | 6:51 PM | 2016-10-07 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 16 | 4417154 | 2016 | 5:23 PM | 2016-12-05 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Unknown | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 17 | 4522653 | 2017 | 7:15 AM | 2017-01-22 | Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 18 | 4522153 | 2017 | 1:43 PM | 2017-03-06 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 19 | 4525534 | 2017 | 5:44 PM | 2017-04-27 | Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Unknown | -- |
| 20 | 4385287 | 2017 | 6:34 PM | 2017-06-03 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 21 | 4405682 | 2017 | 3:28 PM | 2017-08-09 | Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 22 | 4405684 | 2017 | 4:39 PM | 2017-08-09 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 23 | 4412987 | 2017 | 2:27 PM | 2017-08-22 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 24 | 4525727 | 2017 | 8:42 AM | 2017-08-31 | Fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |



## Hallen Avenue and Hillside Street

| Collision ID | Crash <br> Number | Crash Year | Crash Time | Crash Date 1 | Crash Severity | Manner of Collision | Road Surface Condition | Ambient Light | Weather Condition | Bike or Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3372348 | 2013 | 2:23 AM | 02-Feb-2013 | Non-fatal injury | Head-on | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 2 | 3403567 | 2013 | 8:31 AM | 26-Apr-2013 | Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 3 | 3451748 | 2013 | 9:37 AM | 31-May-2013 | Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 4 | 3451744 | 2013 | 3:16 PM | 05-Jun-2013 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 5 | 3728099 | 2013 | 10:37 AM | 23-Nov-2013 | Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 6 | 3728230 | 2013 | 7:55 AM | 28-Nov-2013 | Fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 7 | 3712354 | 2013 | 3:39 PM | 07-Dec-2013 | Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 8 | 3739739 | 2013 | 6:25 PM | 31-Dec-2013 | Not Reported | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 9 | 3723374 | 2014 | 5:10 PM | 06-Jan-2014 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Rain | -- |
| 10 | 3767839 | 2014 | 9:27 AM | 22-Jan-2014 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 11 | 3782467 | 2014 | 4:48 PM | 12-Feb-2014 | Not Reported | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 12 | 3928316 | 2014 | 10:04 PM | 27-Aug-2014 | Not Reported | Head-on | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Rain/Rain | -- |
| 13 | 3928318 | 2014 | 7:09 PM | 28-Aug-2014 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Dusk | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 14 | 4034579 | 2015 | 6:18 AM | 18-Jan-2015 | Not Reported | Sideswipe, opposite direction | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 15 | 4053894 | 2015 | 7:38 PM | 12-Apr-2015 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Dusk | Clear | -- |
| 16 | 4170384 | 2016 | 6:47 PM | 03-Jan-2016 | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 17 | 4212403 | 2016 | 00:28 AM | 08-Jun-2016 | Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 18 | 4238801 | 2016 | 3:39 PM | 24-Jul-2016 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 19 | 4522139 | 2017 | 11:07 AM | 07-Feb-2017 | Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Snow | Daylight | Snow/Sleet | -- |
| 20 | 4525525 | 2017 | 5:55 PM | 07-Apr-2017 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Clear | -- |
| 21 | 4383717 | 2017 | 4:03 PM | 25-Apr-2017 | Fatal injury | Head-on | Wet | Daylight | Rain/Cloudy | -- |
| 22 | 4392915 | 2017 | 2:10 AM | 17-Jul-2017 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | cyc |
| 23 | 4407627 | 2017 | 4:10 AM | 14-Aug-2017 | Not Reported | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 24 | 4438732 | 2017 | 12:18 PM | 12-Oct-2017 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Cloudy | -- |
| 25 | 4443320 | 2017 | 4:03 PM | 20-Oct-2017 | Non-fatal injury | Sideswipe, opposite direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 26 | 4446376 | 2017 | 6:47 PM | 27-Oct-2017 | Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 27 | 4476651 | 2017 | 6:56 PM | 26-Dec-2017 | Non-fatal injury | Unknown | Snow | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 28 | 4174667 | 2016 | 10:52 PM | 19-Jan-2016 | Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |



| Collision ID | Crash <br> Number Crash Time | Crash Date Crash Severity | Manner of Collision | Road <br> Surface <br> Condition | Ambient Light | Weather Condition | Bike or Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3498032 7:17 PM | 2013-06-19 Non-fatal injury | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 2 | 3510903 5:22 PM | 2013-07-06 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 3 | 3656836 12:07 PM | 2013-10-13 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 4 | 3714669 5:19 PM | 2013-11-05 Non-fatal injury | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 5 | 3739746 6:15 AM | 2013-12-28 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 6 | 3786069 7:54 AM | 2014-02-20 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 7 | 3827591 12:50 PM | 2014-05-21 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 8 | 3982998 6:54 PM | 2014-11-14 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 9 | 3998983 6:16 PM | 2014-12-10 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Rain/Cloudy | -- |
| 10 | 3998994 12:19 PM | 2014-12-17 Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Wet | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 11 | 4009886 2:47 PM | 2015-01-23 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 12 | 4106616 4:32 PM | 2015-08-13 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 13 | 4106595 5:43 PM | 2015-08-19 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 14 | 4115776 3:37 PM | 2015-09-05 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 15 | 4089476 11:12 AM | 2015-09-11 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Rain/Cloudy | -- |
| 16 | 4149527 11:26 AM | 2015-11-20 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Cloudy | -- |
| 17 | 4149548 4:51 PM | 2015-11-24 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 18 | 4130795 4:58 PM | 2015-12-22 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Rain/Rain | -- |
| 19 | 4170346 11:28 AM | 2016-01-03 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 20 | 4191764 12:00 PM | 2016-04-01 Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 21 | 4195999 2:00 PM | 2016-05-04 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 22 | 4212390 4:32 PM | 2016-06-15 Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 23 | 4226274 7:49 PM | 2016-07-14 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Cloudy | -- |
| 24 | 4417136 2:56 PM | 2016-10-28 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Rain/Cloudy | -- |
| 25 | 4417142 5:13 PM | 2016-11-14 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 26 | 4522143 1:56 PM | 2017-02-14 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 27 | 4385373 4:25 AM | 2017-02-15 Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 28 | 4522151 5:51 PM | 2017-03-02 Non-fatal injury | Head-on | Dry | Dusk | Clear | -- |
| 29 | 4525155 2:42 AM | 2017-04-08 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 30 | 4523732 10:18 AM | 2017-05-15 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Rain/Cloudy | -- |
| 31 | 4525170 2:11 PM | 2017-06-06 Not Reported | Single vehicle crash | Wet | Daylight | Cloudy/Rain | -- |
| 32 | 4397626 1:48 PM | 2017-07-26 Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Not reported | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 33 | 4403224 3:04 PM | 2017-08-02 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 34 | 4413403 4:55 PM | 2017-08-28 Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 35 | 4418220 4:28 PM | 2017-08-30 Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 36 | 4432632 7:56 PM | 2017-09-30 Non-fatal injury | Angle | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |



Route 28 at Chickatawbut Road

| Collision <br> ID | Crash Number | Crash Date | Crash Time Crash Severity | Manner of Collision | Road <br> Surface <br> Condition | Ambient Light | Weather Condition | Bike or Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3372354 | 29-Jan-2013 | 11:26 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 2 | 3384755 | 31-Jan-2013 | 8:46 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Not Reported | -- |
| 3 | 3392806 | 13-Feb-2013 | 11:53 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 4 | 3430733 | 15-May-2013 | 7:30 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 5 | 3442431 | 21-May-2013 | 8:37 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 6 | 3470431 | 06-Jun-2013 | 1:04 PM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 7 | 3526831 | 07-Jul-2013 | 1:22 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 8 | 3541936 | 12-Jul-2013 | 2:42 PM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 9 | 3587379 | 02-Aug-2013 | 11:41 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 10 | 3584842 | 09-Aug-2013 | 6:36 PM Non-fatal injury | Head-on | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 11 | 3584836 | 16-Aug-2013 | 11:17 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 12 | 3588721 | 04-Sep-2013 | 7:04 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 13 | 3728334 | 19-Nov-2013 | 6:45 AM Non-fatal injury | Head-on | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 14 | 3805634 | 26-Jan-2014 | 4:58 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Head-on | Dry | Dusk | Clear | -- |
| 15 | 3824833 | 27-Mar-2014 | 9:12 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 16 | 3801613 | 01-Apr-2014 | 7:10 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 17 | 3794622 | 03-Apr-2014 | 8:50 AM Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 18 | 3801606 | 11-Apr-2014 | 7:06 PM Non-fatal injury | Sideswipe, opposite direction | Dry | Dusk | Cloudy/Cloudy | ped |
| 19 | 3810951 | 22-Apr-2014 | 3:41 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 20 | 3804112 | 25-Apr-2014 | 7:38 PM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Dusk | Clear | -- |
| 21 | 3827586 | 21-May-2014 | 10:22 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 22 | 3862373 | 24-May-2014 | 8:54 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Cloudy | cyc |
| 23 | 3862380 | 24-May-2014 | 4:55 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 24 | 4114139 | 31-May-2014 | 1:49 AM Fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 25 | 3886567 | 13-Jun-2014 | 6:21 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 26 | 3936831 | 14-Aug-2014 | 7:01 PM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 27 | 3983014 | 14-Nov-2014 | 6:17 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 28 | 3981128 | 17-Nov-2014 | 2:53 PM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Rain | -- |
| 29 | 3998986 | 14-Dec-2014 | 9:49 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 30 | 3999003 | 17-Dec-2014 | 9:46 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Rain/Cloudy | -- |
| 31 | 4007303 | 20-Jan-2015 | 5:40 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - roadway not lighted | Clear | -- |
| 32 | 4023798 | 05-Mar-2015 | 1:55 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - roadway not lighted | Clear | -- |
| 33 | 4021464 | 07-Mar-2015 | 1:16 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 34 | 4032277 | 11-Mar-2015 | 10:21 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 35 | 4048669 | 21-Apr-2015 | 4:55 PM Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 36 | 4048625 | 27-Apr-2015 | 7:58 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 37 | 4048594 | 04-May-2015 | 9:37 PM Not Reported | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 38 | 4113697 | 08-Jun-2015 | 8:17 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 39 | 4089028 | 05-Jul-2015 | 4:31 PM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 40 | 4116708 | 22-Sep-2015 | 2:19 PM Non-fatal injury | Head-on | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 41 | 4129334 | 07-Oct-2015 | 6:23 PM Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Dusk | Clear | -- |
| 42 | 4125337 | 21-Oct-2015 | 10:48 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Rain | -- |
| 43 | 4132361 | 28-Oct-2015 | 7:02 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Rain | -- |
| 44 | 4127422 | 11-Dec-2015 | 9:18 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 45 | 4151243 | 16-Dec-2015 | 4:45 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 47 | 4175169 | 28-Jan-2016 | 6:36 PM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |

## Route 28 at Chickatawbut Road

| Collision ID | Crash <br> Number | Crash Date | Crash Time Crash Severity | Manner of Collision | Road <br> Surface <br> Condition | Ambient Light | Weather Condition | Bike or Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 48 | 4150845 | 31-Jan-2016 | 12:03 AM Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 49 | 4152017 | 12-Feb-2016 | 7:15 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Not Reported | -- |
| 50 | 4181491 | 07-Mar-2016 | 7:44 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 51 | 4187017 | 12-Mar-2016 | 3:02 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 52 | 4186961 | 16-Mar-2016 | 9:04 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 53 | 4191822 | 07-Apr-2016 | 11:32 AM Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Wet | Daylight | Rain/Cloudy | -- |
| 54 | 4193494 | 08-Apr-2016 | 4:02 PM Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 55 | 4193490 | 11-Apr-2016 | 8:57 PM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 56 | 4192897 | 16-Apr-2016 | 4:29 PM Non-fatal injury | Head-on | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 58 | 4195312 | 30-Apr-2016 | 9:03 AM Non-fatal injury | Not reported | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 59 | 4206088 | 15-May-2016 | 2:47 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 60 | 4212391 | 14-Jun-2016 | 4:11 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, opposite direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 61 | 4221071 | 19-Jun-2016 | 11:15 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Not Reported | -- |
| 62 | 4222162 | 21-Jun-2016 | 6:05 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 63 | 4221144 | 21-Jun-2016 | 7:05 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 64 | 4218462 | 25-Jun-2016 | 11:18 AM Not Reported | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Clear | -- |
| 65 | 4226104 | 30-Jun-2016 | 2:41 PM Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 66 | 4226273 | 19-Jul-2016 | 8:32 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 67 | 4240031 | 05-Aug-2016 | 8:42 AM Non-fatal injury | Not reported | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 68 | 4417281 | 15-Sep-2016 | 1:39 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 69 | 4417282 | 18-Sep-2016 | 10:28 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 70 | 4417168 | 29-Sep-2016 | 1:47 PM Non-fatal injury | Head-on | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 71 | 4417124 | 02-Oct-2016 | 2:36 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Rain | -- |
| 72 | 4273105 | 27-Oct-2016 | 3:00 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Cloudy/Rain | -- |
| 73 | 4417237 | 30-Oct-2016 | 8:55 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Rain/Cloudy | -- |
| 74 | 4417243 | 13-Nov-2016 | 12:45 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 75 | 4417815 | 23-Nov-2016 | 1:20 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 76 | 4417257 | 27-Nov-2016 | 12:10 PM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 77 | 4417268 | 13-Dec-2016 | 7:14 PM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 78 | 4417277 | 23-Dec-2016 | 1:02 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 79 | 4522161 | 07-Jan-2017 | 4:10 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Snow | Dusk | Snow | -- |
| 80 | 4522124 | 15-Jan-2017 | 2:13 PM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 81 | 4522130 | 24-Jan-2017 | 7:24 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Other | Cloudy/Rain | -- |
| 82 | 4323114 | 30-Jan-2017 | 2:53 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | -- |
| 83 | 4373410 | 15-Feb-2017 | 6:29 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Cloudy/Rain | -- |
| 84 | 4525176 | 13-Mar-2017 | 7:28 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 85 | 4525528 | 13-Apr-2017 | 8:51 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 86 | 4380353 | 29-May-2017 | 5:10 PM Non-fatal injury | Sideswipe, same direction | Wet | Daylight | Rain | -- |
| 87 | 4394523 | 22-Jul-2017 | 1:20 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 88 | 4397737 | 26-Jul-2017 | 8:04 AM Non-fatal injury | Single vehicle crash | Sand | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 89 | 4398769 | 29-Jul-2017 | 2:53 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 90 | 4408021 | 12-Aug-2017 | 10:30 PM Non-fatal injury | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 91 | 4408022 | 14-Aug-2017 | 6:14 AM Non-fatal injury | Head-on | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 92 | 4418126 | 03-Sep-2017 | 3:49 PM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Rain | -- |
| 93 | 4420325 | 09-Sep-2017 | 11:38 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 94 | 4428130 | 24-Sep-2017 | 12:04 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | -- |

## Route 28 at Chickatawbut Road

| Collision ID | Crash Number | Crash Date | Crash <br> Time Crash Severity | Manner of Collision | Road Surface Condition | Ambient Light | Weather Condition | Bike or Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 95 | 4436719 | 01-Oct-2017 | 11:01 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Cloudy | -- |
| 96 | 4433819 | 03-Oct-2017 | 8:50 AM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 97 | 4444203 | 26-Oct-2017 | 7:53 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Wet | Daylight | Clear | -- |
| 98 | 4446223 | 30-Oct-2017 | 2:44 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Sideswipe, opposite direction | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Cloudy | -- |
| 99 | 4453036 | 10-Nov-2017 | 7:48 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 100 | 4464626 | 06-Dec-2017 | 12:29 PM Property damage only (none injured) | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy/Cloudy | -- |
| 101 | 4476731 | 22-Dec-2017 | 7:10 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear/Clear | -- |
| 102 | 4475352 | 24-Dec-2017 | 7:05 AM Non-fatal injury | Sideswipe, opposite direction | Snow | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |
| 103 | 4476734 | 27-Dec-2017 | 9:32 AM Non-fatal injury | Angle | Ice | Daylight | Cloudy | -- |

## Part 2: Expected Crash Analysis

| Required Input |  | Select from Drop-Down List |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  | Model Output |  |
| Analyst | Seth Asante | Location Information |  |
| Agency or Company | CTPS | Intersection | Route 28 at Blue Hill Parkway |
| Date Performed | $3 / 19 / 2020$ | Intersection Type | 4SG |
| City | Milton | Jurisdiction | MassDOT District 6 |


| Input Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Observed <br> MV crashes | Observed <br> total <br> crashes | Predicted <br> MV <br> crashes | Predicted <br> total <br> crashes | Combined <br> CMF for <br> veh-ped <br> crashes |  |
| 2013 | 5 | 5 | 5.70 | 6.90 | 3.75 |  |
| 2014 | 3 | 4 | 5.70 | 6.90 | 3.75 |  |
| 2015 | 7 | 10 | 5.70 | 6.90 | 3.75 |  |
| 2016 | 10 | 12 | 5.70 | 6.90 | 3.75 |  |
| 2017 | 8 | 10 | 5.70 | 6.90 | 3.75 |  |
| 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Output Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Observed MV crashes | Average observed total crashes | Total predicted MV crashes | Average predicted total crashes | Standard deviation of predicted total crashes | Weight | Total expected MV crashes | No of expected total crashes | Average expected total crashes | High-risk Intersection (Y/N) | Potential for Safety Improvement (PSI) | If avg observed total crashes > avg expected crashes |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.47 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.47 |  |  |  |  |
| 33.00 | 8.20 | 28.50 | 6.90 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 31.79 | 7.47 | 7.47 | $Y$ | 0.57 | $Y$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.47 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.47 |  |  |  |  |


| General Information |  | Location Information |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyst | Seth Asante | Intersection | Route 28 at Central Avenue |
| Agency or Company | CTPS | Intersection Type | 4SG |
| Date Performed | $3 / 20 / 2020$ | Jurisdiction | MassDOT District 6 |
| City | Milton | Analysis Year | 2020 |


| Input Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Observed <br> MV <br> crashes | Observed <br> total <br> crashes | Predicted <br> MV <br> crashes | Predicted <br> total <br> crashes | Combined <br> CMF for <br> veh-ped <br> crashes |  |
| 2013 | 7 | 7 | 5.10 | 6.40 | 5.60 |  |
| 2014 | 2 | 5 | 5.10 | 6.40 | 5.60 |  |
| 2015 | 9 | 11 | 5.10 | 6.40 | 5.60 |  |
| 2016 | 9 | 9 | 5.10 | 6.40 | 5.60 |  |
| 2017 | 8 | 10 | 5.10 | 6.40 | 5.60 |  |
| 32.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Output Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Observed <br> MV <br> crashes | Average observed total crashes | Total predicted MV crashes | Average predicted total crashes | Standard deviation of predicted total crashes | Weight | Total expected MV crashes | No of expected total crashes | Average expected total crashes | High-risk Intersection (Y/N) | Potential for Safety Improvement (PSI) | If avg observed total crashes > avg expected crashes |
| 35.00 | 8.40 | 25.50 | 6.40 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 32.22 | 7.83 | 7.83 | $Y$ | 1.43 | $Y$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.83 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.83 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.83 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.83 |  |  |  |  |


| General Information |  | Location Information |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyst | Seth Asante | Intersection | Route 28 at Centre Street-Canton Avenue |
| Agency or Company | CTPS | Intersection Type | 4SG |
| Date Performed | $3 / 20 / 2020$ | Jurisdiction | MassDOT District 6 |
| City | Milton | Analysis Year | 2020 |


| Input Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Observed <br> MV <br> crashes | Observed <br> total <br> crashes | Predicted <br> MV <br> crashes | Predicted <br> total <br> crashes | Combined <br> CMF for <br> veh-ped <br> crashes |  |
| 2013 | 5 | 6 | 6.00 | 7.20 | 2.78 |  |
| 2014 | 7 | 7 | 6.00 | 7.20 | 2.78 |  |
| 2015 | 5 | 7 | 6.00 | 7.20 | 2.78 |  |
| 2016 | 9 | 11 | 6.00 | 7.20 | 2.78 |  |
| 2017 | 6 | 6 | 6.00 | 7.20 | 2.78 |  |
| 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Output Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Observed <br> MV <br> crashes | Average observed total crashes | Total predicted MV crashes | Average predicted total crashes | Standard deviation of predicted total crashes | Weight | Total expected MV crashes | No of expected total crashes | Average expected total crashes | High-risk Intersection (Y/N) | Potential for Safety Improvement (PSI) | If avg observed total crashes > avg expected crashes |
| 32.00 | 7.40 | 30.00 | 7.20 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 31.48 | 7.26 | 7.26 | $Y$ | 0.06 | $Y$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.26 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.26 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.26 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.26 |  |  |  |  |


| General Information |  | Location Information |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyst | Seth Asante | Intersection | Route 28 at Randolph Ave and Reedsdale Rg |
| Agency or Company | CTPS | Intersection Type | 4SG |
| Date Performed | $3 / 27 / 2020$ | Jurisdiction | MassDOT Highway District 6 |
| City | Milton | Analysis Year | 2020 |


| Input Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Observed <br> MV <br> crashes | Observed <br> total <br> crashes | Predicted <br> MV <br> crashes | Predicted <br> total <br> crashes | Combined <br> CMF for <br> veh-ped <br> crashes |  |  |
| 2013 | 2 | 3 | 8.99 | 10.56 | 2.78 |  |  |
| 2014 | 7 | 7 | 8.99 | 10.56 | 2.78 |  |  |
| 2015 | 8 | 8 | 8.99 | 10.56 | 2.78 |  |  |
| 2016 | 6 | 7 | 8.99 | 10.56 | 2.78 |  |  |
| 2017 | 6 | 6 | 8.99 | 10.56 | 2.78 |  |  |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Output Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Observed MV crashes | Average observed total crashes | Total predicted MV crashes | Average predicted total crashes | Standard deviation of predicted total crashes | Weight | Total expected MV crashes | No of expected total crashes | Average expected total crashes | High-risk Intersection (Y/N) | Potential for Safety Improvement (PSI) | If avg observed total crashes > avg expected crashes |
| 29.00 | 6.20 | 44.95 | 10.56 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 32.03 | 7.39 | 7.39 | $N$ | -3.17 | N |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.39 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.39 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.39 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.39 |  |  |  |  |


| General Information |  | Location Information |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyst | Seth | Intersection | Route 28 at Hallen Avenue |
| Agency or Company | CTPS | Intersection Type | 3ST |
| Date Performed | 06-04-200 | Jurisdiction | MassDOT District 6 |
| City | Milton | Analysis Year | 2020 |


| Input Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Observed <br> MV <br> crashes | Observed <br> total <br> crashes | Predicted <br> MV <br> crashes | Predicted <br> total <br> crashes | Combined <br> CMF for <br> veh-ped <br> crashes |  |
| 2013 | 4 | 4 | 5.50 | 6.50 | 0.91 |  |
| 2014 | 5 | 5 | 5.50 | 6.50 | 0.91 |  |
| 2015 | 3 | 3 | 5.50 | 6.50 | 0.91 |  |
| 2016 | 4 | 4 | 5.50 | 6.50 | 0.91 |  |
| 2017 | 8 | 8 | 5.50 | 6.50 | 0.91 |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Output Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Observed MV crashes | Average observed total crashes | Total predicted MV crashes | Average predicted total crashes | Standard deviation of predicted total crashes | Weight | Total expected MV crashes | No of expected total crashes | Average expected total crashes | High-risk Intersection (Y/N) | Potential for Safety Improvement (PSI) | If avg observed total crashes > avg expected crashes |
| 24.00 | 4.80 | 27.50 | 6.50 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 24.46 | 5.44 | 5.44 | $N$ | -1.06 | $N$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.44 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.44 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.44 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.44 |  |  |  |  |


| General Information |  | Location Information |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyst | Seth | Intersection | Route 28 at Hillside Street |
| Agency or Company | CTPS | Intersection Type | 4SG |
| Date Performed | $6 / 4 / 2020$ | Jurisdiction | MassDOT District 6 |
| City | Milton | Analysis Year | 2020 |


| Input Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Observed <br> MV <br> crashes | Observed <br> total <br> crashes | Predicted <br> MV <br> crashes | Predicted <br> total <br> crashes | Combined <br> CMF for <br> veh-ped <br> crashes |  |  |  |
| 2013 | 3 | 3 | 12.30 | 14.50 | 2.78 |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 1 | 1 | 12.30 | 14.50 | 2.78 |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 0 | 0 | 12.30 | 14.50 | 2.78 |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 3 | 3 | 12.30 | 14.50 | 2.78 |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 4 | 4 | 12.30 | 14.50 | 2.78 |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.50 | 72.50 |


| Output Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Observed MV crashes | Average observed total crashes | Total predicted MV crashes | Average predicted total crashes | Standard deviation of predicted total crashes | Weight | Total expected MV crashes | No of expected total crashes | Average expected total crashes | High-risk Intersection (Y/N) | Potential for Safety Improvement (PSI) | If avg observed total crashes > avg expected crashes |
| 11.00 | 2.20 | 61.50 | 14.50 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 18.38 | 4.24 | 4.24 | $N$ | -10.26 | $N$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.24 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.24 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.24 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.24 |  |  |  |  |


| General Information |  | Location Information |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyst | Seth | Intersection | Route 28 at Chikatawbut Road |
| Agency or Company | CTPS | Intersection Type | 4SG |
| Date Performed | $6 / 8 / 2020$ | Jurisdiction | MassDOT |
| City | Milton | Analysis Year | 2020 |


| Input Information |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Observed <br> MV <br> crashes | Observed <br> total <br> crashes | Predicted <br> MV <br> crashes | Predicted <br> total <br> crashes | Combined <br> CMF for <br> veh-ped <br> crashes |
| 2013 | 13 | 13 | 10.56 | 11.86 | 1.00 |
| 2014 | 15 | 16 | 10.56 | 11.86 | 1.00 |
| 2015 | 15 | 15 | 10.56 | 11.86 | 1.00 |
| 2016 | 32 | 32 | 10.56 | 11.86 | 1.00 |
| 2017 | 25 | 25 | 10.56 | 11.86 | 1.00 |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 101 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Output Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Observed MV crashes | Average observed total crashes | Total predicted MV crashes | Average predicted total crashes | Standard deviation of predicted total crashes | Weight | Total expected MV crashes | No of expected total crashes | Average expected total crashes | High-risk Intersection (Y/N) | Potential for Safety Improvement (PSI) | If avg observed total crashes > avg expected crashes |
| 100.00 | 20.20 | 52.80 | 11.86 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 92.16 | 20.55 | 20.55 | $Y$ | 8.69 | N |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.55 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.55 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.55 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.55 |  |  |  |  |

# Appendix E: Intersection Level of Service Analysis 

Part 1: Existing Conditions<br>Part 2: Short-Term Improvements<br>Part 3: Brook Road: Concept 1<br>Part 4: Brook Road: Concept 2 and 3<br>Part 5: Brook Road and Central Avenue: Roundabout Retrofit<br>Part 6: Reedsdale Road: Concept 1 and 2<br>Part 7: Reedsdale Road: Concept 3<br>Part 8: Reedsdale Road and Randolph Avenue: Roundabout Retrofit<br>Part 9: Randolph Avenue Concept 1<br>Part 10: Randolph Avenue: Concept 2<br>Part 11: Randolph Avenue: Concept 3

## Part 1: Existing Conditions



Splits and Phases: 1: Blue Hill Pkwy \& Brook Rd





Splits and Phases: 5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd



|  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  | J |  |  | + | $)$ | m |  | 4 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group |  | SBL2 | SBL | SBR | SBR2 | SEL2 | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NWR2 |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | * |  |  |  |  | さt |  |  | *t |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) |  | 5 | 50 | 75 | 5 | 5 | 30 | 370 | 50 | 150 | 670 | 50 | 100 |
| Future Volume (vph) |  | 5 | 50 | 75 | 5 | 5 | 30 | 370 | 50 | 150 | 670 | 50 | 100 |
|  |  | 0 | 1679 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3465 | 0 | 0 | 3430 | 0 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) Flt Permitted |  |  | 0.980 |  |  |  |  | *0.840 |  |  | *0.940 |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | 1679 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2922 | 0 | 0 | 3250 | 0 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) <br> Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |  | 0 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 479 | 0 | 0 | 1021 | 0 | 0 |
| Turn Type |  | Prot | Prot |  |  | Perm | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |  |
|  |  | 10 | 10 |  |  |  |  | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |
| Protected Phases Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |  | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 |  | 13.0 | 54.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Act Efft Green (s) |  |  | 17.6 |  |  |  |  | 48.2 |  |  | 48.2 |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  | 0.11 |  |  |  |  | 0.29 |  |  | 0.29 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  | 0.79 |  |  |  |  | 0.56 |  |  | 1.07 |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  | 102.3 |  |  |  |  | 53.8 |  |  | 104.2 |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  | 102.3 |  |  |  |  | 53.8 |  |  | 104.2 |  |  |
| LOS |  |  | F |  |  |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  | 102.3 |  |  |  |  | 53.8 |  |  | 104.2 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | F |  |  |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  |  | 143 |  |  |  |  | 218 |  |  | $\sim 595$ |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  |  | \#275 |  |  |  |  | 327 |  |  | \#889 |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  |  | 638 |  |  |  |  | 1222 |  |  | 851 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  | 205 |  |  |  |  | 856 |  |  | 952 |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  | 0.69 |  |  |  |  | 0.56 |  |  | 1.07 |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 180 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 164.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 96.3 |  |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 113.5\% |  |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * User Entered Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ 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. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Splits and Phases: 6: Canton Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Centre St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $k_{\square 2}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{H}_{\boxed{ }}$ |  | $\mathbf{x}_{\square 10}$ |  | $\mathbf{M}_{\boxed{12}}$ |  |  |  |
| 54 s |  |  | 40 s |  |  |  | 1 s | 25 s |  | 40 s |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \mathrm{m}_{\square 5} & \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

6: Canton Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Centre St

|  | \% | 4 | $\nearrow$ | Ta | 4 | 1 | \% | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NEL2 | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR | SWR2 | $\emptyset 9$ |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | * | 「 |  | \& |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 25 | 75 | 300 | 150 | 70 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 25 | 75 | 300 | 150 | 70 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 1840 | 1770 | 0 | 1831 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  | *0.841 |  |  | 0.991 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 1567 | 1770 | 0 | 1831 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | 109 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 421 | 158 | 0 | 416 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Split | Split | NA | Perm | Split | NA |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 12 | 12 |  |  | 9 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |  |  | 21.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  | 35.2 | 35.2 |  | 35.2 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  | 0.21 | 0.21 |  | 0.21 |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  | 1.07 | 0.34 |  | 1.06 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  | 125.0 | 21.9 |  | 122.9 |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  | 125.0 | 21.9 |  | 122.9 |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  | F | C |  | F |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  | 96.9 |  |  | 122.9 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  |  | $\sim 466$ | 41 |  | $\sim 457$ |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (t) |  |  | \#815 | 123 |  | \#802 |  |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  |  | 500 |  |  | 457 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  | 200 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  | 393 | 463 |  | 391 |  |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  | 1.07 | 0.34 |  | 1.06 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | 1 | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | A | 「 |  | * $\downarrow$ |  | \% | ち |  |  | ( |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1859 | 1583 | 0 | 3451 | 0 | 1770 | 1857 | 0 | 0 | 1840 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.967 |  |  | 0.639 |  | *0.600 |  |  |  | 0.938 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1801 | 1583 | 0 | 2243 | 0 | 1118 | 1857 | 0 | 0 | 1732 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | *100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |  | 332 | 332 | 0 | 478 | 0 | 832 | 558 | 0 | 0 | 305 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 | 16.0 | 20.0 | 45.0 |  | 16.0 | 57.0 |  | 41.0 | 41.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 26.4 | 41.7 |  | 26.4 |  | 38.4 | 38.4 |  |  | 21.3 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.33 | 0.53 |  | 0.33 |  | 0.48 | 0.48 |  |  | 0.27 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.55 | 0.38 |  | 0.64 |  | 1.32 | 0.62 |  |  | 0.65 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 27.9 | 8.8 |  | 28.9 |  | 177.7 | 21.3 |  |  | 34.8 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 27.9 | 8.8 |  | 28.9 |  | 177.7 | 21.3 |  |  | 34.8 |  |
| LOS |  | C | A |  | C |  | F | C |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 18.4 |  |  | 28.9 |  |  | 114.9 |  |  | 34.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th ( ft ) |  | 117 | 50 |  | 91 |  | $\sim 466$ | 159 |  |  | 115 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (t) |  | 316 | 131 |  | 233 |  | \#1193 | 505 |  |  | 310 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 1637 |  |  | 555 |  |  | 1087 |  |  | 816 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 599 | 879 |  | 1208 |  | 629 | 1275 |  |  | 816 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.55 | 0.38 |  | 0.40 |  | 1.32 | 0.44 |  |  | 0.37 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 130 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 79.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 69.2 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.1\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * User Entered Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ 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. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave



Splits and Phases: 9: Randolph Ave \& Reed St


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | $\frac{1}{\dagger}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | む |  |  | \＆ |  |  | べ |  |  | ＊$\downarrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 80 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 1680 | 10 | 5 | 715 | 30 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 80 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 1680 | 10 | 5 | 715 | 30 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 0 | 1745 | 0 | 0 | 1727 | 0 | 0 | 3532 | 0 | 0 | 3518 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.962 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.940 |  |  | 0.941 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 0 | 1745 | 0 | 0 | 1762 | 0 | 0 | 3324 | 0 | 0 | 3310 | 0 |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1800 | 0 | 0 | 790 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm＋pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split（s） | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 13.0 | 13.0 |  | 15.0 | 61.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time（s） |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Efft Green（s） |  | 10.8 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 56.8 |  |  | 56.8 |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.13 |  |  | 0.07 |  |  | 0.68 |  |  | 0.68 |  |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.48 |  |  | 0.04 |  |  | 0.80 |  |  | 0.35 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 43.6 |  |  | 44.0 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 9.1 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 43.6 |  |  | 44.0 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 9.1 |  |
| LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 43.6 |  |  | 44.0 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 9.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |
| Queue Length 50th（ft） |  | 48 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 214 |  |  | 56 |  |
| Queue Length 95th（t） |  | 132 |  |  | 17 |  |  | \＃980 |  |  | 268 |  |
| Internal Link Dist（t） |  | 670 |  |  | 257 |  |  | 2385 |  |  | 2760 |  |
| Turn Bay Length（ t ） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity（vph） |  | 429 |  |  | 173 |  |  | 2251 |  |  | 2242 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v／c Ratio |  | 0.25 |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.80 |  |  | 0.35 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length： 130 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length： 83.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type：Actuated－Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v／c Ratio： 0.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay： 15.6 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS：B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 80．5\％ |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \＃95th percentile volume exceeds capacity，queue may be longer． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases：11：Randolph Ave \＆Hillside St


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  |  | F' |  | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \% | $\hat{\text { A }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 50 | 210 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 770 | 0 | 350 | 70 | 780 | 680 | 0 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 50 | 210 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 770 | 0 | 350 | 70 | 780 | 680 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1828 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2787 | 0 | 3451 | 0 | 1681 | 1761 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.991 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 | 0.995 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1828 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2787 | 0 | 3451 | 0 | 1681 | 1761 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 811 | 0 | 442 | 0 | 739 | 798 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  |  | Over |  | NA |  | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 3 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | , | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 43.0 | 43.0 |  |  |  | 65.0 |  | 32.0 |  | 65.0 | 65.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 8.0 |  |  |  | 5.5 |  | 7.0 |  | 5.5 | 5.5 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 26.5 |  |  |  | 60.5 |  | 21.5 |  | 60.5 | 60.5 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.20 |  |  |  | 0.45 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.45 | 0.45 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.83 |  |  |  | 0.65 |  | 0.81 |  | 0.98 | 1.01 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 72.7 |  |  |  | 35.3 |  | 68.5 |  | 67.1 | 73.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 72.7 |  |  |  | 35.3 |  | 68.5 |  | 67.1 | 73.4 |  |
| LOS |  | E |  |  |  | D |  | E |  | E | E |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 72.7 |  |  | 35.3 |  |  | 68.5 |  |  | 70.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 235 |  |  |  | 283 |  | 185 |  | 606 | 670 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | 395 |  |  |  | 505 |  | 299 |  | \#1207 | \#1309 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  | 527 |  |  | 190 |  |  | 615 |  |  | 531 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 481 |  |  |  | 1247 |  | 649 |  | 752 | 788 |  |
| 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 |  | 0.61 |  |  |  | 0.65 |  | 0.68 |  | 0.98 | 1.01 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 158
Actuated Cycle Length: 135.2
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.01
Intersection Signal Delay: $61.1 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 83.5\% ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 1: Blue Hill Pkwy \& Brook Rd



Cycle Length: 75
Actuated Cycle Length: 36.5
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.30
Intersection Signal Delay: 4.9 Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 43.3\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 3: St Mary St \& Brook Rd


|  |  | - | $\lambda$ | m | k | ¢ | \% | $\nearrow$ | ra | 5 | 4 | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * $\downarrow$ |  |  | * $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 890 | 10 | 30 | 670 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 890 | 10 | 30 | 670 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3529 | 0 | 0 | 3518 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1754 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.933 |  |  | 0.893 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.976 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 3295 | 0 | 0 | 3148 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1754 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 969 | 0 | 0 | 758 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |  |  |  | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  |  |  |  | 22.5 | 22.5 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 25.8 |  |  | 25.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.57 |  |  | 0.57 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.15 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.52 |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.16 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 9.2 |  |  | 8.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 20.8 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 9.2 |  |  | 8.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 20.8 |  |
| LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 9.2 |  |  | 8.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 20.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 50 |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | 230 |  |  | 171 |  |  |  |  |  | 40 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  | 684 |  |  | 1299 |  |  | 95 |  |  | 255 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1879 |  |  | 1796 |  |  |  |  |  | 720 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.52 |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.06 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 73.5
Actuated Cycle Length: 45.2
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.52
Intersection Signal Delay: 9.1
Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 53.4\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 4: Standish St \& Brook Rd


5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | \# | $\downarrow$ | $\cdots$ | 4 | 4 | $\#$ | 4 | 4 | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | EBR2 | WBL2 | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL2 | NBL | NBT | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | \% |  |  | \# | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | * $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 40 | 400 | 450 | 20 | 30 | 150 | 350 | 50 | 20 | 350 | 100 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 40 | 400 | 450 | 20 | 30 | 150 | 350 | 50 | 20 | 350 | 100 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1853 | 1770 | 0 | 0 | 1770 | 3472 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3391 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | *0.800 |  |  |  | *0.800 |  |  |  |  | 0.964 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1490 | 1770 | 0 | 0 | 1490 | 3472 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3391 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 158 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 463 | 495 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 421 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 515 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm |  | pm+pt | pm+pt | NA |  | Split | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 32.0 | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 | 44.0 |  | 35.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 5.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 25.1 | 25.1 |  |  | 39.1 | 37.1 |  |  |  | 25.6 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.18 | 0.18 |  |  | 0.29 | 0.27 |  |  |  | 0.19 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 1.70 | 1.10 |  |  | 0.43 | 0.45 |  |  |  | 1.18dl |  |
| Control Delay |  | 365.1 | 105.5 |  |  | 45.4 | 44.4 |  |  |  | 64.6 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 365.1 | 105.5 |  |  | 45.4 | 44.4 |  |  |  | 64.6 |  |
| LOS |  | F | F |  |  | D | D |  |  |  | E |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 231.0 |  |  |  |  | 44.7 |  |  |  | 64.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  | E |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | $\sim 628$ | ~393 |  |  | 142 | 171 |  |  |  | 238 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#869 | \#635 |  |  | 222 | 231 |  |  |  | 306 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1299 |  |  |  |  | 297 |  |  |  | 359 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 272 | 452 |  |  | 439 | 940 |  |  |  | 744 |  |
| 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 |  | 1.70 | 1.10 |  |  | 0.43 | 0.45 |  |  |  | 0.69 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 145
Actuated Cycle Length: 137.1
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.70
Intersection Signal Delay: $137.4 \quad$ Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 103.1\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd


5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd

|  | $\downarrow$ |  | $\pm$ | $\downarrow$ | $\cdots$ | 4 | - | П |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | SBL | SBT | SBR | SBR2 | NEL2 | NEL | NER | NER2 | $\varnothing 9$ |
| Lane Configurations |  | + $\uparrow$ |  |  |  | * |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 50 | 250 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 90 | 100 | 10 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 50 | 250 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 90 | 100 | 10 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3367 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1818 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.994 |  |  |  | 0.976 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 3367 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1818 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  | *25 |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 442 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 232 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  |  | Prot | Prot |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 1 | 1 |  |  | 10 | 10 |  |  | 9 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 |  |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  |  | 21.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 22.2 |  |  |  | 10.0 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.16 |  |  |  | 0.07 |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.81 |  |  |  | 1.49 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  | 68.5 |  |  |  | 288.1 |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  | 68.5 |  |  |  | 288.1 |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | E |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 68.5 |  |  |  | 288.1 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 205 |  |  |  | $\sim 275$ |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 273 |  |  |  | \#460 |  |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 719 |  |  |  | 676 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 615 |  |  |  | 156 |  |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.72 |  |  |  | 1.49 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | SBL2 | SBL | SBR | SBR2 | SEL2 | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NWR2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Group |  | 15 |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow \uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow \uparrow$ |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | 5 | 120 | 75 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 670 | 75 | 150 | 420 | 30 | 50 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 120 | 75 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 670 | 75 | 150 | 420 | 30 | 50 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 1707 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3479 | 0 | 0 | 3434 | 0 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 0.972 |  |  |  |  | 0.763 |  |  | $* 0.800$ |  |  |
| FIt Permitted | 0 | 1707 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2660 | 0 | 0 | 2778 | 0 | 0 |

Satd. Flow (RTOR)

| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 226 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 810 | 0 | 0 | 685 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Turn Type | Prot | Prot |  |  | Perm | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 10 | 10 |  |  |  |  | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |


| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 | 6 | 2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 13.0 | 55.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |
| Act Efftt Green (s) |  | 20.2 |  |  | 44.0 |  | 44.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.12 |  |  | 0.27 |  | 0.27 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 1.08 |  |  | 1.12 |  | 0.91 |
| Control Delay |  | 147.3 |  |  | 125.2 |  | 75.7 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 147.3 |  |  | 125.2 |  | 75.7 |
| LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  | E |
| Approach Delay |  | 147.3 |  |  | 125.2 |  | 75.7 |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  | E |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | ~249 |  |  | $\sim 466$ |  | 348 |
| Queue Length 95th (t) |  | \#509 |  |  | \#711 |  | \#530 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 638 |  |  | 1207 |  | 921 |
| Turn Bay Length (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 210 |  |  | 721 |  | 841 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 1.08 |  |  | 1.12 |  | 0.81 |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 180
Actuated Cycle Length: 163.1
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.14
Intersection Signal Delay: 109.3
Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 118.1\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 6: Canton Ave \& Reedsdale Ave


|  | \% | $\stackrel{4}{4}$ | $\nearrow$ | T | \% | $\checkmark$ | * | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NEL2 | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR | SWR2 | ø9 |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\dagger$ |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 40 | 90 | 300 | 150 | 50 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 40 | 90 | 300 | 150 | 50 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 1835 | 1583 | 0 | 1833 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  | *0.850 |  |  | 0.993 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 1583 | 1583 | 0 | 1833 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | 109 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 453 | 158 | 0 | 395 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Split | Split | NA | Perm | Split | NA |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 12 | 12 |  |  | 9 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |  |  | 20.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  | 35.3 | 35.3 |  | 35.3 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  | 0.22 | 0.22 |  | 0.22 |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  | 1.14 | 0.37 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  | 145.2 | 22.6 |  | 107.0 |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  | 145.2 | 22.6 |  | 107.0 |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  | F | C |  | F |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  | 113.5 |  |  | 107.0 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (t) |  |  | $\sim 527$ | 41 |  | 405 |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (t) |  |  | \#906 | 125 |  | \#755 |  |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  |  | 500 |  |  | 457 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) |  |  |  | 200 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  | 396 | 427 |  | 396 |  |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  | 1.14 | 0.37 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ${ }_{4}{ }^{\circ}$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }_{\$}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1857 | 1583 | 0 | 3416 | 0 | 1770 | 1848 | 0 | 0 | 1848 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted |  | 0.944 |  |  | 0.574 |  | *0.320 |  |  |  | 0.979 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1758 | 1583 | 0 | 2021 | 0 | 596 | 1848 | 0 | 0 | 1813 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 337 | 789 | 0 | 600 | 0 | 421 | 389 | 0 | 0 | 458 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 | 16.0 | 20.0 | 45.0 |  | 16.0 | 57.0 |  | 41.0 | 41.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Efftt Green (s) |  | 29.3 | 44.0 |  | 29.3 |  | 47.7 | 47.7 |  |  | 31.1 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.32 | 0.48 |  | 0.32 |  | 0.52 | 0.52 |  |  | 0.34 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.60 | 1.04 |  | 1.67dl |  | 0.95 | 0.40 |  |  | 0.74 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 32.6 | 67.6 |  | 53.2 |  | 53.5 | 17.5 |  |  | 37.5 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 32.6 | 67.6 |  | 53.2 |  | 53.5 | 17.5 |  |  | 37.5 |  |
| LOS |  | C | E |  | D |  | D | B |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 57.2 |  |  | 53.2 |  |  | 36.2 |  |  | 37.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 157 | $\sim 439$ |  | 168 |  | 129 | 115 |  |  | 212 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (t) |  | 324 | \#905 |  | \#354 |  | \#591 | 322 |  |  | \#538 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  | 1512 |  |  | 555 |  |  | 1087 |  |  | 816 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 562 | 760 |  | 915 |  | 443 | 1067 |  |  | 718 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.60 | 1.04 |  | 0.66 |  | 0.95 | 0.36 |  |  | 0.64 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 91.5
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.04
Intersection Signal Delay: 47.7
Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 103.1\%
ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave


9: Randolph Ave \& Reed St

|  |  |  | 4 |  |  | $\pm$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | $\varnothing 9$ |
| Lane Configurations | * |  |  | ¢ ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 虫 |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 10 | 50 | 10 | 1050 | 1500 | 10 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 10 | 50 | 10 | 1050 | 1500 | 10 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1639 | 0 | 0 | 3539 | 3536 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.991 |  |  | 0.923 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1639 | 0 | 0 | 3267 | 3536 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 64 | 0 | 0 | 1116 | 1590 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm |  | Perm | NA | NA |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |  | 9 |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 21.0 |  | 62.0 | 62.0 | 62.0 |  | 27.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 |  |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 16.9 |  |  | 41.9 | 41.9 |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.23 |  |  | 0.57 | 0.57 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.17 |  |  | 0.60 | 0.79 |  |  |
| Control Delay | 31.2 |  |  | 13.3 | 17.6 |  |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay | 31.2 |  |  | 13.3 | 17.6 |  |  |
| LOS | C |  |  | B | B |  |  |
| Approach Delay | 31.2 |  |  | 13.3 | 17.6 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | B | B |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 21 |  |  | 130 | 221 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 83 |  |  | 372 | 621 |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 354 |  |  | 1436 | 868 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 373 |  |  | 2604 | 2818 |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.17 |  |  | 0.43 | 0.56 |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 74
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.79
Intersection Signal Delay: $16.2 \quad$ Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 57.6\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 9: Randolph Ave \& Reed St


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | \$ |  |  | $\hat{*}_{*}$ |  |  | ง1 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 100 | 5 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 950 | 5 | 5 | 1575 | 100 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 100 | 5 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 950 | 5 | 5 | 1575 | 100 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1751 | 0 | 0 | 1727 | 0 | 0 | 3529 | 0 | 0 | 3507 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.961 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.659 |  |  | 0.952 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1751 | 0 | 0 | 1762 | 0 | 0 | 2330 | 0 | 0 | 3339 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1058 | 0 | 0 | 1768 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | G |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | , |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 13.0 | 13.0 |  | 15.0 | 61.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 11.9 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 56.8 |  |  | 56.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.14 |  |  | 0.07 |  |  | 0.67 |  |  | 0.67 |  |
| V/c Ratio |  | 0.54 |  |  | 0.04 |  |  | 0.68 |  |  | 0.79 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 44.4 |  |  | 44.8 |  |  | 15.6 |  |  | 17.0 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 44.4 |  |  | 44.8 |  |  | 15.6 |  |  | 17.0 |  |
| LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 44.4 |  |  | 44.8 |  |  | 15.6 |  |  | 17.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 59 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 113 |  |  | 220 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | 157 |  |  | 17 |  |  | \#573 |  |  | \#981 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 670 |  |  | 257 |  |  | 2385 |  |  | 2760 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 426 |  |  | 171 |  |  | 1559 |  |  | 2235 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.31 |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.68 |  |  | 0.79 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 84.9
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.79
Intersection Signal Delay: 17.8
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 85.7\%
ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 11: Randolph Ave \& Driveway


## Part 2: Short-Term Improvements

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 1 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  |  | 「" |  | 性 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 200 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 880 | 0 | 450 | 60 | 400 | 250 | 0 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 200 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 880 | 0 | 450 | 60 | 400 | 250 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1774 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2694 | 0 | 3360 | 0 | 1625 | 1690 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.996 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 | 0.988 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1774 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2694 | 0 | 3360 | 0 | 1625 | 1690 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 253 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 926 | 0 | 537 | 0 | 337 | 347 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  |  |  | Over |  | NA |  | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 3 | 3 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 26.0 | 26.0 |  |  |  | 49.0 |  | 27.0 |  | 49.0 | 49.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 8.0 |  |  |  | 4.5 |  | 7.0 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |
| Act Efftt Green (s) |  | 17.9 |  |  |  | 42.9 |  | 19.9 |  | 42.9 | 42.9 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.17 |  |  |  | 0.41 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.41 | 0.41 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.82 |  |  |  | 0.83 |  | 0.83 |  | 0.50 | 0.50 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 64.7 |  |  |  | 35.3 |  | 53.4 |  | 26.4 | 26.2 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 64.7 |  |  |  | 35.3 |  | 53.4 |  | 26.4 | 26.2 |  |
| LOS |  | E |  |  |  | D |  | D |  | C | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 64.7 |  |  | 35.3 |  |  | 53.4 |  |  | 26.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 160 |  |  |  | 286 |  | 177 |  | 160 | 164 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (t) |  | \#356 |  |  |  | \#523 |  | \#327 |  | 314 | 320 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 527 |  |  | 208 |  |  | 615 |  |  | 531 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 311 |  |  |  | 1167 |  | 654 |  | 703 | 732 |  |
| 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 |  | 0.81 |  |  |  | 0.79 |  | 0.82 |  | 0.48 | 0.47 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 103.4
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.83
Intersection Signal Delay: $39.9 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 74.2\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 1: Blue Hill Pkwy \& Brook Rd



Cycle Length: 75
Actuated Cycle Length: 36.4
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.36
Intersection Signal Delay: 5.4
Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 62.0\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 3: St Mary St \& Brook Rd


|  | $\checkmark$ | , | 2 | m | k | ( | \% | $\ngtr$ | T | 5 | $\cdots$ | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 565 | 5 | 2 | 850 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 10 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 565 | 5 | 2 | 850 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 10 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3529 | 0 | 0 | 3529 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1725 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.915 |  |  | 0.954 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.980 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 3235 | 0 | 0 | 3366 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1725 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 621 | 0 | 0 | 918 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |  |  |  | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  |  |  |  | 22.5 | 22.5 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 25.8 |  |  | 25.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.58 |  |  | 0.58 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.14 |  |
| V/c Ratio |  | 0.33 |  |  | 0.47 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.11 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 7.3 |  |  | 8.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 16.8 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 7.3 |  |  | 8.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 16.8 |  |
| LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 7.3 |  |  | 8.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 16.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 26 |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | 128 |  |  | 202 |  |  |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 719 |  |  | 759 |  |  | 87 |  |  | 255 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1868 |  |  | 1944 |  |  |  |  |  | 723 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.33 |  |  | 0.47 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.04 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 73.5
Actuated Cycle Length: 44.6
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.47
Intersection Signal Delay: 8.1
Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 42.4\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 4: Brook Rd \& Standish St


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 | $\downarrow$ |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $>$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | EBR2 | WBL2 | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL2 | NBL | NBT | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\underline{1}$ |  |  | * | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 50 | 350 | 290 | 50 | 20 | 150 | 300 | 75 | 10 | 540 | 150 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 50 | 350 | 290 | 50 | 20 | 150 | 300 | 75 | 10 | 540 | 150 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1852 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1770 | 3433 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3395 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | *0.800 |  |  |  | *0.800 |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1490 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1490 | 3433 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3395 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 421 | 358 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 758 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm |  | pm+pt | pm+pt | NA |  | Split | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 48.0 | 48.0 | 48.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 | 60.0 |  | 36.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 5.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 41.0 | 41.0 |  |  | 55.0 | 53.0 |  |  |  | 31.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.28 | 0.28 |  |  | 0.38 | 0.37 |  |  |  | 0.22 |  |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.99 | 0.80 |  |  | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |  |  | 1.52dl |  |
| Control Delay |  | 92.9 | 61.9 |  |  | 33.1 | 33.4 |  |  |  | 96.8 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 92.9 | 61.9 |  |  | 33.1 | 33.4 |  |  |  | 96.8 |  |
| LOS |  | F | E |  |  | C | C |  |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 78.7 |  |  |  |  | 33.3 |  |  |  | 96.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | F |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 395 | 312 |  |  | 115 | 138 |  |  |  | $\sim 400$ |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | \#620 | \#462 |  |  | 176 | 182 |  |  |  | \#533 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  | 481 |  |  |  |  | 240 |  |  |  | 294 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 424 | 450 |  |  | 582 | 1263 |  |  |  | 732 |  |
| 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 |  | 0.99 | 0.80 |  |  | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |  |  | 1.04 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 145
Actuated Cycle Length: 144
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.07
Intersection Signal Delay: $81.0 \quad$ Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 103.3\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd



|  | SBL2 | SBL | SBR | SBR2 | SEL2 | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NWR2 | NEL2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Group |  | M |  |  |  | $\uparrow \uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow \uparrow$ |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | 5 | 50 | 75 | 5 | 5 | 370 | 50 | 150 | 670 | 50 | 100 | 25 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 50 | 75 | 5 | 5 | 370 | 50 | 150 | 670 | 50 | 100 | 25 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 1679 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3472 | 0 | 0 | 3430 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 0.980 |  |  |  | 0.866 |  |  | $* 0.940$ |  |  |  |
| FIt Permitted | 0 | 1679 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3010 | 0 | 0 | 3250 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Satd. Flow (RTOR)

| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 447 | 0 | 0 | 1021 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Turn Type | Prot | Prot |  |  | Perm | NA | pm+pt | NA | 0 |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 10 | 10 |  |  |  | 6 | 5 | 2 |  | Split |  |


| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 | 2 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Split (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 10.0 | 60.0 | 41.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  |


| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 13.0 | 54.2 | 54.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.08 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| v/c Ratio | 1.08 | 0.46 | 0.97 |
| Control Delay | 171.4 | 47.8 | 75.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 171.4 | 47.8 | 75.9 |
| LOS | F | D | E |
| Approach Delay | 171.4 | 47.8 | 75.9 |
| Approach LOS | F | D | E |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | ~158 | 190 | 538 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | \#355 | 288 | \#820 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) | 462 | 1254 | 875 |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 131 | 976 | 1054 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 1.08 | 0.46 | 0.97 |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 179
Actuated Cycle Length: 167
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.08
Intersection Signal Delay: 88.8
Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 112.6\%
ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 6: Canton Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Center St


|  | 4 | $\nearrow$ | Ta | $\ldots$ | $\wedge$ | * | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR | SWR2 | $\varnothing 9$ |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | ¢ |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 75 | 300 | 150 | 70 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 75 | 300 | 150 | 70 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1840 | 1770 | 0 | 1831 | 0 | 0 |  |
| FIt Permitted |  | *0.840 |  |  | 0.991 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1565 | 1770 | 0 | 1831 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 110 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 421 | 158 | 0 | 416 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Split | NA | Perm | Split | NA |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  | 12 | 12 |  |  | 9 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |  |  | 20.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |
| Act Efft Green (s) |  | 36.1 | 36.1 |  | 35.1 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.22 | 0.22 |  | 0.21 |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 1.06 | 0.34 |  | 1.08 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  | 121.8 | 21.4 |  | 128.6 |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  | 121.8 | 21.4 |  | 128.6 |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | F | C |  | F |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 94.4 |  |  | 128.6 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | $\sim 450$ | 40 |  | $\sim 462$ |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | \#802 | 121 |  | \#802 |  |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 357 |  |  | 225 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) |  |  | 200 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 398 | 468 |  | 385 |  |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 1.06 | 0.34 |  | 1.08 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | * 1 |  | \% | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1859 | 1583 | 0 | 3451 | 0 | 1625 | 1685 | 0 | 0 | 1779 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.965 |  |  | 0.581 |  | 0.371 | 0.618 |  |  | 0.919 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1798 | 1583 | 0 | 2040 | 0 | 635 | 1055 | 0 | 0 | 1640 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 332 |  | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 332 | 332 | 0 | 478 | 0 | 641 | 749 | 0 | 0 | 305 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | G |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 22.0 | 22.0 | 29.0 | 14.0 | 36.0 |  | 29.0 | 66.0 |  | 37.0 | 37.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 26.7 | 54.0 |  | 26.7 |  | 60.7 | 60.7 |  |  | 31.3 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.26 | 0.53 |  | 0.26 |  | 0.60 | 0.60 |  |  | 0.31 |  |
| V/c Ratio |  | 0.70 | 0.33 |  | 1.14dl |  | 1.06 | 0.97 |  |  | 0.60 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 44.0 | 2.1 |  | 56.5 |  | 74.0 | 46.6 |  |  | 38.0 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 44.0 | 2.1 |  | 56.5 |  | 74.0 | 46.6 |  |  | 38.0 |  |
| LOS |  | D | A |  | E |  | E | D |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 23.1 |  |  | 56.5 |  |  | 59.3 |  |  | 38.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 184 | 0 |  | 146 |  | ~287 | 329 |  |  | 161 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | 353 | 31 |  | \#302 |  | \#925 | \#1012 |  |  | 328 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 722 |  |  | 555 |  |  | 1094 |  |  | 767 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 471 | 994 |  | 629 |  | 603 | 771 |  |  | 506 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.70 | 0.33 |  | 0.76 |  | 1.06 | 0.97 |  |  | 0.60 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 102
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.06
Intersection Signal Delay: $48.0 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 99.2\% ICU Level of Service F
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave



Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 83.9
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.79
Intersection Signal Delay: 11.9 Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 67.0\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 9: Randolph Ave \& Reed St


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | \% |  | $\ddagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | + ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  |  | + $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 80 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 1680 | 10 | 5 | 715 | 30 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 80 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 1680 | 10 | 5 | 715 | 30 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1687 | 0 | 0 | 1669 | 0 | 0 | 3414 | 0 | 0 | 3401 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.769 |  |  | 0.900 |  |  | 0.940 |  |  | 0.941 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1349 | 0 | 0 | 1533 | 0 | 0 | 3213 | 0 | 0 | 3200 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1800 | 0 | 0 | 790 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 11.0 | 64.0 |  | 53.0 | 53.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 11.3 |  |  | 11.3 |  |  | 59.0 |  |  | 59.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.13 |  |  | 0.13 |  |  | 0.69 |  |  | 0.69 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.60 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.82 |  |  | 0.36 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 52.7 |  |  | 37.0 |  |  | 16.4 |  |  | 8.0 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 52.7 |  |  | 37.0 |  |  | 16.4 |  |  | 8.0 |  |
| LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 52.7 |  |  | 37.0 |  |  | 16.4 |  |  | 8.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 51 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 256 |  |  | 65 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#154 |  |  | 15 |  |  | \#877 |  |  | 227 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 678 |  |  | 256 |  |  | 2390 |  |  | 1722 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 207 |  |  | 236 |  |  | 2207 |  |  | 2198 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.52 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.82 |  |  | 0.36 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 85.9
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.82
Intersection Signal Delay: 15.4
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 80.5\%
ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 11: Randolph Ave \& Hillside St/Driveway


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  |  | F' |  | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \% | $\hat{\text { A }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 50 | 210 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 770 | 0 | 350 | 70 | 780 | 680 | 0 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 50 | 210 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 770 | 0 | 350 | 70 | 780 | 680 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1828 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2787 | 0 | 3451 | 0 | 1681 | 1761 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.991 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 | 0.995 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1828 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2787 | 0 | 3451 | 0 | 1681 | 1761 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 811 | 0 | 442 | 0 | 739 | 798 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  |  | Over |  | NA |  | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 3 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | , | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 34.0 | 34.0 |  |  |  | 79.0 |  | 27.0 |  | 79.0 | 79.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 8.0 |  |  |  | 5.5 |  | 7.0 |  | 5.5 | 5.5 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 26.1 |  |  |  | 73.7 |  | 20.1 |  | 73.7 | 73.7 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.18 |  |  |  | 0.50 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.50 | 0.50 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.91 |  |  |  | 0.58 |  | 0.94 |  | 0.88 | 0.90 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 90.7 |  |  |  | 28.8 |  | 90.8 |  | 46.5 | 48.9 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 90.7 |  |  |  | 28.8 |  | 90.8 |  | 46.5 | 48.9 |  |
| LOS |  | F |  |  |  | C |  | F |  | D | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 90.7 |  |  | 28.8 |  |  | 90.8 |  |  | 47.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 264 |  |  |  | 273 |  | 211 |  | 584 | 646 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | \#501 |  |  |  | 428 |  | \#366 |  | \#1038 | \#1133 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  | 326 |  |  | 200 |  |  | 594 |  |  | 517 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 324 |  |  |  | 1399 |  | 471 |  | 844 | 884 |  |
| 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 |  | 0.91 |  |  |  | 0.58 |  | 0.94 |  | 0.88 | 0.90 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 158
Actuated Cycle Length: 146.8
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.94
Intersection Signal Delay: 53.0
Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 83.5\%
ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 1: Blue Hill Pkwy \& Brook Rd



Cycle Length: 75
Actuated Cycle Length: 36.5
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.30
Intersection Signal Delay: 4.9 Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 43.3\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 3: St Mary St \& Brook Rd


|  | $\cdots$ | $\pm$ | 2 | m | k | ¢ | \% | $\nearrow$ | T | 5 | $\grave{ }$ | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{4}{ }^{\circ}$ |  |  | 个t |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 890 | 10 | 30 | 670 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 890 | 10 | 30 | 670 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3529 | 0 | 0 | 3518 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1754 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.933 |  |  | 0.893 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.976 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 3295 | 0 | 0 | 3148 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1754 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 969 | 0 | 0 | 758 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |  |  |  | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  |  |  |  | 22.5 | 22.5 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 25.8 |  |  | 25.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.57 |  |  | 0.57 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.15 |  |
| V/c Ratio |  | 0.52 |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.16 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 9.2 |  |  | 8.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 20.8 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 9.2 |  |  | 8.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 20.8 |  |
| LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 9.2 |  |  | 8.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 20.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 50 |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | 230 |  |  | 171 |  |  |  |  |  | 40 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  | 708 |  |  | 777 |  |  | 174 |  |  | 255 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1879 |  |  | 1796 |  |  |  |  |  | 720 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.52 |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.06 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 73.5
Actuated Cycle Length: 45.2
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.52
Intersection Signal Delay: 9.1
Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 53.4\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 4: Standish St \& Brook Rd


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 | $\downarrow$ |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $>$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | EBR2 | WBL2 | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL2 | NBL | NBT | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | ${ }_{\text {K }}$ |  |  | * | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 40 | 400 | 450 | 20 | 30 | 150 | 350 | 50 | 20 | 350 | 100 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 40 | 400 | 450 | 20 | 30 | 150 | 350 | 50 | 20 | 350 | 100 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1853 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1770 | 3472 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3391 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | *0.800 |  |  |  | *0.800 |  |  |  |  | 0.964 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1490 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1490 | 3472 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3391 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 158 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 463 | 495 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 421 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 515 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm |  | pm+pt | pm+pt | NA |  | Split | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | , |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  | 2 | 2 | , |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 | 55.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 5.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 36.0 | 36.0 |  |  | 50.0 | 48.0 |  |  |  | 20.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.25 | 0.25 |  |  | 0.35 | 0.33 |  |  |  | 0.14 |  |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 1.24 | 0.96 |  |  | 0.36 | 0.36 |  |  |  | 1.58dl |  |
| Control Delay |  | 173.8 | 67.2 |  |  | 37.5 | 37.4 |  |  |  | 125.2 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 173.8 | 67.2 |  |  | 37.5 | 37.4 |  |  |  | 125.2 |  |
| LOS |  | F | E |  |  | D | D |  |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 118.7 |  |  |  |  | 37.5 |  |  |  | 125.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  | F |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | $\sim 538$ | 338 |  |  | 130 | 157 |  |  |  | ~286 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | \#758 | \#571 |  |  | 197 | 206 |  |  |  | \#405 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  | 458 |  |  |  |  | 227 |  |  |  | 291 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 373 | 515 |  |  | 531 | 1159 |  |  |  | 471 |  |
| 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 |  | 1.24 | 0.96 |  |  | 0.36 | 0.36 |  |  |  | 1.09 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 145
Actuated Cycle Length: 143.7
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.25
Intersection Signal Delay: $102.5 \quad$ Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 103.1\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd


|  | * | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | J | 4 | - | $\uparrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | SBL | SBT | SBR | SBR2 | NEL2 | NEL | NER | NER2 | $\varnothing 9$ |
| Lane Configurations |  | * $\uparrow$ |  |  |  | * |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 50 | 250 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 90 | 100 | 10 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 50 | 250 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 90 | 100 | 10 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3387 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1818 | 0 | 0 |  |
| FIt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  | 0.976 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 3387 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1818 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  | *25 |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 442 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 232 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  |  | Prot | Prot |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 1 | 1 |  |  | 10 | 10 |  |  | 9 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 26.0 | 26.0 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  |  | 21.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |
| Act Efft Green (s) |  | 20.7 |  |  |  | 13.0 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.14 |  |  |  | 0.09 |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.91 |  |  |  | 1.25 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  | 83.6 |  |  |  | 192.5 |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  | 83.6 |  |  |  | 192.5 |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | F |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 83.6 |  |  |  | 192.5 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 217 |  |  |  | $\sim 248$ |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | \#314 |  |  |  | \#424 |  |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 619 |  |  |  | 393 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 494 |  |  |  | 186 |  |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.89 |  |  |  | 1.25 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lane Group | SBL2 | SBL | SBR | SBR2 | SEL2 | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NWR2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }^{*}$ |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow \uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {4 }}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 120 | 75 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 670 | 75 | 150 | 420 | 30 | 50 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 120 | 75 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 670 | 75 | 150 | 420 | 30 | 50 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1707 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3479 | 0 | 0 | 3434 | 0 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.972 |  |  |  |  | 0.804 |  |  | *0.800 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1707 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2803 | 0 | 0 | 2778 | 0 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 226 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 810 | 0 | 0 | 685 | 0 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Prot |  |  | Perm | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 10 | 10 |  |  |  |  | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |  | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |  | 10.0 | 60.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 20.2 |  |  |  |  | 48.0 |  |  | 48.0 |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.13 |  |  |  |  | 0.30 |  |  | 0.30 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 1.06 |  |  |  |  | 0.97 |  |  | 0.83 |  |  |
| Control Delay |  | 142.3 |  |  |  |  | 79.2 |  |  | 63.2 |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay |  | 142.3 |  |  |  |  | 79.2 |  |  | 63.2 |  |  |
| LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 142.3 |  |  |  |  | 79.2 |  |  | 63.2 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 223 |  |  |  |  | 408 |  |  | 328 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th ( t ) |  | \#505 |  |  |  |  | \#629 |  |  | 480 |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 522 |  |  |  |  | 1243 |  |  | 888 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 213 |  |  |  |  | 838 |  |  | 939 |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 1.06 |  |  |  |  | 0.97 |  |  | 0.73 |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 179
Actuated Cycle Length: 161
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.11
Intersection Signal Delay: 95.7
Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 115.9\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 6: Canton Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Centre Street


|  | \% | $\stackrel{4}{ }$ | $\nearrow$ | T | $\ldots$ | $\checkmark$ | * | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NEL2 | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR | SWR2 | ø9 |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 40 | 50 | 300 | 150 | 50 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 40 | 50 | 300 | 150 | 50 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 1842 | 1583 | 0 | 1833 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  | *0.800 |  |  | 0.993 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 1490 | 1583 | 0 | 1833 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | *1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 411 | 158 | 0 | 395 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Split | Split | NA | Perm | Split | NA |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 12 | 12 |  |  | 9 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 37.0 | 37.0 | 37.0 | 37.0 | 37.0 | 37.0 |  |  | 20.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |
| Act Efftt Green (s) |  |  | 32.3 | 32.3 |  | 32.3 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  | 0.20 | 0.20 |  | 0.20 |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  | 1.11 | 0.50 |  | 1.08 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  | 138.0 | 65.6 |  | 127.5 |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  | 138.0 | 65.6 |  | 127.5 |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  | F | E |  | F |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  | 117.9 |  |  | 127.5 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  |  | $\sim 430$ | 134 |  | -390 |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th ( t ) |  |  | \#828 | 257 |  | \#788 |  |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  |  | 307 |  |  | 271 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) |  |  |  | 200 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  | 369 | 317 |  | 367 |  |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  | 1.11 | 0.50 |  | 1.08 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ | ( | $\frac{1}{\dagger}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | *T |  | ${ }^{7}$ | * |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1857 | 1583 | 0 | 3416 | 0 | 1625 | 1687 | 0 | 0 | 1786 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.942 |  |  | 0.558 |  | 0.185 | 0.727 |  |  | 0.973 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1755 | 1583 | 0 | 1965 | 0 | 316 | 1235 | 0 | 0 | 1742 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 506 |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 337 | 789 | 0 | 600 | 0 | 354 | 456 | 0 | 0 | 458 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 26.0 | 26.0 | 31.0 | 11.0 | 37.0 |  | 31.0 | 65.0 |  | 34.0 | 34.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 31.7 | 60.8 |  | 31.7 |  | 59.4 | 59.4 |  |  | 28.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.30 | 0.58 |  | 0.30 |  | 0.56 | 0.56 |  |  | 0.27 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.64 | 0.70 |  | 1.95dl |  | 0.73 | 0.57 |  |  | 0.98 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 39.9 | 8.3 |  | 78.9 |  | 28.4 | 18.8 |  |  | 78.0 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 39.9 | 8.3 |  | 78.9 |  | 28.4 | 18.8 |  |  | 78.0 |  |
| LOS |  | D | A |  | E |  | C | B |  |  | E |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 17.8 |  |  | 78.9 |  |  | 23.0 |  |  | 78.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 186 | 92 |  | 201 |  | 134 | 168 |  |  | 292 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 357 | 196 |  | \#419 |  | \#375 | 374 |  |  | \#639 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 707 |  |  | 556 |  |  | 1090 |  |  | 816 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 525 | 1125 |  | 600 |  | 488 | 801 |  |  | 465 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.64 | 0.70 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.73 | 0.57 |  |  | 0.98 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 105.7
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.02
Intersection Signal Delay: $40.6 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 103.1\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave



Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 64.1
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.77
Intersection Signal Delay: 12.4 Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 57.6\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 9: Randolph Ave \& Reed St


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | $4$ | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | * |  |  | *T |  |  | * $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 100 | 5 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 950 | 5 | 5 | 1575 | 100 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 100 | 5 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 950 | 5 | 5 | 1575 | 100 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1692 | 0 | 0 | 1669 | 0 | 0 | 3411 | 0 | 0 | 3390 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.961 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.658 |  |  | 0.952 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1692 | 0 | 0 | 1703 | 0 | 0 | 2249 | 0 | 0 | 3228 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1058 | 0 | 0 | 1768 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 13.0 | 13.0 |  | 15.0 | 61.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 12.1 |  |  | 6.1 |  |  | 56.8 |  |  | 56.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.14 |  |  | 0.07 |  |  | 0.67 |  |  | 0.67 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.55 |  |  | 0.04 |  |  | 0.70 |  |  | 0.82 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 45.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 16.5 |  |  | 18.2 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 45.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 16.5 |  |  | 18.2 |  |
| LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 45.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 16.5 |  |  | 18.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 59 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 118 |  |  | 231 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 158 |  |  | 17 |  |  | \#593 |  |  | \#1010 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 670 |  |  | 257 |  |  | 2385 |  |  | 2760 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 411 |  |  | 165 |  |  | 1501 |  |  | 2155 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.32 |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.70 |  |  | 0.82 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 85.1
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.82
Intersection Signal Delay: 18.8
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 85.7\%
ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 11: Randolph Ave \& Driveway


Part 3: Brook Road: Concept 1

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  |  | 「「＇ |  | 性 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | ${ }_{4}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 20 | 200 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 880 | 0 | 450 | 60 | 400 | 250 | 0 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 20 | 200 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 880 | 0 | 450 | 60 | 400 | 250 | 0 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 0 | 1835 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2787 | 0 | 3476 | 0 | 1681 | 1748 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.996 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 | 0.988 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 0 | 1835 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2787 | 0 | 3476 | 0 | 1681 | 1748 | 0 |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 265 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 973 | 0 | 563 | 0 | 354 | 364 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  |  | Over |  | NA |  | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 3 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split（s） | 26.0 | 26.0 |  |  |  | 49.0 |  | 27.0 |  | 49.0 | 49.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time（s） |  | 8.0 |  |  |  | 4.5 |  | 7.0 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |
| Act Effct Green（s） |  | 18.1 |  |  |  | 43.4 |  | 20.1 |  | 43.4 | 43.4 |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.17 |  |  |  | 0.42 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.42 | 0.42 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.83 |  |  |  | 0.84 |  | 0.84 |  | 0.51 | 0.50 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 65.7 |  |  |  | 36.0 |  | 54.1 |  | 26.7 | 26.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 65.7 |  |  |  | 36.0 |  | 54.1 |  | 26.7 | 26.4 |  |
| LOS |  | E |  |  |  | D |  | D |  | C | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 65.7 |  |  | 36.0 |  |  | 54.1 |  |  | 26.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th（tt） |  | 168 |  |  |  | 303 |  | 186 |  | 168 | 172 |  |
| Queue Length 95th（ft） |  | \＃376 |  |  |  | \＃560 |  | \＃347 |  | 333 | 337 |  |
| Internal Link Dist（ft） |  | 527 |  |  | 196 |  |  | 615 |  |  | 531 |  |
| Turn Bay Length（ft） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity（vph） |  | 318 |  |  |  | 1194 |  | 669 |  | 720 | 749 |  |
| 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 |  | 0.83 |  |  |  | 0.81 |  | 0.84 |  | 0.49 | 0.49 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length： 120
Actuated Cycle Length： 104.4
Control Type：Actuated－Uncoordinated
Maximum v／c Ratio： 0.84
Intersection Signal Delay： 40.5 Intersection LOS：D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 77．1\％ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period（min） 15
\＃95th percentile volume exceeds capacity，queue may be longer．
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles．
Splits and Phases：1：Blue Hill Pkwy \＆Brook Rd



Cycle Length: 84.5
Actuated Cycle Length: 50.5
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.64
Intersection Signal Delay: 9.6 Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 94.3\% ICU Level of Service F
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 3: St Mary St \& Brook Rd


|  | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Group |  | $\Phi$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Lane Configurations | 20 | 565 | 10 | 20 | 850 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 10 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 565 | 10 | 20 | 850 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 10 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 1855 | 0 | 0 | 1855 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1731 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 0.960 |  |  | 0.983 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.981 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0 | 1785 | 0 | 0 | 1826 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1731 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 11 | 11 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | 0 | 657 | 0 | 0 | 983 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |  |  |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Turn Type | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |


| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 8 |  |  | 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Split (s) | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 46.7 |  | 46.7 |  |  | 6.4 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.90 |  | 0.90 |  |  | 0.12 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.41 |  | 0.60 |  |  | 0.12 |
| Control Delay |  | 6.0 |  | 9.4 |  |  | 20.6 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 6.0 |  | 9.4 |  |  | 20.6 |
| LOS |  | A |  | A |  |  | C |
| Approach Delay |  | 6.0 |  | 9.4 |  |  | 20.6 |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  | A |  |  | C |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 4 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 370 |  | \#775 |  |  | 31 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 716 |  | 871 | 91 |  | 255 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1609 |  | 1646 |  |  | 674 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.41 |  | 0.60 |  |  | 0.04 |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 51.8
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.60
Intersection Signal Delay: 8.3 Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 69.3\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 4: Standish St \& Brook Rd


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 | $\downarrow$ |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $>$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | EBR2 | WBL2 | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL2 | NBL | NBT | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\underline{1}$ |  |  | 気 | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}{ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 50 | 350 | 290 | 50 | 20 | 150 | 300 | 75 | 10 | 540 | 150 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 50 | 350 | 290 | 50 | 20 | 150 | 300 | 75 | 10 | 540 | 150 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1852 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1770 | 3433 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3395 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.794 |  |  |  | *0.900 |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1479 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1676 | 3433 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3395 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 166 |  |  |  | 23 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 442 | 376 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 415 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 796 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm |  | pm+pt | pm+pt | NA |  | Split | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 | , |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 | 57.0 |  | 36.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 5.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 38.0 | 38.0 |  |  | 52.0 | 50.0 |  |  |  | 31.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.26 | 0.26 |  |  | 0.36 | 0.35 |  |  |  | 0.21 |  |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 1.14 | 0.70 |  |  | 0.31 | 0.34 |  |  |  | 1.60dl |  |
| Control Delay |  | 135.6 | 34.0 |  |  | 35.2 | 34.0 |  |  |  | 112.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 135.6 | 34.0 |  |  | 35.2 | 34.0 |  |  |  | 112.4 |  |
| LOS |  | F | C |  |  | D | C |  |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 88.9 |  |  |  |  | 34.4 |  |  |  | 112.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | F |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | $\sim 481$ | 182 |  |  | 126 | 143 |  |  |  | $\sim 440$ |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | \#704 | 309 |  |  | 192 | 191 |  |  |  | \#580 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 370 |  |  |  |  | 368 |  |  |  | 338 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( ft ) |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 389 | 538 |  |  | 608 | 1203 |  |  |  | 730 |  |
| 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 |  | 1.14 | 0.70 |  |  | 0.31 | 0.34 |  |  |  | 1.09 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 145
Actuated Cycle Length: 144.4
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.14
Intersection Signal Delay: $79.5 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.2\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd



|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  |  | 「「＇ |  | 个 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 50 | 210 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 770 | 0 | 350 | 70 | 780 | 680 | 0 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 50 | 210 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 770 | 0 | 350 | 70 | 780 | 680 | 0 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 0 | 1828 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2951 | 0 | 3451 | 0 | 1681 | 1761 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.991 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 | 0.995 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 0 | 1828 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2951 | 0 | 3451 | 0 | 1681 | 1761 | 0 |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 309 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 851 | 0 | 464 | 0 | 776 | 838 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  |  | Over |  | NA |  | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 3 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split（s） | 28.0 | 28.0 |  |  |  | 52.0 |  | 22.0 |  | 52.0 | 52.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time（s） |  | 8.0 |  |  |  | 5.5 |  | 7.0 |  | 5.5 | 5.5 |  |
| Act Effct Green（s） |  | 20.1 |  |  |  | 46.7 |  | 15.1 |  | 46.7 | 46.7 |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.19 |  |  |  | 0.44 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.44 | 0.44 |  |
| v／c Ratio |  | 0.89 |  |  |  | 0.65 |  | 0.94 |  | 1.04 | 1.08 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 69.9 |  |  |  | 26.8 |  | 74.2 |  | 75.0 | 84.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 69.9 |  |  |  | 26.8 |  | 74.2 |  | 75.0 | 84.4 |  |
| LOS |  | E |  |  |  | C |  | E |  | E | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 69.9 |  |  | 26.8 |  |  | 74.2 |  |  | 79.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |
| Queue Length 50th（ft） |  | 196 |  |  |  | 233 |  | 158 |  | $\sim 534$ | $\sim 626$ |  |
| Queue Length 95th（ft） |  | \＃427 |  |  |  | 399 |  | \＃315 |  | \＃1003 | \＃1086 |  |
| Internal Link Dist（ft） |  | 527 |  |  | 190 |  |  | 615 |  |  | 531 |  |
| Turn Bay Length（t） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity（vph） |  | 348 |  |  |  | 1307 |  | 493 |  | 744 | 779 |  |
| 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 |  | 0.89 |  |  |  | 0.65 |  | 0.94 |  | 1.04 | 1.08 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length： 120
Actuated Cycle Length： 105.4
Control Type：Actuated－Uncoordinated
Maximum v／c Ratio： 1.08
Intersection Signal Delay： $64.2 \quad$ Intersection LOS：E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 86．8\％ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period（min） 15
～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．
Splits and Phases：1：Blue Hill Pkwy \＆Brook Rd



Cycle Length: 75
Actuated Cycle Length: 36.5
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.60
Intersection Signal Delay: 10.4 Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 63.7\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 3: St Mary St \& Brook Rd


|  | $\cdots$ | , | $\lambda$ | $m$ | k | $\checkmark$ | \% | $\nearrow$ | a | 4 | $\grave{ }$ | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\$}$ |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 20 | 890 | 10 | 30 | 670 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 890 | 10 | 30 | 670 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1859 | 0 | 0 | 1852 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1756 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.979 |  |  | 0.941 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.976 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1822 | 0 | 0 | 1746 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1756 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 1017 | 0 | 0 | 796 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |  |  |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 55.0 | 55.0 |  |  |  |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.5 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 50.1 |  |  | 50.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.81 |  |  | 0.81 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.12 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.69 |  |  | 0.56 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.21 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 12.0 |  |  | 9.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 27.9 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 12.0 |  |  | 9.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 27.9 |  |
| LOS |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 12.0 |  |  | 9.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 27.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 162 |  |  | 103 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#837 |  |  | 512 |  |  |  |  |  | 49 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 714 |  |  | 850 |  |  | 90 |  |  | 255 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1482 |  |  | 1421 |  |  |  |  |  | 302 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.69 |  |  | 0.56 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.15 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 61.6
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.69
Intersection Signal Delay: 11.1
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 69.5\%
ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 4: Standish St \& Brook Rd


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

Cycle Length: 145
Actuated Cycle Length: 143.3
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.12
Intersection Signal Delay: 89.7
Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.1\%
ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd



## Part 4: Brook Road: Concepts 2 and 3

|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  |  | 「「＇ |  | 中t |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 20 | 200 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 880 | 0 | 450 | 60 | 400 | 250 | 0 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 20 | 200 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 880 | 0 | 450 | 60 | 400 | 250 | 0 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 0 | 1835 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2787 | 0 | 3476 | 0 | 1681 | 1748 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.996 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 | 0.988 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 0 | 1835 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2787 | 0 | 3476 | 0 | 1681 | 1748 | 0 |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 265 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 973 | 0 | 563 | 0 | 354 | 364 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  |  | Over |  | NA |  | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 3 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split（s） | 26.0 | 26.0 |  |  |  | 49.0 |  | 27.0 |  | 49.0 | 49.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time（s） |  | 8.0 |  |  |  | 4.5 |  | 7.0 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |
| Act Effict Green（s） |  | 18.1 |  |  |  | 43.4 |  | 20.1 |  | 43.4 | 43.4 |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio |  | 0.17 |  |  |  | 0.42 |  | 0.19 |  | 0.42 | 0.42 |  |
| v／c Ratio |  | 0.83 |  |  |  | 0.84 |  | 0.84 |  | 0.51 | 0.50 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 65.7 |  |  |  | 36.0 |  | 54.1 |  | 26.7 | 26.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 65.7 |  |  |  | 36.0 |  | 54.1 |  | 26.7 | 26.4 |  |
| LOS |  | E |  |  |  | D |  | D |  | C | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 65.7 |  |  | 36.0 |  |  | 54.1 |  |  | 26.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th（ft） |  | 168 |  |  |  | 303 |  | 186 |  | 168 | 172 |  |
| Queue Length 95th（ft） |  | \＃376 |  |  |  | \＃560 |  | \＃347 |  | 333 | 337 |  |
| Internal Link Dist（ft） |  | 527 |  |  | 196 |  |  | 615 |  |  | 531 |  |
| Turn Bay Length（ft） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity（vph） |  | 318 |  |  |  | 1194 |  | 669 |  | 720 | 749 |  |
| 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 |  | 0.83 |  |  |  | 0.81 |  | 0.84 |  | 0.49 | 0.49 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length： 120
Actuated Cycle Length： 104.4
Control Type：Actuated－Uncoordinated
Maximum v／c Ratio： 0.84
Intersection Signal Delay： 40.5 Intersection LOS：D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 77．1\％ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period（min） 15
\＃95th percentile volume exceeds capacity，queue may be longer．
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles．
Splits and Phases：1：Blue Hill Pkwy \＆Brook Rd



Cycle Length: 84.5
Actuated Cycle Length: 50.4
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.56
Intersection Signal Delay: 8.5 Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 55.0\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 3: St Mary St \& Brook Rd


| Lane Group | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F |  | \% | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  | ¢ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 565 | 10 | 20 | 850 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 10 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 565 | 10 | 20 | 850 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 10 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1857 | 0 | 1770 | 1857 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1731 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.209 |  |  | 0.384 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.981 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 389 | 1857 | 0 | 715 | 1857 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1731 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 22 | 635 | 0 | 22 | 961 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |  |  |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |


| Permitted Phases | 4 | 8 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Split (s) | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 |  | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |
| Act Effict Green (s) | 46.7 | 46.7 | 46.7 | 46.7 |  |  | 6.4 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |  | 0.12 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.06 | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0.57 |  |  | 0.12 |
| Control Delay | 6.0 | 5.6 | 5.2 | 9.0 |  |  | 20.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 6.0 | 5.6 | 5.2 | 9.0 |  |  | 20.6 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A |  |  | C |
| Approach Delay |  | 5.6 |  | 8.9 |  |  | 20.6 |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  | A |  |  | C |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 4 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 19 | 341 | 17 | \#742 |  |  | 31 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 716 |  | 871 | 91 |  | 255 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 120 |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 350 | 1673 | 644 | 1674 |  |  | 674 |
| 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 | 0.06 | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0.57 |  |  | 0.04 |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 51.8
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.57
Intersection Signal Delay: 7.8 Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization $60.7 \%$ ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 4: Standish St \& Brook Rd


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 | $\downarrow$ |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $>$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | EBR2 | WBL2 | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL2 | NBL | NBT | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\underline{1}$ |  |  | 気 | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}{ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 50 | 350 | 290 | 50 | 20 | 150 | 300 | 75 | 10 | 540 | 150 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 50 | 350 | 290 | 50 | 20 | 150 | 300 | 75 | 10 | 540 | 150 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1852 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1770 | 3433 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3395 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.794 |  |  |  | *0.900 |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1479 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1676 | 3433 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3395 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 166 |  |  |  | 23 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 442 | 376 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 415 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 796 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm |  | pm+pt | pm+pt | NA |  | Split | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 | , |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 | 57.0 |  | 36.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 5.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 38.0 | 38.0 |  |  | 52.0 | 50.0 |  |  |  | 31.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.26 | 0.26 |  |  | 0.36 | 0.35 |  |  |  | 0.21 |  |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 1.14 | 0.70 |  |  | 0.31 | 0.34 |  |  |  | 1.60dl |  |
| Control Delay |  | 135.6 | 34.0 |  |  | 35.2 | 34.0 |  |  |  | 112.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 135.6 | 34.0 |  |  | 35.2 | 34.0 |  |  |  | 112.4 |  |
| LOS |  | F | C |  |  | D | C |  |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 88.9 |  |  |  |  | 34.4 |  |  |  | 112.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | F |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | $\sim 481$ | 182 |  |  | 126 | 143 |  |  |  | $\sim 440$ |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | \#704 | 309 |  |  | 192 | 191 |  |  |  | \#580 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 370 |  |  |  |  | 368 |  |  |  | 338 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( ft ) |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 389 | 538 |  |  | 608 | 1203 |  |  |  | 730 |  |
| 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 |  | 1.14 | 0.70 |  |  | 0.31 | 0.34 |  |  |  | 1.09 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 145
Actuated Cycle Length: 144.4
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.14
Intersection Signal Delay: $79.5 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.2\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd



|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  |  | F't |  | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \% | $\hat{4}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 50 | 210 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 770 | 0 | 350 | 70 | 780 | 680 | 0 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 50 | 210 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 770 | 0 | 350 | 70 | 780 | 680 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1828 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2951 | 0 | 3451 | 0 | 1681 | 1761 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.991 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.950 | 0.995 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1828 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2951 | 0 | 3451 | 0 | 1681 | 1761 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 309 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 851 | 0 | 464 | 0 | 776 | 838 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  |  |  | Over |  | NA |  | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 3 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 28.0 | 28.0 |  |  |  | 52.0 |  | 22.0 |  | 52.0 | 52.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 8.0 |  |  |  | 5.5 |  | 7.0 |  | 5.5 | 5.5 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 20.1 |  |  |  | 46.7 |  | 15.1 |  | 46.7 | 46.7 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.19 |  |  |  | 0.44 |  | 0.14 |  | 0.44 | 0.44 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.89 |  |  |  | 0.65 |  | 0.94 |  | 1.04 | 1.08 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 69.9 |  |  |  | 26.8 |  | 74.2 |  | 75.0 | 84.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 69.9 |  |  |  | 26.8 |  | 74.2 |  | 75.0 | 84.4 |  |
| LOS |  | E |  |  |  | C |  | E |  | E | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 69.9 |  |  | 26.8 |  |  | 74.2 |  |  | 79.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 196 |  |  |  | 233 |  | 158 |  | $\sim 534$ | $\sim 626$ |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#427 |  |  |  | 399 |  | \#315 |  | \#1003 | \#1086 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 527 |  |  | 190 |  |  | 615 |  |  | 531 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 348 |  |  |  | 1307 |  | 493 |  | 744 | 779 |  |
| 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 |  | 0.89 |  |  |  | 0.65 |  | 0.94 |  | 1.04 | 1.08 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 105.4
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.08
Intersection Signal Delay: $64.2 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 86.8\% ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 1: Blue Hill Pkwy \& Brook Rd



Cycle Length: 75
Actuated Cycle Length: 36.5
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.60
Intersection Signal Delay: 10.2 Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 59.6\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 3: St Mary St \& Brook Rd


| Lane Group | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }_{1}$ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 890 | 10 | 30 | 670 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 890 | 10 | 30 | 670 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 10 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1859 | 0 | 1770 | 1855 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1756 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.305 |  |  | 0.181 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.976 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 568 | 1859 | 0 | 337 | 1855 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1756 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 22 | 995 | 0 | 33 | 763 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |  |  |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |


| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 8 |  | 6 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Split (s) | 55.0 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 55.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 4.5 |
| Act Effit Green (s) | 44.6 | 44.6 | 44.6 | 44.6 |  |  | 7.6 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |  |  | 0.14 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.05 | 0.66 | 0.12 | 0.51 |  |  | 0.18 |
| Control Delay | 6.1 | 11.4 | 7.5 | 7.9 |  |  | 26.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 6.1 | 11.4 | 7.5 | 7.9 |  |  | 26.6 |
| LOS | A | B | A | A |  |  | C |
| Approach Delay |  | 11.3 |  | 7.9 |  |  | 26.6 |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  | A |  |  | C |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 2 | 151 | 3 | 91 |  |  | 11 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 17 | \#796 | 26 | 442 |  |  | 49 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 714 |  | 850 | 90 |  | 255 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 120 |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 474 | 1551 | 281 | 1548 |  |  | 363 |
| 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 | 0.05 | 0.64 | 0.12 | 0.49 |  |  | 0.12 |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 55.4
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.66
Intersection Signal Delay: 10.2 Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 61.9\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 4: Standish St \& Brook Rd


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 | $\downarrow$ | $\cdots$ |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $>$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | EBR2 | WBL2 | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL2 | NBL | NBT | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\underline{1}$ |  |  | * | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 40 | 400 | 450 | 20 | 30 | 150 | 350 | 50 | 20 | 350 | 100 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 40 | 400 | 450 | 20 | 30 | 150 | 350 | 50 | 20 | 350 | 100 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1853 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1770 | 3472 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3391 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.860 |  |  |  | 0.153 |  |  |  |  | 0.964 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1602 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 285 | 3472 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3391 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 158 |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 486 | 519 | 0 | 0 | 199 | 442 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 542 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm |  | pm+pt | pm+pt | NA |  | Split | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 | , |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 46.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 | 58.0 |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 5.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 39.0 | 39.0 |  |  | 53.0 | 51.0 |  |  |  | 21.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.27 | 0.27 |  |  | 0.37 | 0.36 |  |  |  | 0.15 |  |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 1.12 | 0.95 |  |  | 1.12 | 0.36 |  |  |  | 1.57d |  |
| Control Delay |  | 125.9 | 63.9 |  |  | 151.7 | 34.2 |  |  |  | 121.6 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 125.9 | 63.9 |  |  | 151.7 | 34.2 |  |  |  | 121.6 |  |
| LOS |  | F | E |  |  | F | C |  |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 93.9 |  |  |  |  | 70.6 |  |  |  | 121.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  | F |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | $\sim 523$ | 360 |  |  | ~155 | 156 |  |  |  | ~300 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | \#745 | \#593 |  |  | \#319 | 204 |  |  |  | \#423 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 394 |  |  |  |  | 311 |  |  |  | 325 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( ft ) |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 435 | 545 |  |  | 178 | 1243 |  |  |  | 498 |  |
| 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 |  | 1.12 | 0.95 |  |  | 1.12 | 0.36 |  |  |  | 1.09 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 145
Actuated Cycle Length: 143.3
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.12
Intersection Signal Delay: 89.7
Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.1\%
ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd



Part 5: Brook Road and Central Avenue: Roundabout Retrofit

5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 12.2 |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 818 | 603 | 796 | 287 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 834 | 615 | 811 | 292 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 483 | 912 | 687 | 1161 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 970 | 586 | 524 | 366 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 10.1 | 14.1 | 13.5 | 11.9 |
| Approach LOS | B | B | B | B |


| Lane | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Right |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Designated Moves | LT | R | LT | TR | L | LTR | LT | TR |
| Assumed Moves | LT | R | LT | TR | L | LTR | LT | TR |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 0.541 | 0.459 | 0.470 | 0.530 | 0.530 | 0.470 | 0.469 | 0.531 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.667 | 2.535 | 2.667 | 2.535 | 2.667 | 2.535 | 2.667 | 2.535 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.645 | 4.328 | 4.645 | 4.328 | 4.645 | 4.328 | 4.645 | 4.328 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 451 | 383 | 289 | 326 | 430 | 381 | 137 | 155 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 866 | 942 | 583 | 654 | 718 | 792 | 464 | 529 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.981 | 0.982 | 0.981 | 0.980 | 0.980 | 0.981 | 0.984 | 0.980 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 442 | 376 | 283 | 320 | 422 | 374 | 135 | 152 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 849 | 925 | 572 | 641 | 703 | 777 | 456 | 519 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.521 | 0.407 | 0.495 | 0.498 | 0.599 | 0.481 | 0.295 | 0.293 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 11.4 | 8.6 | 14.8 | 13.6 | 15.5 | 11.3 | 12.6 | 11.3 |
| LOS | B | A | B | B | C | B | B | B |
| 95th \%tile Queue, veh | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |



5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 17.7 |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | C |  | WB |  |
| Approach | EB | 2 | SB |  |
| Entry Lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 2 | 641 | 2 |  |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 1005 | 654 | 542 | 464 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 1025 | 698 | 782 | 473 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 676 | 642 | 834 | 1037 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 834 | 0 | 0 | 315 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 0 | 1.000 | 0 |  |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 10.9 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 17.5 | B | 13.6 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  | D | B |


| Lane | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Right |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Designated Moves | LT | R | LT | TR | LT | R | LT | TR |
| Assumed Moves | LT | R | LT | TR | LT | R | LT | TR |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 0.484 | 0.516 | 0.469 | 0.531 | 0.960 | 0.040 | 0.469 | 0.531 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.667 | 2.535 | 2.667 | 2.535 | 2.667 | 2.535 | 2.667 | 2.535 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.645 | 4.328 | 4.645 | 4.328 | 4.645 | 4.328 | 4.645 | 4.328 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 496 | 529 | 307 | 347 | 530 | 22 | 222 | 251 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 725 | 799 | 710 | 785 | 654 | 727 | 520 | 588 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.980 | 0.981 | 0.982 | 0.980 | 0.980 | 1.000 | 0.983 | 0.981 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 486 | 519 | 302 | 340 | 519 | 22 | 218 | 246 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 710 | 784 | 698 | 769 | 641 | 727 | 511 | 577 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.684 | 0.662 | 0.432 | 0.442 | 0.811 | 0.030 | 0.427 | 0.427 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 18.7 | 16.4 | 11.2 | 10.6 | 29.2 | 5.3 | 14.3 | 12.9 |
| LOS | C | C | B | B | D | A | B | B |
| 95th \%tile Queue, veh | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 2 |



## Part 6: Reedsdale Road: Concept 1 and 2

Reedsdale Road: Concepts 1 and 2
5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 | $\downarrow$ |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $>$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | EBR2 | WBL2 | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL2 | NBL | NBT | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\underline{1}$ |  |  | 気 | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}{ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 50 | 350 | 290 | 50 | 20 | 150 | 300 | 75 | 10 | 540 | 150 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 50 | 350 | 290 | 50 | 20 | 150 | 300 | 75 | 10 | 540 | 150 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1852 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1770 | 3433 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3395 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.794 |  |  |  | *0.900 |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1479 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1676 | 3433 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3395 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 166 |  |  |  | 23 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 442 | 376 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 415 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 796 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm |  | pm+pt | pm+pt | NA |  | Split | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 | , |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 | 57.0 |  | 36.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 5.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 38.0 | 38.0 |  |  | 52.0 | 50.0 |  |  |  | 31.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.26 | 0.26 |  |  | 0.36 | 0.35 |  |  |  | 0.21 |  |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 1.14 | 0.70 |  |  | 0.31 | 0.34 |  |  |  | 1.60dl |  |
| Control Delay |  | 135.6 | 34.0 |  |  | 35.2 | 34.0 |  |  |  | 112.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 135.6 | 34.0 |  |  | 35.2 | 34.0 |  |  |  | 112.4 |  |
| LOS |  | F | C |  |  | D | C |  |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 88.9 |  |  |  |  | 34.4 |  |  |  | 112.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | F |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | $\sim 481$ | 182 |  |  | 126 | 143 |  |  |  | $\sim 440$ |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | \#704 | 309 |  |  | 192 | 191 |  |  |  | \#580 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 370 |  |  |  |  | 368 |  |  |  | 338 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( ft ) |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 389 | 538 |  |  | 608 | 1203 |  |  |  | 730 |  |
| 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 |  | 1.14 | 0.70 |  |  | 0.31 | 0.34 |  |  |  | 1.09 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 145
Actuated Cycle Length: 144.4
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.14
Intersection Signal Delay: $79.5 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.2\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd



Reedsdale Road: Concepts 1 and 2

| Lane Group | SBL2 | SBL | SBR | SBR2 | SEL2 | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NWR2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{4}^{+1}$ |  |  | * ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 50 | 75 | 5 | 5 | 30 | 370 | 50 | 150 | 670 | 50 | 100 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 50 | 75 | 5 | 5 | 30 | 370 | 50 | 150 | 670 | 50 | 100 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1679 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3469 | 0 | 0 | 3430 | 0 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.980 |  |  |  |  | 0.664 |  |  | 0.704 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1679 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2312 | 0 | 0 | 2434 | 0 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 110 |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 503 | 0 | 0 | 1073 | 0 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Prot |  |  | Perm | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 10 | 10 |  |  |  |  | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  |  | 63.0 | 63.0 | 63.0 |  | 10.0 | 73.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  | 67.0 |  |  | 67.0 |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.04 |  |  |  |  | 0.42 |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.84 |  |  |  |  | 0.51 |  |  | 1.04 |  |  |
| Control Delay |  | 57.8 |  |  |  |  | 35.7 |  |  | 83.4 |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay |  | 57.8 |  |  |  |  | 35.7 |  |  | 83.4 |  |  |
| LOS |  | E |  |  |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 57.8 |  |  |  |  | 35.7 |  |  | 83.4 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 42 |  |  |  |  | 198 |  |  | $\sim 630$ |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#168 |  |  |  |  | 257 |  |  | \#771 |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 638 |  |  |  |  | 186 |  |  | 282 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 179 |  |  |  |  | 978 |  |  | 1030 |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.84 |  |  |  |  | 0.51 |  |  | 1.04 |  |  |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 179
Actuated Cycle Length: 159
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.20
Intersection Signal Delay: $94.9 \quad$ Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 118.0\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 6: Canton Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Center St



|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ $\downarrow$ |  | \% | ¢ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1859 | 1583 | 0 | 3451 | 0 | 1681 | 1743 | 0 | 0 | 1840 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.962 |  |  | 0.572 |  | 0.375 | 0.622 |  |  | 0.915 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1792 | 1583 | 0 | 2008 | 0 | 664 | 1098 | 0 | 0 | 1689 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 348 |  | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 349 | 348 | 0 | 503 | 0 | 672 | 787 | 0 | 0 | 320 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | . |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 | 27.0 | 11.0 | 35.0 |  | 27.0 | 67.0 |  | 40.0 | 40.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 28.5 | 53.7 |  | 28.5 |  | 61.5 | 61.5 |  |  | 34.3 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.27 | 0.51 |  | 0.27 |  | 0.59 | 0.59 |  |  | 0.33 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.72 | 0.35 |  | 1.21dl |  | 1.13 | 1.02 |  |  | 0.58 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 44.8 | 2.3 |  | 60.1 |  | 97.3 | 57.3 |  |  | 35.7 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 44.8 | 2.3 |  | 60.1 |  | 97.3 | 57.3 |  |  | 35.7 |  |
| LOS |  | D | A |  | E |  | F | E |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 23.6 |  |  | 60.1 |  |  | 75.7 |  |  | 35.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 199 | 0 |  | 160 |  | ~356 | 367 |  |  | 168 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#406 | 34 |  | \#337 |  | \#977 | \#1061 |  |  | 331 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 689 |  |  | 555 |  |  | 881 |  |  | 816 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 488 | 981 |  | 583 |  | 595 | 775 |  |  | 555 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.72 | 0.35 |  | 0.86 |  | 1.13 | 1.02 |  |  | 0.58 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 104.6
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.13
Intersection Signal Delay: $56.6 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 103.2\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave


Reedsdale Road: Concepts 1 and 2
5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | EBR2 | WBL2 | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL2 | NBL | NBT | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\underline{4}$ |  |  | N | 中 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  | $\uparrow \hat{*}$ |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 40 | 400 | 450 | 20 | 30 | 150 | 350 | 50 | 20 | 350 | 100 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 40 | 400 | 450 | 20 | 30 | 150 | 350 | 50 | 20 | 350 | 100 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1853 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1770 | 3472 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3391 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.860 |  |  |  | 0.153 |  |  |  |  | 0.964 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1602 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 285 | 3472 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3391 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 158 |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 486 | 519 | 0 | 0 | 199 | 442 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 542 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm |  | pm+pt | pm+pt | NA |  | Split | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | , |  |  | , | 3 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 46.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 | 58.0 |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 5.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 39.0 | 39.0 |  |  | 53.0 | 51.0 |  |  |  | 21.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.27 | 0.27 |  |  | 0.37 | 0.36 |  |  |  | 0.15 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 1.12 | 0.95 |  |  | 1.12 | 0.36 |  |  |  | 1.57d |  |
| Control Delay |  | 125.9 | 63.9 |  |  | 151.7 | 34.2 |  |  |  | 121.6 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 125.9 | 63.9 |  |  | 151.7 | 34.2 |  |  |  | 121.6 |  |
| LOS |  | F | E |  |  | F | C |  |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 93.9 |  |  |  |  | 70.6 |  |  |  | 121.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  | F |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | $\sim 523$ | 360 |  |  | $\sim 155$ | 156 |  |  |  | $\sim 300$ |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#745 | \#593 |  |  | \#319 | 204 |  |  |  | \#423 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 394 |  |  |  |  | 311 |  |  |  | 325 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( ft ) |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 435 | 545 |  |  | 178 | 1243 |  |  |  | 498 |  |
| 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 |  | 1.12 | 0.95 |  |  | 1.12 | 0.36 |  |  |  | 1.09 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 145
Actuated Cycle Length: 143.3
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.12
Intersection Signal Delay: $89.7 \quad$ Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.1\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd


Reedsdale Road: Concepts 1 and 2
5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd


Reedsdale Road: Concepts 1 and 2

| Lane Group | SBL2 | SBL | SBR | SBR2 | SEL2 | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NWR2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \% |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{f}_{4}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 120 | 75 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 670 | 75 | 150 | 420 | 30 | 50 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 120 | 75 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 670 | 75 | 150 | 420 | 30 | 50 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1709 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3479 | 0 | 0 | 3437 | 0 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.972 |  |  |  |  | 0.759 |  |  | *0.800 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1709 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2646 | 0 | 0 | 2780 | 0 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 239 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 852 | 0 | 0 | 718 | 0 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Prot |  |  | Perm | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 10 | 10 |  |  |  |  | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 23.0 | 23.0 |  |  | 47.0 | 47.0 | 47.0 |  | 10.0 | 57.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Act Effit Green (s) |  | 18.1 |  |  |  |  | 46.7 |  |  | 46.7 |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.11 |  |  |  |  | 0.29 |  |  | 0.29 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 1.26 |  |  |  |  | 1.12 |  |  | 0.90 |  |  |
| Control Delay |  | 207.1 |  |  |  |  | 121.1 |  |  | 71.6 |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay |  | 207.1 |  |  |  |  | 121.1 |  |  | 71.6 |  |  |
| LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 207.1 |  |  |  |  | 121.1 |  |  | 71.6 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | $\sim 295$ |  |  |  |  | $\sim 492$ |  |  | 361 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#564 |  |  |  |  | \#743 |  |  | \#547 |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 638 |  |  |  |  | 268 |  |  | 319 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 190 |  |  |  |  | 763 |  |  | 877 |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 1.26 |  |  |  |  | 1.12 |  |  | 0.82 |  |  |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 179
Actuated Cycle Length: 162.7
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.35
Intersection Signal Delay: 137.1 Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 122.9\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 6: Canton Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Center St


|  | J | 4 | $\nearrow$ | a | \% | $\grave{ }$ | * | 4 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NEL2 | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR | SWR2 | $\emptyset 9$ |  |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ${ }_{*}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 40 | 90 | 300 | 150 | 50 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 40 | 90 | 300 | 150 | 50 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 1835 | 1583 | 0 | 1833 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  | *0.850 |  |  | 0.868 |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 1583 | 1583 | 0 | 1602 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | 110 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | , | 475 | 166 | 0 | 415 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 9 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 | 4 |  | 4 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 |  |  | 20.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  | 36.3 | 36.3 |  | 33.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  | 0.22 | 0.22 |  | 0.20 |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  | 1.35 | 0.38 |  | 1.27 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  | 220.5 | 23.3 |  | 193.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  | 220.5 | 23.3 |  | 193.0 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  | F | C |  | F |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  | 169.4 |  |  | 193.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  |  | $\sim 613$ | 46 |  | $\sim 515$ |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  |  | \#1004 | 134 |  | \#879 |  |  |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  |  | 500 |  |  | 457 |  |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  |  |  | 200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  | 352 | 438 |  | 327 |  |  |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  | 1.35 | 0.38 |  | 1.27 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ $\downarrow$ |  | \% | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1857 | 1583 | 0 | 3416 | 0 | 1681 | 1743 | 0 | 0 | 1848 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.940 |  |  | 0.557 |  | 0.219 | 0.697 |  |  | 0.972 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1751 | 1583 | 0 | 1961 | 0 | 388 | 1225 | 0 | 0 | 1800 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 489 |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 354 | 829 | 0 | 630 | 0 | 367 | 484 | 0 | 0 | 481 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | . |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 28.0 | 28.0 | 25.0 | 11.0 | 39.0 |  | 25.0 | 63.0 |  | 38.0 | 38.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 34.1 | 57.2 |  | 34.1 |  | 57.3 | 57.3 |  |  | 32.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.32 | 0.54 |  | 0.32 |  | 0.54 | 0.54 |  |  | 0.30 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.63 | 0.77 |  | 1.91dl |  | 0.83 | 0.64 |  |  | 0.88 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 37.9 | 12.4 |  | 72.2 |  | 34.9 | 22.0 |  |  | 54.6 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 37.9 | 12.4 |  | 72.2 |  | 34.9 | 22.0 |  |  | 54.6 |  |
| LOS |  | D | B |  | E |  | C | C |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 20.0 |  |  | 72.2 |  |  | 27.5 |  |  | 54.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 191 | 146 |  | 209 |  | 133 | 190 |  |  | 290 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 369 | \#380 |  | \#433 |  | \#405 | 412 |  |  | \#619 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 716 |  |  | 555 |  |  | 820 |  |  | 816 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 562 | 1078 |  | 633 |  | 442 | 755 |  |  | 547 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.63 | 0.77 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.83 | 0.64 |  |  | 0.88 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 106.1
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.00
Intersection Signal Delay: $37.8 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.5\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave


## Part 7: Reedsdale Road: Concept 3

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 | $\downarrow$ |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | EBR2 | WBL2 | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL2 | NBL | NBT | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\underline{1}$ |  |  | \% | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {A }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 50 | 350 | 290 | 50 | 20 | 150 | 300 | 75 | 10 | 540 | 150 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 50 | 350 | 290 | 50 | 20 | 150 | 300 | 75 | 10 | 540 | 150 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1790 | 1531 | 0 | 0 | 1711 | 3319 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3281 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | *0.800 |  |  |  | *0.800 |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1441 | 1531 | 0 | 0 | 1441 | 3319 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3281 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 442 | 376 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 415 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 796 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm |  | pm+pt | pm+pt | NA |  | Split | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 | , |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 48.0 | 48.0 | 48.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 | 60.0 |  | 36.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 5.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 41.0 | 41.0 |  |  | 55.0 | 53.0 |  |  |  | 31.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.28 | 0.28 |  |  | 0.38 | 0.37 |  |  |  | 0.22 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 1.08 | 0.86 |  |  | 0.33 | 0.34 |  |  |  | 1.65dl |  |
| Control Delay |  | 114.9 | 69.2 |  |  | 33.8 | 33.9 |  |  |  | 124.2 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 114.9 | 69.2 |  |  | 33.8 | 33.9 |  |  |  | 124.2 |  |
| LOS |  | F | E |  |  | C | C |  |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 93.9 |  |  |  |  | 33.8 |  |  |  | 124.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  | F |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | $\sim 461$ | 336 |  |  | 122 | 147 |  |  |  | $\sim 453$ |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#679 | \#514 |  |  | 186 | 193 |  |  |  | \#586 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 481 |  |  |  |  | 240 |  |  |  | 294 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( ft ) |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 410 | 435 |  |  | 563 | 1221 |  |  |  | 707 |  |
| 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 |  | 1.08 | 0.86 |  |  | 0.33 | 0.34 |  |  |  | 1.13 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 145
Actuated Cycle Length: 144
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.15
Intersection Signal Delay: $97.7 \quad$ Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.2\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd



Reedsdale Road: Concept 3

|  | SBL2 | SBL | SBR | SBR2 | SEL2 | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NWR2 | NEL2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Group |  | M |  |  |  | $\uparrow \uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow \uparrow$ |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | 5 | 50 | 75 | 5 | 5 | 370 | 50 | 150 | 670 | 50 | 100 | 25 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 50 | 75 | 5 | 5 | 370 | 50 | 150 | 670 | 50 | 100 | 25 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 1623 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3356 | 0 | 0 | 3316 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 0.980 |  |  |  | 0.819 |  |  | $* 0.940$ |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0 | 1623 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2752 | 0 | 0 | 3142 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Satd. Flow (RTOR)

| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 470 | 0 | 0 | 1073 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Turn Type | Prot | Prot |  |  | Perm | NA | pm+pt | NA |  | Split |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 10 | 10 |  |  |  | 6 | 5 | 2 |  | 4 |  |  |


| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 |  | 2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Split (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 10.0 | 60.0 |
| Total |  | 50 |  | 61.0 |  |  |


| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 13.0 | 54.2 | 54.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.08 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| V/c Ratio | 1.19 | 0.53 | 1.05 |
| Control Delay | 201.2 | 49.7 | 96.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 201.2 | 49.7 | 96.1 |
| LOS | F | D | F |
| Approach Delay | 201.2 | 49.7 | 96.1 |
| Approach LOS | F | D | F |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | $\sim 180$ | 205 | $\sim 594$ |
| Queeue Length 95th (ft) | $\# 382$ | 310 | $\# 908$ |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 462 | 1254 | 875 |
| Turn Bay Lenth |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vt) |  | 892 | 1019 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 126 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0 | 0.53 | 1.05 |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 179
Actuated Cycle Length: 167
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.19
Intersection Signal Delay: $108.2 \quad$ Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 117.1\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 6: Canton Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Center St


6: Canton Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Center St

|  | 4 | $\nearrow$ | - | 4 | $\checkmark$ | * | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR | SWR2 | $\varnothing 9$ |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\overline{7}$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 75 | 300 | 150 | 70 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 75 | 300 | 150 | 70 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1779 | 1711 | 0 | 1768 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | *0.840 |  |  | 0.991 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1513 | 1711 | 0 | 1768 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 110 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 443 | 166 | 0 | 437 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Split | NA | Perm | Split | NA |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  | 12 | 12 |  |  | 9 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |  |  | 20.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |
| Act Effit Green (s) |  | 36.1 | 36.1 |  | 35.1 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.22 | 0.22 |  | 0.21 |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 1.15 | 0.36 |  | 1.18 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  | 150.1 | 23.1 |  | 158.7 |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  | 150.1 | 23.1 |  | 158.7 |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | F | C |  | F |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 115.5 |  |  | 158.7 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | $\sim 520$ | 47 |  | $\sim 522$ |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#873 | 133 |  | \#873 |  |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 357 |  |  | 225 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  | 200 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 384 | 456 |  | 371 |  |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 1.15 | 0.36 |  | 1.18 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ $\downarrow$ |  | \% | ¢ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1797 | 1531 | 0 | 3336 | 0 | 1625 | 1685 | 0 | 0 | 1779 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.962 |  |  | 0.575 |  | 0.351 | 0.598 |  |  | 0.913 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1732 | 1531 | 0 | 1951 | 0 | 600 | 1021 | 0 | 0 | 1629 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 348 |  | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 349 | 348 | 0 | 503 | 0 | 672 | 787 | 0 | 0 | 320 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | . |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 22.0 | 22.0 | 29.0 | 14.0 | 36.0 |  | 29.0 | 66.0 |  | 37.0 | 37.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 28.6 | 55.8 |  | 28.6 |  | 60.5 | 60.5 |  |  | 31.3 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.28 | 0.54 |  | 0.28 |  | 0.58 | 0.58 |  |  | 0.30 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.73 | 0.35 |  | 1.21dl |  | 1.16 | 1.06 |  |  | 0.65 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 45.3 | 2.2 |  | 62.6 |  | 109.7 | 70.8 |  |  | 40.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 45.3 | 2.2 |  | 62.6 |  | 109.7 | 70.8 |  |  | 40.4 |  |
| LOS |  | D | A |  | E |  | F | E |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 23.8 |  |  | 62.6 |  |  | 88.7 |  |  | 40.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | F |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 197 | 0 |  | 160 |  | ~385 | $\sim 438$ |  |  | 178 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#406 | 32 |  | \#336 |  | \#841 | \#1090 |  |  | \#370 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 722 |  |  | 555 |  |  | 1094 |  |  | 767 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 476 | 984 |  | 590 |  | 579 | 744 |  |  | 493 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.73 | 0.35 |  | 0.85 |  | 1.16 | 1.06 |  |  | 0.65 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 103.7
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.16
Intersection Signal Delay: $63.9 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 103.2\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | EBR2 | WBL2 | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL2 | NBL | NBT | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 | $\underline{6}$ |  |  | 幺 | 性 |  |  |  | ¢ $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 40 | 400 | 450 | 20 | 30 | 150 | 350 | 50 | 20 | 350 | 100 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 40 | 400 | 450 | 20 | 30 | 150 | 350 | 50 | 20 | 350 | 100 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1792 | 1531 | 0 | 0 | 1711 | 3356 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3278 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | *0.800 |  |  |  | *0.800 |  |  |  |  | 0.964 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1441 | 1531 | 0 | 0 | 1441 | 3356 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3278 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 158 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 486 | 519 | 0 | 0 | 199 | 442 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 542 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm |  | pm+pt | pm+pt | NA |  | Split | Split | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 | 55.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  | 5.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 36.0 | 36.0 |  |  | 50.0 | 48.0 |  |  |  | 20.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.25 | 0.25 |  |  | 0.35 | 0.33 |  |  |  | 0.14 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 1.35 | 1.04 |  |  | 0.39 | 0.40 |  |  |  | 1.73d |  |
| Control Delay |  | 216.0 | 85.9 |  |  | 38.4 | 38.2 |  |  |  | 157.6 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 216.0 | 85.9 |  |  | 38.4 | 38.2 |  |  |  | 157.6 |  |
| LOS |  | F | F |  |  | D | D |  |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 148.8 |  |  |  |  | 38.2 |  |  |  | 157.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  | F |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | $\sim 595$ | $\sim 404$ |  |  | 138 | 167 |  |  |  | ~322 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#817 | \#633 |  |  | 208 | 218 |  |  |  | \#442 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 458 |  |  |  |  | 227 |  |  |  | 291 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 360 | 501 |  |  | 513 | 1118 |  |  |  | 455 |  |
| 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 |  | 1.35 | 1.04 |  |  | 0.39 | 0.40 |  |  |  | 1.19 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 145
Actuated Cycle Length: 144
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.35
Intersection Signal Delay: $124.2 \quad$ Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.1\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd


5: Central Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Brook Rd


| Lane Group | SBL2 | SBL | SBR | SBR2 | SEL2 | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NWR2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{4}^{+1}$ |  |  | * ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 120 | 75 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 670 | 75 | 150 | 420 | 30 | 50 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 120 | 75 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 670 | 75 | 150 | 420 | 30 | 50 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1652 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3363 | 0 | 0 | 3323 | 0 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.972 |  |  |  |  | 0.779 |  |  | *0.800 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1652 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2625 | 0 | 0 | 2688 | 0 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 239 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 852 | 0 | 0 | 718 | 0 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Prot |  |  | Perm | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 10 | 10 |  |  |  |  | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |  | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |  | 10.0 | 60.0 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 20.1 |  |  |  |  | 48.7 |  |  | 48.7 |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.12 |  |  |  |  | 0.30 |  |  | 0.30 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 1.17 |  |  |  |  | 1.07 |  |  | 0.89 |  |  |
| Control Delay |  | 172.6 |  |  |  |  | 105.3 |  |  | 68.4 |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay |  | 172.6 |  |  |  |  | 105.3 |  |  | 68.4 |  |  |
| LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 172.6 |  |  |  |  | 105.3 |  |  | 68.4 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | $\sim 270$ |  |  |  |  | $\sim 476$ |  |  | 354 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#549 |  |  |  |  | \#718 |  |  | \#535 |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 522 |  |  |  |  | 1243 |  |  | 888 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 205 |  |  |  |  | 795 |  |  | 904 |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 1.17 |  |  |  |  | 1.07 |  |  | 0.79 |  |  |

## Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 179
Actuated Cycle Length: 161.7
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.21
Intersection Signal Delay: $117.5 \quad$ Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 120.6\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 6: Canton Ave \& Reedsdale Ave \& Centre Street


|  | \% | $\stackrel{4}{ }$ | $\nearrow$ | T | $\ldots$ | $\checkmark$ | * | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | NEL2 | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR | SWR2 | ¢9 |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 40 | 50 | 300 | 150 | 50 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 40 | 50 | 300 | 150 | 50 | 300 | 20 | 5 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 1781 | 1531 | 0 | 1772 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  | *0.800 |  |  | 0.993 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 1441 | 1531 | 0 | 1772 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  | *1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 431 | 166 | 0 | 415 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Split | Split | NA | Perm | Split | NA |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 12 | 12 |  |  | 9 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 37.0 | 37.0 | 37.0 | 37.0 | 37.0 | 37.0 |  |  | 20.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  |  | 32.2 | 32.2 |  | 32.2 |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  | 0.20 | 0.20 |  | 0.20 |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  | 1.21 | 0.54 |  | 1.18 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  | 172.0 | 67.9 |  | 158.9 |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  | 172.0 | 67.9 |  | 158.9 |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  | F | E |  | F |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  | 143.0 |  |  | 158.9 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  |  | $\sim 505$ | 147 |  | $\sim 474$ |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  |  | \#892 | 271 |  | \#852 |  |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  |  | 307 |  |  | 271 |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  | 200 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  | 355 | 305 |  | 353 |  |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  | 1.21 | 0.54 |  | 1.18 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ $\downarrow$ |  | \% | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1795 | 1531 | 0 | 3302 | 0 | 1625 | 1685 | 0 | 0 | 1786 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.920 |  |  | 0.550 |  | 0.167 | 0.665 |  |  | 0.971 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1657 | 1531 | 0 | 1872 | 0 | 286 | 1130 | 0 | 0 | 1738 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 500 |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 354 | 829 | 0 | 630 | 0 | 367 | 484 | 0 | 0 | 481 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | . |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 26.0 | 26.0 | 31.0 | 11.0 | 37.0 |  | 31.0 | 65.0 |  | 34.0 | 34.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 32.2 | 61.3 |  | 32.2 |  | 59.3 | 59.3 |  |  | 28.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.30 | 0.58 |  | 0.30 |  | 0.56 | 0.56 |  |  | 0.27 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.71 | 0.76 |  | 2.24dl |  | 0.77 | 0.63 |  |  | 1.04 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 43.0 | 11.0 |  | 106.3 |  | 33.1 | 20.6 |  |  | 92.2 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 43.0 | 11.0 |  | 106.3 |  | 33.1 | 20.6 |  |  | 92.2 |  |
| LOS |  | D | B |  | F |  | C | C |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 20.5 |  |  | 106.3 |  |  | 26.0 |  |  | 92.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 200 | 125 |  | $\sim 240$ |  | 154 | 183 |  |  | $\sim 315$ |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#419 | \#273 |  | \#458 |  | \#415 | 406 |  |  | \#681 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 707 |  |  | 556 |  |  | 1090 |  |  | 816 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 501 | 1095 |  | 569 |  | 476 | 763 |  |  | 462 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.71 | 0.76 |  | 1.11 |  | 0.77 | 0.63 |  |  | 1.04 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 106.2
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.11
Intersection Signal Delay: $50.1 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.5\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave


# Part 8: Reedsdale Road and Randolph Avenue: Roundabout Retrofit 

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 19.6 |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | C |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 697 | 503 | 1459 | 320 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 711 | 514 | 1487 | 326 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 485 | 1493 | 1375 |  |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 1216 | 372 | 618 | 632 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 19.0 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 8.7 | 38.4 | C | 16.6 |
| Approach LOS | A | E | C |  |


| Lane | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Right |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Designated Moves | LT | R | L | LTR | L | LTR | LT | TR |
| Assumed Moves | LT | R | L | TR | L | LTR | LT | TR |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 0.501 | 0.499 | 0.352 | 0.648 | 0.530 | 0.470 | 0.469 | 0.531 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.667 | 2.535 | 2.667 | 2.535 | 2.667 | 2.535 | 2.667 | 2.535 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.645 | 4.328 | 4.645 | 4.328 | 4.645 | 4.328 | 4.645 | 4.328 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 356 | 355 | 181 | 333 | 788 | 699 | 153 | 173 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 864 | 940 | 342 | 399 | 953 | 1030 | 381 | 441 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.981 | 0.980 | 0.978 | 0.979 | 0.981 | 0.981 | 0.984 | 0.982 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 349 | 348 | 177 | 326 | 773 | 685 | 151 | 170 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 848 | 922 | 334 | 391 | 935 | 1010 | 375 | 433 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.412 | 0.378 | 0.529 | 0.834 | 0.827 | 0.679 | 0.402 | 0.392 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 9.2 | 8.1 | 24.9 | 45.7 | 23.3 | 14.1 | 17.9 | 15.5 |
| LOS | A | A | C | E | C | B | C | C |
| 95th \%tile Queue, veh | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 2 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 25.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | D |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| Entry Lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 1183 | 630 | 851 | 481 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 1207 | 642 | 868 | 490 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 863 | 868 | 378 | 1071 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 698 | 378 | 1692 | 439 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 46.6 | 14.2 | 8.9 | 14.7 |
| Approach LOS | E | B | A | B |


| Lane | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Right |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Designated Moves | LTR | R | L | LTR | L | LTR | LT | TR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | R | L | LTR | L | LTR | LT | TR |
| RT Channelized |  | 0.470 | 0.530 | 0.530 | 0.470 | 0.530 | 0.470 | 0.469 |
| Lane Util |  | 0.531 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 2.667 | 2.535 | 2.667 | 2.535 | 2.667 | 2.535 | 2.667 | 2.535 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.645 | 4.328 | 4.645 | 4.328 | 4.645 | 4.328 | 4.645 | 4.328 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 567 | 640 | 340 | 302 | 460 | 408 | 230 | 260 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 610 | 682 | 607 | 679 | 953 | 1030 | 504 | 571 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.981 | 0.980 | 0.981 | 0.980 | 0.981 | 0.981 | 0.983 | 0.981 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 5556 | 627 | 334 | 296 | 451 | 400 | 226 | 255 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 599 | 668 | 596 | 665 | 935 | 1010 | 496 | 560 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.929 | 0.939 | 0.560 | 0.445 | 0.482 | 0.396 | 0.456 | 0.455 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 47.3 | 45.9 | 16.2 | 11.9 | 9.8 | 7.9 | 15.5 | 14.0 |
| LOS | E | E | C | B | A | A | C | B |
| 95th \%tile Queue, veh | 12 | 13 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

## Part 9: Randolph Avenue: Concept 1

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ $\downarrow$ |  | \% | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1797 | 1531 | 0 | 3336 | 0 | 1625 | 1685 | 0 | 0 | 1779 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.963 |  |  | 0.576 |  | 0.381 | 0.628 |  |  | 0.915 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1734 | 1531 | 0 | 1955 | 0 | 652 | 1072 | 0 | 0 | 1633 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 348 |  | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 349 | 348 | 0 | 503 | 0 | 672 | 787 | 0 | 0 | 320 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | . |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 | 26.0 | 11.0 | 35.0 |  | 26.0 | 67.0 |  | 41.0 | 41.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 29.4 | 53.5 |  | 29.4 |  | 61.4 | 61.4 |  |  | 35.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.28 | 0.51 |  | 0.28 |  | 0.58 | 0.58 |  |  | 0.33 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.72 | 0.37 |  | 1.20dl |  | 1.19 | 1.06 |  |  | 0.59 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 45.2 | 2.5 |  | 60.9 |  | 122.2 | 72.4 |  |  | 35.6 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 45.2 | 2.5 |  | 60.9 |  | 122.2 | 72.4 |  |  | 35.6 |  |
| LOS |  | D | A |  | E |  | F | E |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 23.9 |  |  | 60.9 |  |  | 95.4 |  |  | 35.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | F |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 200 | 0 |  | 162 |  | ~392 | $\sim 412$ |  |  | 167 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#418 | 35 |  | \#343 |  | \#995 | \#1082 |  |  | 331 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 722 |  |  | 555 |  |  | 1094 |  |  | 767 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 483 | 948 |  | 562 |  | 565 | 741 |  |  | 547 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.72 | 0.37 |  | 0.90 |  | 1.19 | 1.06 |  |  | 0.59 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 105.5
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.19
Intersection Signal Delay: $66.4 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 103.2\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave



Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 88.4
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.81
Intersection Signal Delay: $12.4 \quad$ Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 69.6\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 9: Randolph Ave \& Reed St


|  | 4 |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | $\emptyset 9$ |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 「 |  | $\uparrow \uparrow$ | 个 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 50 | 30 | 1730 | 700 | 10 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 50 | 30 | 1730 | 700 | 10 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1711 | 1531 | 0 | 3418 | 3414 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.932 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1711 | 1531 | 0 | 3189 | 3414 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 55 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 6 | 55 | 0 | 1945 | 785 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | Perm | NA | NA |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  |  | 2 | 6 |  | 9 |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 59.5 | 59.5 | 59.5 |  | 28.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) | 6.2 | 6.2 |  | 57.1 | 57.1 |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.09 | 0.09 |  | 0.86 | 0.86 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.04 | 0.28 |  | 0.71 | 0.27 |  |  |
| Control Delay | 29.8 | 13.7 |  | 5.8 | 2.1 |  |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay | 29.8 | 13.7 |  | 5.8 | 2.1 |  |  |
| LOS | C | B |  | A | A |  |  |
| Approach Delay | 15.3 |  |  | 5.8 | 2.1 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | A | A |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 2 | 0 |  | 177 | 36 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 13 | 31 |  | 316 | 61 |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 413 |  |  | 945 | 1436 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 453 | 446 |  | 2739 | 2933 |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.01 | 0.12 |  | 0.71 | 0.27 |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 66.5
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.71
Intersection Signal Delay: 5.0 Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 85.1\% ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 10: Randolph Ave \& Hallen Ave


|  | $\stackrel{*}{ }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | $\uparrow \downarrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 80 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 1680 | 10 | 5 | 715 | 30 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 80 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 1680 | 10 | 5 | 715 | 30 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1685 | 0 | 0 | 1669 | 0 | 0 | 3414 | 0 | 0 | 3401 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.769 |  |  | 0.900 |  |  | 0.939 |  |  | 0.937 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1347 | 0 | 0 | 1533 | 0 | 0 | 3209 | 0 | 0 | 3186 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1890 | 0 | 0 | 829 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 11.0 | 64.0 |  | 53.0 | 53.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Efft Green (s) |  | 11.5 |  |  | 11.5 |  |  | 58.9 |  |  | 58.9 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.13 |  |  | 0.13 |  |  | 0.68 |  |  | 0.68 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.63 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.86 |  |  | 0.38 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 53.7 |  |  | 37.0 |  |  | 18.3 |  |  | 8.3 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 53.7 |  |  | 37.0 |  |  | 18.3 |  |  | 8.3 |  |
| LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 53.7 |  |  | 37.0 |  |  | 18.3 |  |  | 8.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 53 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 296 |  |  | 72 |  |
| Queue Length 95th ( t ) |  | \#164 |  |  | 15 |  |  | \#947 |  |  | 241 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 678 |  |  | 256 |  |  | 2390 |  |  | 1722 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 206 |  |  | 235 |  |  | 2199 |  |  | 2183 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.54 |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.86 |  |  | 0.38 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 86
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.86
Intersection Signal Delay: 16.8
Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 84.1\%
ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 11: Randolph Ave \& Hillside St/Driveway


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ${ }_{4}{ }^{\circ}$ |  | \% | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1795 | 1531 | 0 | 3302 | 0 | 1625 | 1685 | 0 | 0 | 1786 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.940 |  |  | 0.557 |  | 0.195 | 0.676 |  |  | 0.972 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1693 | 1531 | 0 | 1896 | 0 | 334 | 1148 | 0 | 0 | 1740 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 494 |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 354 | 829 | 0 | 630 | 0 | 367 | 484 | 0 | 0 | 481 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | , |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 28.0 | 28.0 | 27.0 | 11.0 | 39.0 |  | 27.0 | 63.0 |  | 36.0 | 36.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 34.2 | 59.3 |  | 34.2 |  | 57.3 | 57.3 |  |  | 30.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.32 | 0.56 |  | 0.32 |  | 0.54 | 0.54 |  |  | 0.28 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.65 | 0.77 |  | 1.96dl |  | 0.84 | 0.67 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 38.8 | 12.1 |  | 80.3 |  | 38.1 | 23.0 |  |  | 72.7 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 38.8 | 12.1 |  | 80.3 |  | 38.1 | 23.0 |  |  | 72.7 |  |
| LOS |  | D | B |  | F |  | D | C |  |  | E |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 20.1 |  |  | 80.3 |  |  | 29.5 |  |  | 72.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 193 | 138 |  | 212 |  | 146 | 192 |  |  | 303 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#375 | \#371 |  | \#442 |  | \#429 | 420 |  |  | \#657 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 707 |  |  | 556 |  |  | 1090 |  |  | 816 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 545 | 1073 |  | 612 |  | 437 | 726 |  |  | 495 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.65 | 0.77 |  | 1.03 |  | 0.84 | 0.67 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 106.2
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.03
Intersection Signal Delay: $42.7 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.5\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave



Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 66.7
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.78
Intersection Signal Delay: 12.7 Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 59.7\% ICU Level of Service B
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 9: Randolph Ave \& Reed St



Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 74.4
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.70
Intersection Signal Delay: 11.7 Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 93.8\% ICU Level of Service F
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 10: Randolph Ave \& Hallen Ave


|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ${ }_{4}{ }^{2}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 100 | 5 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 950 | 5 | 5 | 1575 | 100 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 100 | 5 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 950 | 5 | 5 | 1575 | 100 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1696 | 0 | 0 | 1669 | 0 | 0 | 3411 | 0 | 0 | 3390 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.962 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.630 |  |  | 0.951 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1696 | 0 | 0 | 1703 | 0 | 0 | 2153 | 0 | 0 | 3224 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1111 | 0 | 0 | 1858 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 13.0 | 13.0 |  | 15.0 | 61.0 |  | 46.0 | 46.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effict Green (s) |  | 12.3 |  |  | 6.1 |  |  | 56.8 |  |  | 56.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.14 |  |  | 0.07 |  |  | 0.67 |  |  | 0.67 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.57 |  |  | 0.04 |  |  | 0.78 |  |  | 0.87 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 45.5 |  |  | 45.2 |  |  | 18.8 |  |  | 20.2 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 45.5 |  |  | 45.2 |  |  | 18.8 |  |  | 20.2 |  |
| LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 45.5 |  |  | 45.2 |  |  | 18.8 |  |  | 20.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 63 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 139 |  |  | 266 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 166 |  |  | 17 |  |  | \#660 |  |  | \#1088 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 670 |  |  | 257 |  |  | 2385 |  |  | 2760 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 410 |  |  | 165 |  |  | 1433 |  |  | 2146 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.34 |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.78 |  |  | 0.87 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 85.4
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.87
Intersection Signal Delay: 20.9
Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 89.5\%
ICU Level of Service E
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 11: Randolph Ave \& Hillside Street/Driveway


## Part 10: Randolph Avenue: Concept 2

|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ${ }_{4}{ }^{2}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1797 | 1531 | 0 | 3336 | 0 | 1625 | 1685 | 0 | 0 | 1779 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.963 |  |  | 0.576 |  | 0.373 | 0.620 |  |  | 0.915 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1734 | 1531 | 0 | 1955 | 0 | 638 | 1058 | 0 | 0 | 1633 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 348 |  | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 349 | 348 | 0 | 503 | 0 | 672 | 787 | 0 | 0 | 320 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 | 27.0 | 11.0 | 35.0 |  | 27.0 | 67.0 |  | 40.0 | 40.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 29.4 | 54.6 |  | 29.4 |  | 61.4 | 61.4 |  |  | 34.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.28 | 0.52 |  | 0.28 |  | 0.58 | 0.58 |  |  | 0.32 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.72 | 0.36 |  | 1.20dl |  | 1.18 | 1.06 |  |  | 0.60 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 45.2 | 2.4 |  | 60.9 |  | 118.8 | 72.0 |  |  | 36.9 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 45.2 | 2.4 |  | 60.9 |  | 118.8 | 72.0 |  |  | 36.9 |  |
| LOS |  | D | A |  | E |  | F | E |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 23.9 |  |  | 60.9 |  |  | 93.5 |  |  | 36.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | F |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 200 | 0 |  | 162 |  | $\sim 388$ | $\sim 412$ |  |  | 170 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#418 | 35 |  | \#343 |  | \#992 | \#1082 |  |  | 335 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 689 |  |  | 555 |  |  | 881 |  |  | 816 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 483 | 959 |  | 562 |  | 568 | 742 |  |  | 531 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | , |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.72 | 0.36 |  | 0.90 |  | 1.18 | 1.06 |  |  | 0.60 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 105.5
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.18
Intersection Signal Delay: $65.6 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 103.2\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave



Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 78
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.22
Intersection Signal Delay: $87.0 \quad$ Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 111.2\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 9: Randolph Ave \& Reed St



Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 69
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.17
Intersection Signal Delay: $65.8 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 108.1\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.

Splits and Phases: 10: Randolph Ave \& Hallen Ave


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | 中 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 80 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 1680 | 10 | 5 | 715 | 30 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 80 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 1680 | 10 | 5 | 715 | 30 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1685 | 0 | 0 | 1669 | 0 | 1711 | 1799 | 0 | 1711 | 3401 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | *0.900 |  |  |  |  | *0.900 |  |  | *0.900 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1577 | 0 | 0 | 1703 | 0 | 1621 | 1799 | 0 | 1621 | 3401 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 22 | 1868 | 0 | 6 | 823 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  | Split | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 10.0 | 10.0 |  | 11.0 | 86.5 |  | 9.5 | 85.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 4.5 | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 9.2 |  |  | 5.1 |  | 84.2 | 82.3 |  | 83.0 | 79.6 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.08 |  |  | 0.05 |  | 0.77 | 0.75 |  | 0.76 | 0.73 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.76 |  |  | 0.06 |  | 0.02 | 1.38 |  | 0.00 | 0.33 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 79.1 |  |  | 50.2 |  | 5.6 | 195.4 |  | 6.2 | 8.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 79.1 |  |  | 50.2 |  | 5.6 | 195.4 |  | 6.2 | 8.4 |  |
| LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  | A | F |  | A | A |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 79.1 |  |  | 50.2 |  |  | 193.2 |  |  | 8.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  | A |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 67 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 | $\sim 1539$ |  | 1 | 55 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#239 |  |  | 18 |  | 19 | \#2940 |  | 8 | 288 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 670 |  |  | 257 |  |  | 1702 |  |  | 2770 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |  |  | 200 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 147 |  |  | 79 |  | 1251 | 1352 |  | 1234 | 2540 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.76 |  |  | 0.06 |  | 0.02 | 1.38 |  | 0.00 | 0.32 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 145
Actuated Cycle Length: 109.4
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.38
Intersection Signal Delay: $134.4 \quad$ Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 113.7\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 11: Randolph Ave \& Hillside St/Driveway


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ $\downarrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1795 | 1531 | 0 | 3302 | 0 | 1711 | 1786 | 0 | 0 | 1786 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.939 |  |  | 0.553 |  | 0.195 |  |  |  | 0.976 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1691 | 1531 | 0 | 1882 | 0 | 351 | 1786 | 0 | 0 | 1747 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 494 |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 354 | 829 | 0 | 630 | 0 | 442 | 409 | 0 | 0 | 481 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | . |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 27.0 | 27.0 | 28.0 | 11.0 | 38.0 |  | 28.0 | 64.0 |  | 36.0 | 36.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 33.2 | 59.3 |  | 33.2 |  | 58.3 | 58.3 |  |  | 30.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.31 | 0.56 |  | 0.31 |  | 0.55 | 0.55 |  |  | 0.28 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.67 | 0.77 |  | 2.08dl |  | 0.93 | 0.42 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 40.4 | 12.1 |  | 92.9 |  | 49.8 | 16.7 |  |  | 71.7 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 40.4 | 12.1 |  | 92.9 |  | 49.8 | 16.7 |  |  | 71.7 |  |
| LOS |  | D | B |  | F |  | D | B |  |  | E |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 20.6 |  |  | 92.9 |  |  | 33.9 |  |  | 71.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 196 | 138 |  | $\sim 232$ |  | 188 | 139 |  |  | 303 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#400 | \#361 |  | \#450 |  | \#515 | 307 |  |  | \#655 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 716 |  |  | 555 |  |  | 820 |  |  | 816 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 528 | 1073 |  | 589 |  | 475 | 981 |  |  | 497 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.67 | 0.77 |  | 1.07 |  | 0.93 | 0.42 |  |  | 0.97 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 106.2
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.07
Intersection Signal Delay: $46.5 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.5\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave



Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 102.1
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.85
Intersection Signal Delay: $14.2 \quad$ Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 73.9\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 9: Randolph Ave \& Reed St



Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 71.6
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.65
Intersection Signal Delay: 5.4 Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 67.8\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 10: Randolph Ave \& Hallen Ave


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 100 | 5 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 950 | 5 | 5 | 1575 | 100 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 100 | 5 | 20 | 2 | , | 2 | 50 | 950 | 5 | 5 | 1575 | 100 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1696 | 0 | 0 | 1669 | 0 | 1711 | 1799 | 0 | 1711 | 3390 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | *0.900 |  |  | 0.980 |  | *0.800 |  |  | *0.800 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1587 | 0 | 0 | 1669 | 0 | 1441 | 1799 | 0 | 1441 | 3390 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 55 | 1056 | 0 | 6 | 1852 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  | Split | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 10.0 | 10.0 |  | 11.0 | 67.5 |  | 9.5 | 66.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 4.5 | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 10.2 |  |  | 5.1 |  | 71.0 | 69.0 |  | 67.3 | 61.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.10 |  |  | 0.05 |  | 0.73 | 0.71 |  | 0.69 | 0.63 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.76 |  |  | 0.06 |  | 0.05 | 0.83 |  | 0.01 | 0.86 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 69.5 |  |  | 45.2 |  | 6.8 | 21.2 |  | 8.0 | 22.8 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 69.5 |  |  | 45.2 |  | 6.8 | 21.2 |  | 8.0 | 22.8 |  |
| LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  | A | C |  | A | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 69.5 |  |  | 45.2 |  |  | 20.5 |  |  | 22.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 76 |  |  | 2 |  | 6 | 267 |  | 1 | 386 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#258 |  |  | 17 |  | 41 | \#1361 |  | 9 | \#1127 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 670 |  |  | 257 |  |  | 1820 |  |  | 2771 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |  |  | 200 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 183 |  |  | 89 |  | 1063 | 1271 |  | 1006 | 2147 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.76 |  |  | 0.06 |  | 0.05 | 0.83 |  | 0.01 | 0.86 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 97.7
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.86
Intersection Signal Delay: 24.0
Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 75.6\%
ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# User Entered Value
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 11: Randolph Ave \& Hillside Street/Driveway


## Part 11: Randolph Avenue: Concept 3

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ $\downarrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 300 | 315 | 160 | 270 | 25 | 790 | 520 | 10 | 20 | 250 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1859 | 1583 | 0 | 3451 | 0 | 1770 | 1857 | 0 | 0 | 1840 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.962 |  |  | 0.569 |  | 0.193 |  |  |  | 0.927 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1792 | 1583 | 0 | 1998 | 0 | 360 | 1857 | 0 | 0 | 1711 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 348 |  | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 349 | 348 | 0 | 503 | 0 | 873 | 586 | 0 | 0 | 320 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 23.0 | 23.0 | 42.0 | 11.0 | 34.0 |  | 42.0 | 68.0 |  | 26.0 | 26.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 28.3 | 68.6 |  | 28.3 |  | 62.4 | 62.4 |  |  | 20.1 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.27 | 0.65 |  | 0.27 |  | 0.59 | 0.59 |  |  | 0.19 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.73 | 0.30 |  | 1.26dl |  | 1.25 | 0.53 |  |  | 0.98 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 45.9 | 1.4 |  | 63.7 |  | 150.8 | 16.5 |  |  | 87.7 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 45.9 | 1.4 |  | 63.7 |  | 150.8 | 16.5 |  |  | 87.7 |  |
| LOS |  | D | A |  | E |  | F | B |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 23.7 |  |  | 63.7 |  |  | 96.9 |  |  | 87.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 202 | 0 |  | 163 |  | $\sim 640$ | 202 |  |  | 206 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#418 | 22 |  | \#345 |  | \#1145 | 450 |  |  | \#484 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 689 |  |  | 555 |  |  | 881 |  |  | 816 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 481 | 1151 |  | 555 |  | 697 | 1099 |  |  | 328 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.73 | 0.30 |  | 0.91 |  | 1.25 | 0.53 |  |  | 0.98 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 105.4
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.25
Intersection Signal Delay: 73.2
Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 111.5\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave



Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 78
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.18
Intersection Signal Delay: $75.6 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 111.2\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 9: Randolph Ave \& Reed St


|  | 4 |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% | F | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 个 |  |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 5 | 50 | 30 | 1730 | 700 | 10 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 50 | 30 | 1730 | 700 | 10 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1859 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  | 0.305 |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1583 | 568 | 1863 | 1859 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 55 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |  | 55 | 33 | 1912 | 785 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | pm+pt | NA | NA |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  | 5 | 2 | 6 |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 9.6 | 97.0 | 87.4 |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 6.6 | 6.6 | 99.7 | 100.6 | 94.8 |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.88 | 0.89 | 0.84 |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.06 | 0.38 | 0.06 | 1.16 | 0.50 |  |  |
| Control Delay | 49.2 | 20.9 | 1.5 | 90.5 | 5.4 |  |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Total Delay | 49.2 | 20.9 | 1.5 | 90.5 | 5.4 |  |  |
| LOS | D | C | A | F | A |  |  |
| Approach Delay | 23.6 |  |  | 89.0 | 5.4 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | F | A |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 4 | 0 | 2 | ~1704 | 174 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 18 | 40 | 7 | \#1942 | 288 |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 413 |  |  | 2770 | 1436 |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 100 |  | 200 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 281 | 298 | 554 | 1654 | 1555 |  |  |
| 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 | 0.02 | 0.18 | 0.06 | 1.16 | 0.50 |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 119.5
Actuated Cycle Length: 113.3
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.16
Intersection Signal Delay: $64.1 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.3\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.

Splits and Phases: 10: Randolph Ave \& Hallen Ave


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  | * | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 80 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 1680 | 10 | 5 | 715 | 30 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 80 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 1680 | 10 | 5 | 715 | 30 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1744 | 0 | 0 | 1727 | 0 | 1770 | 1861 | 0 | 1770 | 1852 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.769 |  |  | 0.920 |  | 0.233 |  |  | 0.051 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1394 | 0 | 0 | 1621 | 0 | 434 | 1861 | 0 | 95 | 1852 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 22 | 1868 | 0 |  | 823 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 11.0 | 88.0 |  | 77.0 | 77.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 9.1 |  |  | 9.1 |  | 83.8 | 82.8 |  | 78.6 | 78.6 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.08 |  |  | 0.08 |  | 0.78 | 0.77 |  | 0.73 | 0.73 |  |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.95 |  |  | 0.04 |  | 0.05 | 1.31 |  | 0.09 | 0.61 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 122.1 |  |  | 50.8 |  | 5.1 | 160.3 |  | 14.0 | 13.2 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 122.1 |  |  | 50.8 |  | 5.1 | 160.3 |  | 14.0 | 13.2 |  |
| LOS |  | F |  |  | D |  | A | F |  | B | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 122.1 |  |  | 50.8 |  |  | 158.5 |  |  | 13.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 74 |  |  | 3 |  | 2 | ~1525 |  | 1 | 144 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) |  | \#238 |  |  | 18 |  | 17 | \#2505 |  | 12 | 740 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 670 |  |  | 257 |  |  | 1702 |  |  | 2770 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |  |  | 200 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 118 |  |  | 137 |  | 412 | 1431 |  | 69 | 1353 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.95 |  |  | 0.04 |  | 0.05 | 1.31 |  | 0.09 | 0.61 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 107.6
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.31
Intersection Signal Delay: 114.4
Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 113.7\%
ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 11: Randolph Ave \& Hillside St/Driveway


Seth

|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | А 1 |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 300 | 750 | 350 | 200 | 20 | 400 | 350 | 20 | 15 | 400 | 20 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1857 | 1583 | 0 | 3416 | 0 | 1770 | 1848 | 0 | 0 | 1848 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.939 |  |  | 0.553 |  | 0.195 |  |  |  | 0.976 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1749 | 1583 | 0 | 1947 | 0 | 363 | 1848 | 0 | 0 | 1807 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 494 |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 354 | 829 | 0 | 630 | 0 | 442 | 409 | 0 | 0 | 481 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 | 5 | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 27.0 | 27.0 | 28.0 | 11.0 | 38.0 |  | 28.0 | 64.0 |  | 36.0 | 36.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 33.2 | 59.3 |  | 33.2 |  | 58.3 | 58.3 |  |  | 30.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.31 | 0.56 |  | 0.31 |  | 0.55 | 0.55 |  |  | 0.28 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.65 | 0.75 |  | 2.02dl |  | 0.90 | 0.40 |  |  | 0.94 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 39.4 | 11.1 |  | 82.1 |  | 43.8 | 16.4 |  |  | 64.9 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 39.4 | 11.1 |  | 82.1 |  | 43.8 | 16.4 |  |  | 64.9 |  |
| LOS |  | D | B |  | F |  | D | B |  |  | E |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 19.6 |  |  | 82.1 |  |  | 30.7 |  |  | 64.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 194 | 133 |  | 213 |  | 182 | 138 |  |  | 299 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 374 | \#268 |  | \#442 |  | \#500 | 303 |  |  | \#643 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 716 |  |  | 555 |  |  | 820 |  |  | 816 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (t) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 546 | 1102 |  | 610 |  | 492 | 1016 |  |  | 514 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.65 | 0.75 |  | 1.03 |  | 0.90 | 0.40 |  |  | 0.94 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 106.2
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.03
Intersection Signal Delay: $42.0 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 107.5\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
dl Defacto Left Lane. Recode with 1 though lane as a left lane.
Splits and Phases: 8: Randolph Ave \& Reedsdale Ave



Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 100.4
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.21
Intersection Signal Delay: 77.0 Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 99.4\% ICU Level of Service F
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 9: Randolph Ave \& Reed St



Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 120.6
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.16
Intersection Signal Delay: $58.3 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.2\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 10: Randolph Ave \& Hallen Ave


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 100 | 5 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 950 | 5 | 5 | 1575 | 100 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 100 | 5 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 50 | 950 | 5 | 5 | 1575 | 100 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1754 | 0 | 0 | 1727 | 0 | 1770 | 1861 | 0 | 1770 | 1846 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | *0.900 |  |  | 0.936 |  | *0.800 |  |  | *0.800 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1641 | 0 | 0 | 1649 | 0 | 1490 | 1861 | 0 | 1490 | 1846 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 55 | 1056 | 0 | 6 | 1852 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | , |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 11.0 | 78.5 |  | 9.5 | 77.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 6.0 |  | 4.5 | 6.0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 9.1 |  |  | 9.1 |  | 81.0 | 79.0 |  | 77.4 | 72.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.09 |  |  | 0.09 |  | 0.77 | 0.75 |  | 0.73 | 0.68 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio |  | 0.95 |  |  | 0.03 |  | 0.05 | 0.76 |  | 0.01 | 1.47 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 109.1 |  |  | 43.0 |  | 4.7 | 15.7 |  | 5.5 | 235.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 109.1 |  |  | 43.0 |  | 4.7 | 15.7 |  | 5.5 | 235.4 |  |
| LOS |  | F |  |  | D |  | A | B |  | A | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 109.1 |  |  | 43.0 |  |  | 15.1 |  |  | 234.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 88 |  |  | 2 |  | 5 | 238 |  | 1 | $\sim 1661$ |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#273 |  |  | 16 |  | 32 | \#1198 |  | 7 | \#2648 |  |
| Internal Link Dist ( t ) |  | 670 |  |  | 257 |  |  | 1820 |  |  | 2771 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |  |  | 200 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 147 |  |  | 144 |  | 1161 | 1401 |  | 1107 | 1262 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.95 |  |  | 0.03 |  | 0.05 | 0.75 |  | 0.01 | 1.47 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 105.4
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.47
Intersection Signal Delay: 150.4
Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 116.2\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15

* User Entered Value
~ 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.
Splits and Phases: 11: Randolph Ave \& Hillside Street/Driveway



## Appendix F: Pedestrian and Bicycle Levels of Service

## Existing Conditions 3 HG-MNDQIaQG \%IF FOH5 HSRUN\&DLG\$ WHMVP HQW



Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) to the Boston Region MPO: www.ctps.org | 857.702.3700 | ctps@ctps.org

Ryan Hicks, Congestion Management Process Manager:
www.ctps.org/cmp | 857.702.3661 | rhicks@ctps.org
Casey Claude, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager: www.ctps.org/bicycle-pedestrian-activities | 857.702.3707 | cclaude@ctps.org

## Pedestrian Report Card Assessment (PRCA): Roadway Segment

## Roadway Segment Location

Route 28 in Milton (Brook Rd and Reesdale Rd)

| Grading Categories ${ }^{[1]}$ | Score | Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safety | 1.8 | Fair |
| System Preservation | 2.0 | Fair |
| Capacity Management <br> and Mobility | 2.3 | Good |
| Economic Vitality | 2.0 | Fair |

Transportation Equity ${ }^{[2]}$

| High Priority Area |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Moderate Priority Area | $\checkmark$ |
| Low Priority Area |  |

[1] Poor $=0$ to 1.7; Fair $=1.8$ to 2.2; Good $=2.3$ to 3.0
[2] Low $=0$ or 1 Factor; Moderate $=2$ or 3 Factors; High $=4$ or 5 Factors

## Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown Roadway Segment

## Capacity Management and Mobility

| Performance Measure ${ }^{[1]}$ | Percentage | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { (out of } 3.0 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalk Presence | 50\% | 3 | Good |
| Crosswalk Presence | 33\% | 1 | Poor |
| Walkway Width | 17\% | 3 | Good |
| GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL ${ }^{[2]}$ (Sidewalk Presence Score * 0.5) + (Crosswalk Presence Score * 0.33 ) $+(W$ alk Score * 0.33 ) + (Walkway Width Score * 0.17) | 100\% | 2.3 | Good |


| Economic Vitality |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure ${ }^{[1]}$ | Percentage | score <br> (out of 3.0) $)$ | Rating |
| Pedestrian Volumes | $50 \%$ | 2 | Fair |
| Adjacent Bicycle <br> Accommodations | $50 \%$ | 2 | Fair |
| GRADING CATEGORY TOTALL <br> (Pedestrian Volumes Score $* .5)+($ Adiacent <br> Bicycle Accommodations score 0.5$)$ | $100 \%$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | Fair |

[1] Poor = 1.0; Fair = 2.0; Good $=3.0$
[2] Poor $=0$ to 1.7; Fair $=1.8$ to 2.2; Good $=2.3$ to 3.0
[3] Use these factors to determine Transportation Equity priority level (front)

| Safety |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure ${ }^{[1]}$ | Percentage | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { (out of 3.0) } \end{gathered}$ | Rating |
| Pedestrian Crashes | 60\% | 2 | Fair |
| Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer | 20\% | 2 | Fair |
| Vehicle Travel Speed | 20\% | 1 | Poor |
| GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL ${ }^{[2]}$ <br> (Pedestrian Crashes Score * 0.6) + (Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer Score * 0.2) + (Vehicle Travel Speed Score * 0.2) | 100\% | 1.8 | Fair |

## System Preservation

| Performance Measure ${ }^{[1]}$ | Percentage | Score <br> (out of 3.0) | Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalk Condition | $100 \%$ | 2 | Fair |

Transportation Equity Factors ${ }^{[3]}$

| Area Condition | Yes/No |
| :---: | :---: |
| Low-Income Population $\geq 32.32 \%$ |  |
| Minority Population $\geq 28.19 \%$ | $\vee$ |
| More than $6.69 \%$ of Population $>75$ Years of Age | V |
| More than $16.15 \%$ of Households w/o Vehicle |  |
| Within $1 / 4$ Mile of School/College | V |

## Roadway Segment Notes

## Detailed Performance Measure Information

| Grading Category | Performance Measure | Features of Analyzed Locations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity Management and Mobility | Sidewalk Presence | Standard sidewalks on either side of the road |
|  | Crosswalk Presence | 7 crosswalks in 1.6 miles (4 crosswalks per mile) |
|  | Walkway Width | Standard width ( 5.5 feet) |
| Economic Vitality | Pedestrian Volumes | 5-60 pedestrians per hour |
|  | Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations | Sharrows for the most part |
| Safety | Pedestrian Crashes | 2 pedestrian and 2 bicycle crashes |
|  | Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer | 7 feet (3 feet grass buffer and 4 feet shoulder) |
|  | Vehicle Travel Speed | 30 mph and 45 mph |
| System Preservation | Sidewalk Condition | Fair |



Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) to the Boston Region MPO: www.ctps.org | 857.702.3700 | ctps@ctps.org

Ryan Hicks, Congestion Management Process Manager:
www.ctps.org/cmp | 857.702.3661 | rhicks@ctps.org
Casey Claude, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager: www.ctps.org/bicycle-pedestrian-activities | 857.702.3707 | cclaude@ctps.org

## Pedestrian Report Card Assessment (PRCA): Roadway Segment

## Roadway Segment Location

Route 28 in Milton (Randolph Ave)

| Grading Categories ${ }^{[1]}$ | Score | Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safety | 1.6 | Poor |
| System Preservation | 2.0 | Fair |
| Capacity Management <br> and Mobility | 2.3 | Good |
| Economic Vitality | 1.5 | Poor |

Transportation Equity ${ }^{[2]}$

| High Priority Area |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Moderate Priority Area | $\checkmark$ |
| Low Priority Area |  |

[1] Poor $=0$ to 1.7; Fair $=1.8$ to 2.2; Good $=2.3$ to 3.0
[2] Low $=0$ or 1 Factor; Moderate $=2$ or 3 Factors; High $=4$ or 5 Factors

## Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown Roadway Segment

## Capacity Management and Mobility

| Performance Measure ${ }^{[1]}$ | Percentage | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { (out of } 3.0 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalk Presence | 50\% | 3 | Good |
| Crosswalk Presence | 33\% | 1 | Fair |
| Walkway Width | 17\% | 3 | Good |
| GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL ${ }^{[2]}$ (Sidewalk Presence Score * 0.5) + (Crosswalk Presence Score * 0.33 ) $+(W$ alk Score * 0.33 ) + (Walkway Width Score * 0.17) | 100\% | 2.3 | Good |


| Economic Vftality |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure ${ }^{[1]}$ | Percentage | Score <br> (out of 3.0) | Rating |
| Pedestrian Volumes | $50 \%$ | 2 | Fair |
| Adjacent Bicycle <br> Accommodations | $50 \%$ | 1 | Poor |
| GRADDNG CATEGORY TOTAL <br> (Pedestrian Volumes Score $* .5)+($ Adjacent <br> Bicycle Accommodations Score $* 0.5)$ | $100 \%$ | 1.5 | Poor |

[1] Poor = 1.0; Fair = 2.0; Good $=3.0$
[2] Poor $=0$ to 1.7; Fair $=1.8$ to 2.2; Good $=2.3$ to 3.0
[3] Use these factors to determine Transportation Equity priority level (front)

| Safety |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure ${ }^{[1]}$ | Percentage | $\begin{gathered} \text { Score } \\ \text { (out of 3.0) } \end{gathered}$ | Rating |
| Pedestrian Crashes | 60\% | 2 | Fair |
| Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer | 20\% | 1 | Poor |
| Vehicle Travel Speed | 20\% | 1 | Poor |
| GRADING CATEGORY TOTAL ${ }^{[2]}$ <br> (Pedestrian Crashes Score * 0.6) + (Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer Score * 0.2) + (Vehicle Travel Speed Score * 0.2) | 100\% | 1.6 | Poor |

System Preservation

| Performance Measure ${ }^{[1]}$ | Percentage | Score <br> (out of 3.0) | Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalk Condition | $100 \%$ | 2.0 | Fair |

Transportation Equity Factors ${ }^{[3]}$

| Area Condition | Yes/No |
| :---: | :---: |
| Low-Income Population $\geq 32.32 \%$ |  |
| Minority Population $\geq 28.19 \%$ | $\vee$ |
| More than $6.69 \%$ of Population $>75$ Years of Age | V |
| More than $16.15 \%$ of Households w/o Vehicle |  |
| Within $1 / 4$ Mile of School/College | V |

## Roadway Segment Notes

## Detailed Performance Measure Information

| Grading Category | Performance Measure | Features of Analyzed Locations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity Management and Mobility | Sidewalk Presence | Standard sidewalks on either side of the road |
|  | Crosswalk Presence | 4 crosswalks in 1.7 miles (2 crosswalks per mile) |
|  | Walkway Width | Standard width ( 5.5 feet) |
| Economic Vitality | Pedestrian Volumes | 5-60 pedestrians per hour |
|  | Adjacent Bicycle Accommodations | None |
| Safety | Pedestrian Crashes | 1 pedestrian and 2 bicycle crashes |
|  | Pedestrian-Vehicle Buffer | None |
|  | Vehicle Travel Speed | 45 mph |
| System Preservation | Sidewalk Condition | Fair |



Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) to the Boston Region MPO: www.ctps.org | 857.702.3700 | ctps@ctps.org

Casey Claude, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager:
www.ctps.org/bicycle-pedestrian-activities | 857.702.3707 | cclaude@ctps.org

## Bicycle Report Card

Roadway Segment Location
Route 28 in Milton (Brook Rd and Reedsdale Rd)

| Grading Categories | Score | Grade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safety | 32 | F |
| System Preservation | 75 | C |
| Capacity Management <br> and Mobility | 60 | D |
| Economic Vitality | 50 | F |

## Transportation Equity

| High Priority Area |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Moderate Priority Area | V |
| Low Priority Area |  |

Grading
A: 90-100 Excellent
B: 80-89 Satisfactory
C: 70-79 Acceptable
D: 60-69 Needs Improvement
F: 59-0 Not recommended for bicycle travel

## Transportation Equity Priority

High: Four (4) or Five (5) Factors
Moderate: Two (2) or Three (3) Factors
Low: Zero (0) or One (1) Factor

## Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown

| Capacity Management and Mobility |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Percentage | Points | Grade |
| Bicycle Facility Presence | $50 \%$ | 20 | F |
| Proximity to Bike Network | $33 \%$ | 100 | A |
| Proximity to Transit | $17 \%$ | 100 | A |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | D |


| Economic Vitality |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Percentage | Points | Grade |
| Bike Rack Presence | $50 \%$ | 0 | F |
| Land Use | $50 \%$ | 100 | A |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | F |

Grading
A: 90-100 Excellent
B: 80-89 Satisfactory
C: 70-79 Acceptable
D: 60-69 Needs Improvement
F: 59-0 Not recommended for bicycle travel

## Transportation Equity Priority

High: Four (4) or Five (5) Factors
Moderate: Two (2) or Three (3) Factors
Low: Zero (0) or One (1) Factor

| Safety |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Percentage | Points | Grade |
| Bicycle Facility Presence | $33 \%$ | 20 | F |
| Absence of Bicycle Crashes | $33 \%$ | 40 | F |
| Bicyclist Operating Space | $17 \%$ | 0 | F |
| Number of Travel Lanes | $17 \%$ | 70 | C |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | F |

## System Preservation

| Performance Measure | Percentage | Points | Grade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycle Facility Continuity | $50 \%$ | 100 | F |
| Bicycle Facility Condition | $50 \%$ | 50 | F |
| Total | $100 \%$ | 75 | C |

## Transportation Equity Priority

| Area Condition | Yes/No |
| :---: | :---: |
| Low Income Population =/> $32.32 \%$ |  |
| Minority Population =/> $28.19 \%$ | V |
| $18.2 \%+$ of Population < 16 Years Old | V |
| $16.15 \%+$ of Households w/o Vehicle |  |
| Within $1 / 4$ Mile of School/College | V |

Notes
Detailed Performance Measure Information

| Goal | Performance Measure | Features of Analyzed Locations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity Management and Mobility | Bicycle Facility Presence | Sharrows/shared-use lane |
|  | Proximity to Bike Network | Bicycle facility network within $1 / 4$ mile |
|  | Proximity to Transit | Has a bus route on it and several stops in the corridor |
| Economic Vitality | Bike Rack Presence | No bicycle rack in the segment |
|  | Land Use | Mixed use-educational, recreational, residential |
| Safety | Bicycle Facility Presence | Sharrows/shared-use lane |
|  | Absence of Bicycle Crashes | 2 bicycle crashes |
|  | Bicyclist Operating Space | Bicycle operates in mixed traffic |
|  | Number of Travel Lanes | Two travel lanes per direction |
| System Preservation | Bicycle Facility Continuity | Length of bicycle facility matches length of segment |
|  | Bicycle Facility Condition | Bicycle facility in fair condition |



Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) to the Boston Region MPO: www.ctps.org | 857.702.3700 | ctps@ctps.org

Casey Claude, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager:
www.ctps.org/bicycle-pedestrian-activities | 857.702.3707 | cclaude@ctps.org

## Bicycle Report Card

Roadway Segment Location
Route 28 in Milton (Randolph Ave)

| Grading Categories | Score | Grade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safety | 32 | F |
| System Preservation | 0 | F |
| Capacity Management <br> and Mobility | 50 | F |
| Economic Vitality | 50 | F |

## Transportation Equity

| High Priority Area |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Moderate Priority Area | V |
| Low Priority Area |  |

Grading
A: 90-100 Excellent
B: 80-89 Satisfactory
C: 70-79 Acceptable
D: 60-69 Needs Improvement
F: 59-0 Not recommended for bicycle travel

## Transportation Equity Priority

High: Four (4) or Five (5) Factors
Moderate: Two (2) or Three (3) Factors
Low: Zero (0) or One (1) Factor

## Grading Categories: Scoring Breakdown

| Capacity Management and Mobility |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Percentage | Points | Grade |
| Bicycle Facility Presence | $50 \%$ | 0 | F |
| Proximity to Bike Network | $33 \%$ | 100 | A |
| Proximity to Transit | $17 \%$ | 100 | A |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | F |


| Economic Vitality |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Percentage | Points | Grade |
| Bike Rack Presence | $50 \%$ | 0 | F |
| Land Use | $50 \%$ | 100 | A |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | F |

Grading
A: 90-100 Excellent
B: 80-89 Satisfactory
C: 70-79 Acceptable
D: 60-69 Needs Improvement
F: 59-0 Not recommended for bicycle travel

## Transportation Equity Priority

High: Four (4) or Five (5) Factors
Moderate: Two (2) or Three (3) Factors
Low: Zero (0) or One (1) Factor

| Safety |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Measure | Percentage | Points | Grade |
| Bicycle Facility Presence | $33 \%$ | 0 | F |
| Absence of Bicycle Crashes | $33 \%$ | 40 | F |
| Bicyclist Operating Space | $17 \%$ | 0 | F |
| Number of Travel Lanes | $17 \%$ | 70 | C |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | F |

## System Preservation

| Performance Measure | Percentage | Points | Grade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycle Facility Continuity | $50 \%$ | 0 | F |
| Bicycle Facility Condition | $50 \%$ | 0 | F |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | F |

## Transportation Equity Priority

| Area Condition | Yes/No |
| :---: | :---: |
| Low Income Population =/> $32.32 \%$ |  |
| Minority Population =/> $28.19 \%$ | V |
| $18.2 \%+$ of Population < 16 Years Old | V |
| $16.15 \%+$ of Households w/o Vehicle |  |
| Within $1 / 4$ Mile of School/College | V |

Notes
Detailed Performance Measure Information

| Goal | Performance Measure | Features of Analyzed Locations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capacity Management and Mobility | Bicycle Facility Presence | Sharrows/shared-use lane |
|  | Proximity to Bike Network | Bicycle facility network within $1 / 4$ mile |
|  | Proximity to Transit | Has a bus route on it and several stops in the corridor |
| Economic Vitality | Bike Rack Presence | No bicycle rack in the segment |
|  | Land Use | Mixed use-educational, recreational, residential |
| Safety | Bicycle Facility Presence | Sharrows/shared-use lane |
|  | Absence of Bicycle Crashes | 2 bicycle crashes |
|  | Bicyclist Operating Space | Bicycle operates in mixed traffic |
|  | Number of Travel Lanes | Two travel lanes per direction |
| System Preservation | Bicycle Facility Continuity | Length of bicycle facility matches length of segment |
|  | Bicycle Facility Condition | Bicycle facility in fair condition |

## Appendix G: Survey Comments

## Milton Route 28 (Brook Road, Reedsdale Road, and Randolph Avenue) Survey

The Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), in conjunction with the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) and the Town of Milton, is conducting a transportation planning study for a segment of Route 28 in Milton. The segment of focus is from Blue Hill Parkway to the Quincy city line, as shown in the map below. The objectives of the study are to collect data, analyze existing roadway conditions, identify problems and needs, and develop short-, mid-, and long-term community-supported solutions to provide safe and comfortable travel for all uses and users of the roadway. This survey will help MPO staff to understand the public's perception of the existing transportation problems and needs, and collect ideas to address them. The MPO staff will consider the survey responses as solutions are developed for safe and efficient accommodations in the corridor. Please take a few minutes to complete this brief survey.

This study will not reevaluate the Route 28 and Chickatawbut Road intersection due to an ongoing project. However, final recommendations developed for the intersection will be included in the Route 28 Priority Corridor study.


Route 28 (Brook Road, Reedsdale Road, and Randolph Avenue) and You

1. What is your relationship to the Route $\mathbf{2 8}$ corridor? (Check all that apply)I live along Route 28I work along Route 28I commute through Route 28I drive to school, hospital, library, or recreational area along Route 28Other (please specify)

## 2. How do you typically travel on Route 28? (Check all that apply)

$\square$ Drive alone in an automobile
$\square$ Drive others or travel as a passenger in an automobileWalkBicycleRide on the bus (Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority or Brockton Area Transit Authority)Other (please specify)
3. Please indicate any transportation problems/issues that you encounter while on Route 28. (Check all that apply)

### 3.1 Safety Issues

$\square$ High speed of vehicles
$\square$ Crashes and vehicle conflict points
$\square$ Difficulty crossing Route 28
$\square$ Poor street lighting
$\square$ Other (please specify)

### 3.2 Congestion Issues

High volumes of trafficCongestion and long delays at signalized intersections$\square$ Difficulty turning into or out of side streets
$\square$ Cut-through traffic to avoid congestion
$\square$ Other (please specify)

### 3.3 Pedestrian and Bicycle Issues

$\square$ Sidewalks in poor condition
$\square$ Lack of accessible curb/wheelchair ramps
$\square$ Lack of accommodation for bicycles (bike lanes, multiuse path, or useable shoulders)
$\square$ High volumes of traffic
$\square$ High speed of vehicles
$\square$ Difficulty crossing Route 28 (location or absence of crosswalks)
$\square$ Gaps in sidewalk network
$\square$ Insufficient pedestrian crossing times at the signalized intersections
$\square$ Poor street lightingUnwelcoming streetscape/landscape
$\square$ Other (please specify)

### 3.4 Bus transit service issues

Bus stop amenities (shelters, benches, lighting, or quality of bus stop)Frequency of bus serviceBus stops difficult to reach via sidewalks and bicycle facilities$\square$ Routes and bus stops not close to my destination (work, school, recreational, hospital)Other (please specify)

### 3.5 Access Management Issues

Access to properties and businesses along the corridorAccess to schools (school traffic issues)Other (please specify)4. Please use the space below to describe safety and operational problems at specific locations (intersections or roadway segments) that you would like to see addressed.

Click here to enter text.
5. Automobile Opportunities: What investments do you believe would improve driving conditions on Route 28? (Check all that apply)Reduce congestion and delay at intersections
Reduce crashes and vehicle conflict points
Reduce vehicle speeds
Reduce turning conflicts
Reduce cut-through trafficImprove sight lines and distances at intersections
Improve roadway lightingOther (please specify)
6. Bicycle Opportunities: What investments would make it more likely for you to bicycle along Route 28? (Check all that apply)Multiuse lanes (cycle tracks or shared pedestrian and bicycle sidewalks)Higher quality bicycle lanes (wider space between bicycle and vehicular travel lanes)Continuous and connected bicycle facilities (access to more destinations by bicycling)Bicycle parking at my destination (schools, hospital, library, recreation areas)Reduce vehicle speed through better roadway design or law enforcementImprove roadway lightingOther, please specify
7. Pedestrian Opportunities: What investments would make it more likely for you to walk along Route 28? (Check all that apply)Higher quality sidewalksContinuous and connected pedestrian sidewalks (access to more destinations by walking)Wider space/landscaping between sidewalk and vehicular travel lanesCorridor-wide Americans with Disability Act access for users with a range of abilitiesReduce vehicle speedImprove roadway lightingGreener and more welcoming streetscapeOther, please specify
8. Transit Opportunities: What transportation investments would make it more likely for you to ride the bus in the Route $\mathbf{2 8}$ corridor? (Check all that apply)Bus routes and stops closer to my destination (work, school, recreational, hospital, library)Bus stops easier and safer to reach via sidewalks/crosswalks and bicycle facilitiesBus stop amenities (shelters, benches, lighting, etc.)More reliable bus trip timesMore frequent bus service
Improved roadway lightingOther, please specify
9. Please use the space below to describe specific improvements that you would like to see implemented in the Route $\mathbf{2 8}$ corridor.

Click here to enter text.

## Thank you!

## Common comments encountered

## Brook Road at Thacher Street

- Thacher Street to Highland Street is a cut through road to get to Randolph and thus cars go very fast down Thacher Street.
- Far too many non-local people cutting through on Highland Street, causing extra traffic at the Canton-Highland-Thatcher intersection.


## Brook Road at St. Mary's Road

- Asphalt on St. Mary's Road is breaking up due to higher volume of traffic and the fact that it hasn't been repaved in a long time.
- Combination of curve in the road, four lanes of traffic, and cut through nature of St. Mary's Road makes this a dangerous intersection to cross on foot, even when the walk sign is on.
- Pickup and drop-off at St. Mary's School is also very dangerous for kids, parents, grandparents on foot, and vehicles merging into one lane.


## Brook Road at Standish Road

- Cars run the light on Brook Road at Standish Road.
- Several crashes have occurred at the intersection of Route 28 and Windsor Road near Kelly Field (seems annual).
- Kelly Field is full of kids and four lanes of traffic is not safe for crossing. Also, overflow parking for Kelly Field onto the Route 28 leads to limited visibility and dangerous situations.


## Brook Road at Reedsdale Road and Central Avenue

- The Pierce Middle School intersection also is difficult as it has five roads leading into it. Maybe if the real roundabout works at Chickatawbut, it could be considered at Brook Road and Reedsdale Road and Central Avenue intersection.
- At Brook Road and Reedsdale Road intersection, the light is badly synchronized.
- The intersection at Central Avenue, Brook Road, and Reedsdale Road needs better signage cars regularly enter Brook Road from wrong direction or turn from both lanes on Route 28 to Brook Road.
- Traffic speeds in the vicinity of Pierce Middle School and Saint Mary's School is dangerously high. The high volumes and high speeds create sustained accidents in this area and jeopardizes student safety. It's a big liability to the town and state. There should be better signage at the intersection of Route 28 and Central Street indicating that Route 28 bears left instead of onto Central Avenue.
- Everyday dozens of cars try to beat the light at the intersection and turn into Central Avenue at speeds exceeding speeds at 50 mph . The intersection of Brook Road, Central Avenue and Reedsdale Road has lots of red light runners at high speeds (and right by a school!)
- The Pierce Middle School intersection (5-way intersection at Reedsdale Road/Brook Road) is really out of control. At almost every red light during the school commute hours, one can watch cars drive through red lights. There is virtually no police presence. Speeds are high, as a resident and parent I think it is urgent that the speed limit be reduced to 25 mph .


## Reedsdale Road at Canton Avenue and Centre Street

- Due to the signals at the Milton Public Library when crossing Route 28 from Centre Street to Canton Avenue, the traffic can back up quickly as vehicles attempt to enter the Library parking lot.
- Intersection of Centre Street, Canton Avenue, and Reedsdale Road has numerous accidents due to running red lights and speeding cars.
- The intersection of Reedsdale Road with Center and Canton Avenue and Centre Street has an extremely short pedestrian light, which also takes a very long time to come on. It seems as a pedestrian you have to wait for an entire cycle of lights before the walk signal comes on. The only way to cross the whole intersection is to cut diagonally through two or more streets. There's not enough time in the signal to cross one road at a time. This always feels dangerous.
- There is a decent amount of pedestrian traffic at the intersection, people going to the library, for instance-and I think there would be more if the intersection were safer to cross.
- The five leg intersection on Reedsdale Road, Center Street, and Canton Avenue is a mess, people run the red lights every light cycle and speeding is rampant.
- Cars do not follow turn signs, especially during peak commute hours. For example, cars will be in right lane on Brook Road and continue straight onto Brook Road when signs show right lane is for turning right (either Reedsdale Road or Centre Street). Also at the same intersection going the opposite direction, cars from the middle lane will make a soft left onto Centre Street cutting the folks off that are in the left turn lane to go on Centre Street.
- The intersection has issues for pedestrians and drivers. Left turn leaving library not safe. Crosswalks need visual and auditory signals that are must stronger. Many drivers do not realize that 5 way intersection is a dangerous area.


## Randolph Avenue at Reedsdale Road

- Intersection of Randolph Avenue and Reedsdale Road can back traffic up on Randolph Avenue to Centre Street, which creates a traffic queue on Centre Street preventing residents going from Centre Lane and Sias Lane on to Canton Avenue.
- Very long waits for light cycle at Randolph and Reedsdale - both as a pedestrian as well as a motorist (particularly coming from Pleasant Street.)
- During rush hour, the light by Saint Elizabeth Rectory, at the intersection of Reedsdale Road and Randolph Avenue when you are going southbound, the light is not long enough to let enough cars through. As a result, the buildup of traffic is terrible and it often backs up to the light at Milton Academy and sometimes even beyond that.
- Sometimes, unnecessary waits for non-existing cross traffic at Reedsdale Road crossing Randolph Avenue and heading toward Pleasant Street.
- Cars don't stop at intersection of Reedsdale Road and Randolph Avenue, even when there is a walk signal. Kids often cross there after school, tragedy waiting to happen.


## Randolph Avenue at Pleasant Street

- I live on the one way section of Pleasant Street off of Randolph Avenue. To get to my street, I have to cross two lanes of oncoming traffic to take a sharp left in front of Bents. It is difficult to gauge oncoming traffic because one lane is traveling at high speeds and the other lane is slowing down to veer right onto Pleasant Street. I was also rear ended while stopped waiting to take the left. Traffic travels so fast that I need to brake and signal far before my turn, and still people swerve to go around me at high speeds.
- Making left hand turn off 28 South onto Pleasant Street is very difficult.
- Turning left onto Pleasant Street from southbound Route 28 is incredibly dangerous, also no crosswalk for pedestrians here, even though sidewalk across the street ends.
- There needs to be a stop light at the intersections of Route 28 at Pleasant Street and Pleasant Street at Reedsdale Road. There are school bus stops at each intersection and as we speak cars are using that small stretch of street as a cut through.
- There is often a backup on Pleasant Street because of the light at Reedsdale Road and Randolph Avenue. It seems likely that traffic is being directed to Pleasant Street to avoid traffic backup on the Expressway.
- I live at the intersection of Randolph Avenue and Pleasant Street. All day and night people traveling northbound on Route 28 turn onto Pleasant Street at a high rate of speed to cut through to East Milton. This intersection is unprotected and dangerous. There needs to be a traffic light installed at this intersection.


## Randolph Avenue at Hallen Avenue and Highland Street

- I am unable to make a left out of Hallen Avenue most days. It is too dangerous.
- Hallen Avenue constantly have accidents and even deaths.
- Hallen Avenue is where most accidents take place. There needs to be traffic lights at Wollaston Golf Course \& Pepsi Plant. In addition, there needs to be a solution for speeding on Randolph Avenue.
- Route 28 at the golf course is always bad or even up at Hallen Avenue.
- I would like to see the traffic flow improved to the point where Highland Street is no longer seen as a better alternative to Route 28.


## Randolph Avenue at Hillside Street

- Drivers do not respect traffic light and block the intersection at Hillside Street all the time.
- There are several crashes a month right outside our house near Hillside Street and Randolph Avenue. People run red light or more commonly speed and weave in and out of traffic. When we
turn left into our driveway we often see cars flying up behind us trying to change lanes at the last minute.
- The conditions of the sidewalks between Hillside Street and Highland Street are horrific. They are uneven and there are a ton of downed wires and tree branches sticking out into the sidewalks. Walking with our baby in a stroller is nearly impossible.
- The intersection at Hillside Street has high number of crashes
- Difficulty turning left maneuvers
- Highly congested during peak periods
- Inadequate intersection traffic capacity
- Merge from two lanes to one lane
- Long traffic queues on all approaches, regardless of the light cycle.
- Something needs to be done about the speeding and people running the light at Hillside Street. This is a pure traffic enforcement issue. Presence will help, not a sign that asks people to slow down or a fake police car.
- Half of the crosswalk buttons at 28 and Hillside have been broken for over two years. You have been notified and done nothing.


## Pedestrian and Bicycle Issues

- Need to clarify if parking is allowed on street at Kelly Field. New plantings and sidewalk last year helped. But need more parking for Kelly in general.
- It is not safe to walk along the Randolph Avenue and there are no bicycles lanes leaving those of us in the side neighborhoods feeling like we cannot exercise or leave our neighborhoods unless we drive, which is also unsafe.
- No way of crossing from Randolph Avenue to Pleasant Street to the cafe shop because of high speed of vehicles
- The light at Randolph Avenue and Reedsdale Road is not long enough for pedestrians.
- High speed of vehicles are a huge problem as there are lots of kids who live along the route and it is incredibly dangerous. The noise from high speed vehicles is very bothersome.
- Dangerous intersections at Pierce Middle School and at the intersection with Blue Hills Parkway for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Speed has become a major safety issue along Brook Road (Route 28) where I live. It is very dangerous to cross Brook Road to either walk to school or parks or library. Walking and biking to school is encouraged and residents would love to, but the narrow sidewalks make it very dangerous for kids to bike next to cars driving 60 mph . There have been many car accidents due to speeding and kids put in danger from crossing the street. Traffic lights are not respected even in front of schools. Would love to see this section of Route 28 with one lane for cars in each direction, parking and bike path for safety and pollution.
- No crosswalk for pedestrians at the intersection of Randolph Avenue and Pleasant Street, even though sidewalk across the street ends there.
- I ride my bike to work every day, and I cross Route 28 at Standish Road light to avoid a lot of cars. While cars on Standish triggers the traffic light to stop traffic on Route 28, bikes do not. So I have to get off my bike and hit the pedestrian crosswalk button. On a bike, I do not need the 1520 second pedestrian signal duration, only about 5 seconds that a car would need. So if the Standish traffic light sensor was set for bikes and cars it would solve the problem and improve safety and operations.
- Longer crosswalk times at the intersection of Canton Avenue/Centre Street/Reedsdale Road (very hard to get across with stroller in time!)
- Cars don't stop at intersection of Route 28 and Randolph Avenue, even when there is a walk signal. Kids often cross there after school, tragedy waiting to happen.


# Appendix H: MassDOT Highway Division Project Development Process 

## Overview of the Project Development Process

Transportation decision-making is complex and can be influenced by legislative mandates, environmental regulations, financial limitations, agency programmatic commitments, and partnering opportunities. Decision-makers and reviewing agencies, when consulted early and often throughout the project development process, can ensure that all participants understand the potential impact these factors can have on project implementation. Project development is the process that takes a transportation improvement from concept through construction.

The MassDOT Highway Division has developed a comprehensive project development process which is contained in Chapter 2 of the MassDOT Highway Division's Project Development and Design Guide. The eight-step process covers a range of activities extending from identification of a project need, through completion of a set of finished contract plans, to construction of the project. The sequence of decisions made through the project development process progressively narrows the project focus and, ultimately, leads to a project that addresses the identified needs. The descriptions provided below are focused on the process for a highway project, but the same basic process will need to be followed for non-highway projects as well.

## 1. Needs Identification

For each of the locations at which an improvement is to be implemented, MassDOT leads an effort to define the problem, establishes project goals and objectives, and defines the scope of the planning needed for implementation. To that end, it has to complete a Project Need Form (PNF), which states in general terms the deficiencies or needs related to the transportation facility or location. The PNF documents the problems and explains why corrective action is needed. For this study, the information defining the need for the project will be drawn primarily, perhaps exclusively, from the present report. Also, at this point in the process, MassDOT meets with potential participants, such as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and community members, to allow for an informal review of the project.

The PNF is reviewed by the MassDOT Highway Division district office whose jurisdiction includes the location of the proposed project. MassDOT also sends the PNF to the MPO, for informational purposes. The outcome of this step determines whether the project requires further planning, whether it is already well supported by prior planning studies, and, therefore, whether it is ready to move forward into the design phase, or whether it should be dismissed from further consideration.

## 2. Planning

This phase will likely not be required for the implementation of the improvements proposed in this planning study, as this planning report should constitute the outcome of this step. However, in general, the purpose of this implementation step is for the project proponent to identify issues, impacts, and approvals that may need to be obtained, so that the subsequent design and permitting processes are understood.

The level of planning needed will vary widely, based on the complexity of the project. Typical tasks include: define the existing context, confirm project need, establish goals and objectives, initiate public outreach, define the project, collect data, develop and analyze alternatives, make recommendations, and provide documentation. Likely outcomes include consensus on the project definition to enable it to move forward into environmental documentation (if needed) and design, or a recommendation to delay the project or dismiss it from further consideration.

## 3. Project Initiation

At this point in the process, the proponent, MassDOT Highway Division, fills out a Project Initiation Form (PIF) for each improvement, which is reviewed by its Project Review Committee (PRC) and the MPO. The PRC is composed of the Chief Engineer, each District Highway Director, and representatives of the Project Management, Environmental, Planning, Right-ofWay, Traffic, and Bridge departments, and the MassDOT Federal Aid Program Office (FAPO). The PIF documents the project type and description, summarizes the project planning process, identifies likely funding and project management responsibility, and defines a plan for interagency and public participation. First the PRC reviews and evaluates the proposed project based on the MassDOT's statewide priorities and criteria. If the result is positive, MassDOT Highway Division moves the project forward to the design phase, and to programming review by the MPO. The PRC may provide a Project Management Plan to define roles and responsibilities for subsequent steps. The MPO review includes project evaluation based on the MPO's regional priorities and criteria. The MPO may assign project evaluation criteria score, a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) year, a tentative project category, and a tentative funding category.

## 4. Environmental Permitting, Design, and Right-of-Way Process

This step has four distinct but closely integrated elements: public outreach, environmental documentation and permitting (if required), design, and right-of-way acquisition (if required). The outcome of this step is a fully designed and permitted project ready for construction. However, a project does not have to be fully designed in order for the MPO to program it in the TIP. The sections below provide more detailed information on the four elements of this step of the project development process.

## Public Outreach

Continued public outreach in the design and environmental process is essential to maintain public support for the project and to seek meaningful input on the design elements. The public outreach is often in the form of required public hearings, but can also include less formal dialogues with those interested in and affected by a proposed project.

Environmental Documentation and Permitting
The project proponent, in coordination with the Environmental Services section of the MassDOT Highway Division, will be responsible for identifying and complying with all applicable federal, state, and local environmental laws and requirements. This includes determining the appropriate project category for both the Massachusetts Environmental Protection Act (MEPA) and the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). Environmental documentation and permitting is often completed in conjunction with the Preliminary Design phase described below.

Design
There are three major phases of design. The first is Preliminary Design, which is also referred to as the 25 -percent submission. The major components of this phase include full survey of the project area, preparation of base plans, development of basic geometric layout, development of preliminary cost estimates, and submission of a functional design report. Preliminary Design, although not required to, is often completed in conjunction with the Environmental Documentation and Permitting. The next phase is Final Design, which is also referred to as the 75-percent and 100-percent submission. The major components of this phase include preparation of a subsurface exploratory plan (if required), coordination of utility relocations, development of traffic management plans through construction zones, development of final cost estimates, and refinement and finalization of the construction plans. Once Final Design is complete, a full set of Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS\&E) is developed for the project.

Right-of-Way Acquisition
A separate set of Right-of-Way plans are required for any project that requires land acquisition or easements. The plans must identify the existing and proposed layout lines, easements, property lines, names of property owners, and the dimensions and areas of estimated takings and easements.

## 5. Programming (Identification of Funding)

Programming, which typically begins during the design phase, can actually occur at any time during the process, from planning to design. In this step, which is distinct from project initiation, the proponent requests that the MPO place the project in the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The proponent requesting the project's listing on the TIP can be the community or it can be one of the MPO member agencies (the Regional Planning Agency, MassDOT, and the Regional Transit Authority). The MPO then considers the project in terms of state and regional needs, evaluation criteria, and compliance with the regional Transportation Plan and decides whether to place it in the draft TIP for public review and then in the final TIP.

## 6. Procurement

Following project design and programming of a highway project, the MassDOT Highway Division publishes a request for proposals. It then reviews the bids and awards the contract to the qualified bidder with the lowest bid.

## 7. Construction

After a construction contract is awarded, MassDOT Highway Division and the contractor develop a public participation plan and a management plan for the construction process.

## 8. Project Assessment

The purpose of this step is to receive constituents' comments on the project development process and the project's design elements. MassDOT Highway Division can apply what is learned in this process to future projects.

## Project Development Schematic Timetable

| Description | Schedule Influence | Typical Duration |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Step I: Problem/Need/Opportunity Identification The proponent completes a Project Need Form (PNF). This form is then reviewed by the MassDOT District office which provides guidance to the proponent on the subsequent steps of the process. | The Project Need Form has been developed so that it can be prepared quickly by the proponent, including any supporting data that is readily available. The District office shall return comments to the proponent within one month of PNF submission. | 1 to 3 months |
| Step II: Planning <br> Project planning can range from agreement that the problem should be addressed through a clear solution to a detailed analysis of alternatives and their impacts. | For some projects, no planning beyond preparation of the Project Need Form is required. Some projects require a planning study centered on specific project issues associated with the proposed solution or a narrow family of alternatives. More complex projects will likely require a detailed alternatives analysis. | Project Planning Report: 3 to 24+ months |
| Step III: Project Initiation <br> The proponent prepares and submits a Project Initiation Form (PIF) and a Transportation Evaluation Criteria (TEC) form in this step. The PIF and TEC are informally reviewed by the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and MassDOT District office, and formally reviewed by the PRC. | The PIF includes refinement of the preliminary information contained in the PNF. Additional information summarizing the results of the planning process, such as the Project Planning Report, are included with the PIF and TEC. The schedule is determined by PRC staff review (dependent on project complexity) and meeting schedule. | 1 to 4 months |
| Step IV: Design, Environmental, and Right of Way <br> The proponent completes the project design. Concurrently, the proponent completes necessary environmental permitting analyses and files applications for permits. Any right of way needed for the project is identified and the acquisition process begins. | The schedule for this step is dependent upon the size of the project and the complexity of the design, permitting, and right-of-way issues. Design review by the MassDOT district and appropriate sections is completed in this step. | 3 to 48+ months |
| Step V: Programming <br> The MPO considers the project in terms of its regional priorities and determines whether or not to include the project in the draft Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which is then made available for public comment. The TIP includes a project description and funding source. | The schedule for this step is subject to each MPO's programming cycle and meeting schedule. It is also possible that the MPO will not include a project in its Draft TIP based on its review and approval procedures. | 3 to 12+ months |
| Step VI: Procurement The project is advertised for construction and a contract awarded. | Administration of competing projects can influence the advertising schedule. | 1 to 12 months |
| Step VII: Construction The construction process is initiated including public notification and any anticipated public involvement. Construction continues to project completion. | The duration for this step is entirely dependent upon project complexity and phasing. | 3 to 60+ months |
| Step VIII: Project Assessment The construction period is complete and project elements and processes are evaluated on a voluntary basis. | The duration for this step is dependent upon the proponent's approach to this step and any follow-up required. | 1 month |

Source: MassDOT Highway Division Project Development and Design Guide


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ An HSIP crash cluster is a location in which the number and severity of crashes-as measured on the "Equivalent Property Damage Only" (EPDO) index-ranks the location among the top five percent of crash clusters in the region. The EPDO method assigns weighted values to each crash based on whether the crash resulted in property damage (unweighted), injury (weighted by five), or a fatality (weighted by 10 ).

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization, Destination 2040: The New Long-Range Transportation Plan of the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization, endorsed by the Boston Region MPO on August 29, 2019.
    ${ }^{3}$ Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization, Unified Planning Work Program, FFY 2020, endorsed by the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization on July 18, 2019.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ Safety Conditions: The location has a higher-than-average crash rate for its functional class; contains a crash cluster that makes it eligible for HSIP funding; contains a crash location on MassDOT Highway Division's Top High Crash Locations Report; or has a significant number of pedestrian and bicycle crashes (two or more per mile).
    ${ }^{5}$ Congested Conditions: The travel time index is at least 1.3. The travel time index is the ratio of the peak-period travel time to the free-flow travel time.
    ${ }^{6}$ Multimodal Significance: The roadway carries one or more bus routes or is adjacent to a transit stop or station; the roadway supports bicycle or pedestrian activities or there is a project planned that will support these activities; there is a need to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists and improve transit on the roadway; or there is a significant amount of truck traffic on the roadway serving regional commerce.
    ${ }^{7}$ Regional Significance: The roadway is on the National Highway System; carries a significant portion of regional traffic (average daily traffic of 20,000 vehicles or more); lies within 0.5 miles of environmental-justice transportation analysis areas or zones; or is essential for the region's economic, cultural, or recreational development.
    ${ }^{8}$ Regional Equity: To ensure that, over time, all subregions in the MPO's planning area receive support from the MPO in the form of UPWP planning studies, during each funding cycle, MPO staff select no more than one location per subregion to study and choose a location in a different subregion from the location studied in the preceding cycle.
    ${ }^{9}$ Implementation Potential: The study location is proposed by the jurisdictional agency or agencies for the roadway; proposed or prioritized by a subregional group; or identified as a priority for improvement by other stakeholders.
    ${ }^{10}$ Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization, Selection of FFY 2020 LRTP Priority Corridor Study Location, Technical Memorandum, November 7, 2019.

[^3]:    Note: Weekday AM = 6:00 AM to 9:00 AM. Weekday PM = 3:00 PM to 6:00 PM. Weekend PM 11:00 AM to 2:00 PM. Shading denotes that a crosswalk is absent on Route 28 at this location.
    Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

[^4]:    ${ }^{11}$ Yuanchang Xie and Chen (Julian) Chen, Calibration of Safety Performance Functions for Massachusetts Urban and Suburban Intersections. Report prepared for MassDOT Office of Transportation Planning, March 2016.
    ${ }^{12}$ American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Highway Safety Manual 2010, Washington, DC, December 2010.

[^5]:    Note: Green shading denotes segments within the corridor.
    HSIP = Highway Safety Improvement Program. PSI = Potential for Safety Improvement.
    Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

[^6]:    ${ }^{13}$ Jeffrey Gooch, VHB, MassDOT Average Comprehensive Crash Costs, Technical Memorandum, dated January 1, 2018, to MassDOT.
    ${ }^{14}$ For the purposes of this study, MPO staff used two values: $\$ 15,600$ per property damage only crash and $\$ 260,800$ per crash involving injury.

[^7]:    ${ }^{15}$ Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Highway Capacity Manual 2010, Washington, DC, December 2010.
    ${ }^{16}$ Trafficware Inc., Synchro Studio 9, Synchro plus SimTraffic, Build 914, Sugar Land, Texas.

[^8]:    Note: Shading denotes intersections that are congested during peak travel hours.

    * Negative (-) sign = Volume exceeds capacity (queue may be longer)
    ** Negative (-) sign = 95 percentile volume exceed capacity, queue may be longer
    $E B=$ eastbound. $L O S=$ level of service. $L=$ left. $R=$ right. $L R=$ left and right. $L T=$ left and through. $T R=$ through and right. $\mathrm{LTR}=$ left, through, and right. $\mathrm{NE}=$ northeast. $\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound. $\mathrm{WB}=$ westbound $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. $\mathrm{NW}=$ northwest. SE = southeast. SW = southwest.
    Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

[^9]:    ${ }^{17}$ Ryan Hicks and Casey-Marie Claude, Pedestrian Level-of-Service Memorandum, Technical Memorandum to the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization, January 19, 2017.

[^10]:    Note: * Negative (-) sign = Volume exceeds capacity (queue may be longer)
    ** Negative (-) sign = 95 percentile volume exceed capacity, queue may be longer
    $E B=$ eastbound. $L=$ left. LOS = level of service. $L R=$ left and right. $L T=$ left and through. $L T R=$ left, through, and right.
    $\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound. $\mathrm{NE}=$ northeast. $\mathrm{NW}=$ northwest. $\mathrm{R}=$ right. $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. $\mathrm{SW}=$ southwest. $\mathrm{TR}=$ through and right. WB = westbound.
    Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

[^11]:    Note: * Negative (-) sign = Volume exceeds capacity (queue may be longer).
    ** Negative ( - ) sign = 95 percentile volume exceed capacity, queue may be longer.
    $E B=$ eastbound. $L=$ left. LOS $=$ level of service. $L R=$ left and right. $L T=$ left and through. $L T R=$ left, through, and right.
    $\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound. $\mathrm{NE}=$ northeast. $\mathrm{NW}=$ northwest. $\mathrm{R}=$ right. $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. $\mathrm{SE}=$ southeast. $\mathrm{SW}=$ southwest. $\mathrm{TR}=$ through and right. WB = westbound.
    Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

[^12]:    LOS = level of service. EB = eastbound. L= left. LOS = level of service. LR = left and right. LT= left and through. LTR = left, through, and right. NB = northbound. $\mathrm{R}=$ right. $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound. $\mathrm{WB}=$ westbound.
    Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

[^13]:    ${ }^{18}$ US Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, Crash Modification Factors Clearinghouse, August 14, 2018, http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/.
    ${ }^{19}$ L. Chen, C. Chen, and R. Ewing. "The Relative Effectiveness of Pedestrian Safety Countermeasures at Urban Intersections-Lessons from a New York City Experience." Presented at the 91st Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, January 22-26, Washington, DC, 2012, http://www.cmfclearinghouse.org/study_detail.cfm?stid=280.
    ${ }^{20}$ P. Alluri, A. Raihan, D. Saha, et al. "Statewide Analysis of Bicycle Crashes." Florida Department of Transportation (May 2017).

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ Destination 2040: The New Long-Range Transportation Plan of the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization was adopted by the Boston Region MPO in August 2019.

[^15]:    ${ }^{2}$ The FFY 2020 Unified Planning Work Program was endorsed by the Boston Region MPO on July 18, 2019.
    ${ }^{3}$ The Boston Region MPO's work program for Addressing Priority Corridors from the LongRange Transportation Plan Needs Assessment: Federal Fiscal Year 2020 was approved on September 19, 2019.

[^16]:    ${ }^{4}$ Ryan Hicks and Casey-Marie Claude, Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization, Pedestrian Level-of-Service Memorandum, January 19, 2017; Casey-Marie Claude, Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization, Development of a Scoring System for Bicycle Travel in the Boston Region, November 8, 2018.

[^17]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^18]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^19]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^20]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^21]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. BL: Bear left, BR: Bear right, HL: Hard left, HR: Hard right, L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^22]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^23]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^24]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^25]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^26]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^27]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^28]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^29]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^30]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^31]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^32]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^33]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^34]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^35]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^36]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

[^37]:    *Pedestrians and Bicycles on Crosswalk. L: Left, R: Right, T: Thru, U: U-Turn

