STATE OF CONNECTICUT CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

PETITION OF MONTVILLE POWER LLC FOR A DECLARATORY RULING TO APPROVE THE RETROFIT AND OPERATION OF A 40 MW BIOMASS-FUELED GENERATION UNIT AT MONTVILLE STATION IN UNCASVILLE, CONNECTICUT

MONTVILLE POWER LLC PETITION FOR DECLARATORY RULING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION								
	A.	Statutory Authority1							
	B.	Project Overview							
	C.	Applicant Information							
II.	DES	CRIPTION OF THE PROJECT							
	A.	Site Description							
	В.	Station Redevelopment							
		1. Retrofit of Existing Unit 54							
		2. New Fuel							
		3. Electrical Interconnection							
		4. Site Aesthetics							
		5. Sound Attenuation							
		6. Traffic Impacts							
	C.	Construction Plan9							
III.	NEE	D FOR THE PROJECT 10							
IV.	ENV	IRONMENTAL IMPACTS 11							
	A.	Air Emissions							
	B.	Natural Diversity 12							
	C.	Coastal Zone Consistency Review 13							
	D.	Subsurface Environmental Conditions							

	Е.	Water Resources 14
		1. Cooling Water Diversion 14
		2. Water Discharges
		3. Site Storm Water Runoff 15
	F.	Sound
V.	STA	FE AND MUNICIPAL CONSULTATIONS 16
VI.	CON	CLUSION 18
ATT	ACHM	ENTS
	Α.	Site Location Map 20
	Β.	General Arrangement Plan 20
	C.	Noise Study 20
	D.	Traffic Study
	E.	Construction Schedule

STATE OF CONNECTICUT CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

PETITION OF MONTVILLE POWER LLC FOR A DECLARATORY RULING TO APPROVE THE RETROFIT AND OPERATION OF A 40 MW BIOMASS-FUELED GENERATION UNIT AT MONTVILLE STATION IN UNCASVILLE, CONNECTICUT

PETITION NO. 907

June 22, 2009

PETITION FOR DECLARATORY RULING

I. INTRODUCTION

A. <u>Statutory Authority</u>

Pursuant to § 16-50k of the Connecticut General Statutes ("C.G.S.") and §§ 16-50j-38 to 16-50j-40 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies ("R.C.S.A."), Montville Power LLC ("Montville Power"), hereby submits to the Connecticut Siting Council (the "Council") this Petition for a Declaratory Ruling ("Petition") approving Montville Power's proposal to retrofit Montville Station (the "Station") Unit 5 to enable the unit to use clean wood biomass to produce up to 40 MW of renewable energy (the "Project"). The Project is eligible to be approved by declaratory ruling because it is an electric generating facility that will be located at a site where an electric generating facility existed prior to July 1, 2004. C.G.S. § 16-50k(a).

B. <u>Project Overview</u>

Originally placed in service in the 1950s, Unit 5 is an 82 MW steam generation unit presently fueled by natural gas and No. 6 oil. Montville Power proposes to retrofit Unit 5 to use clean wood biomass to produce up to 40 MW of renewable energy. In addition, the Project will be designed to maintain Unit 5's ability to operate on liquid fuel or natural gas at its full 82 MW capacity, when needed, in order to continue to provide power during peak periods. In addition, Unit 5's liquid fuel will be switched form No. 6 fuel oil to ultra-low sulfur distillate fuel oil ("ULSD fuel"). The Project will utilize a stoker technology with a vibrating grate feed system that will allow the biomass to be evenly combusted with increased efficiency and lower ash discharge. To control emissions, retrofitted Unit 5 will be equipped with enhanced pollution control systems, and will be among the cleanest biomass-fueled projects in the country.

Montville Power plans to procure the biomass fuel supply to power Unit 5 from local Connecticut sources, including foresters. The Station's location on the estuarine portion of the Thames River also affords Montville Power the option to transport sustainable biomass by barge from the northern states in the event that Connecticut's indigenous supply becomes depleted. The biomass fuel source will consist exclusively of untreated wood, clean urban wood wastes and forest residues, all of which qualify as sustainable biomass under Connecticut law as further discussed in Section II below.

Due to its location, configuration, fuel source and anticipated emission reductions, the Project will not have substantial adverse environmental effects.

-2-

C. Applicant Information

Montville Power is a wholly-owned subsidiary of NRG Energy, Inc. ("NRG"). NRG is a competitive power generation company with an approximately 25,000 MW portfolio distinguished by its range in geography, fuel source and dispatch level. Headquartered in Princeton, New Jersey, NRG owns and operates a diverse portfolio of power-generating facilities in the Northeast and throughout the United States. NRG and its subsidiaries own and operate almost 2,000 MW of generation capacity within Connecticut. NRG is a Member of the New England Power Pool.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

A. <u>Site Description</u>

Montville Power has owned and operated the Station since purchasing it from The Connecticut Light & Power Company ("CL&P") in December 1999. Located in Uncasville, Connecticut, six miles north of New London, Connecticut, on the Thames River, the Station has a nominal, aggregate generating capacity of 500 MW, and currently consists of four units: two steam boilers, Units 5 and 6, and two diesel-fired internal combustion turbines, Units 10 and 11. Unit 5 currently has a nominal rating of 82 MW. (A Site Location Map is included as Attachment A to this Petition.) Montville Power owns approximately 50 acres comprising the Station site, of which the Project will utilize no more than 20%.

As part of the Project, Montville Power will construct a fuel storage shed capable of storing enough wood to fuel Unit 5 for 14 days. The fuel storage shed also will be equipped with automated stacking and a reclaim process integrated into the unit's fuel

-3-

management system. As stated above, once retrofitted as a biomass unit, Unit 5 will remain able to operate up to 82 MW of capacity, using natural gas or ULSD fuel. The Station is connected to the Algonquin Gas Transmission ("Algonquin") pipeline by a pipeline spur, owned by Yankee Gas Services Company ("Yankee Gas"), and, in order to accommodate Unit 5's full load capacity, one of the existing fuel oil storage tanks will be converted to suitable storage for ULSD fuel. (A General Arrangement Plan illustrating the general layout of the existing Station and the retrofit of Unit 5 is included as Attachment B to this Petition.)

B. <u>Station Redevelopment</u>

1. Retrofit of Existing Unit 5

Upon completion of the Project, Unit 5 is expected to run as a biomass-fueled, base load resource for the majority of the year. The Project consists of retrofitting Unit 5 to be fueled by biomass to produce up to 40 MW, or to be fueled by either natural gas or ULSD fuel to retain the ability to provide up to 82 MW for a limited period of time. The . operational flexibility of the retrofitted Unit 5 – its ability to operate at a nominal rating of 40 MW when fueled by biomass, while retaining the ability to operate up to 82 MW on either natural gas or ULSD fuel – will provide both economic and system reliability benefits to the state of Connecticut.

Converting Unit 5 to a base load, biomass-fueled generator will increase its operating efficiency and will produce cleaner energy, as compared with many of the oilfired, steam units currently in operation in Connecticut. When the Project is completed, Unit 5 will be equipped with regenerative selective catalytic reduction ("RSCR")

-4-

technology to reduce nitrous oxide ("NOx" emissions, and with an oxidation catalyst to reduce carbon monoxide ("CO") and volatile organic compound ("VOC") emissions, which will reduce the Station's overall NOx rates up to 75% at Unit 5's full load, as compared to current allowable rates for the Station. (A more detailed description of the emissions profile for the Station following completion of the Project is provided in Section IV of this Petition.) Unit 5's base load, biomass-fueled operations also will enhance its operational flexibility by allowing Unit 5 to respond more quickly to the needs of the system on high energy demand days. In other words, because Unit 5 will be operating as a base load resource, the unit will effectively provide spinning reserve capacity at times of system peak – with the added benefit that, as a biomass-fueled generator, Unit 5 will provide much cleaner spinning reserve capacity than would be provided by a ULSD fuel or natural gas-fired unit.

Furthermore, because Unit 5 is expected to operate as a base load resource when fueled by biomass, completion of the Project will help to moderate the market price of energy and of renewable energy credits ("RECs"). Simply put, Unit 5 will provide more flexible, lower cost, lower emitting, Class 1 renewable energy with the ability to provide additional power on demand. When Unit 5 operates on biomass fuel, which should be the majority of the hours in the year, it will generate approximately 40 MWs of RECs to contribute towards the state's renewable portfolio requirements, which are escalating at a rate of one percent per year over the next several years. As a result, Connecticut's consumers will benefit from lower cost power, even as the state moves closer to meeting its renewable energy goals.

-5-

2. New Fuel

For base load operations, retrofitted Unit 5 primarily will use biomass fuel obtained from three source streams:

(1) *untreated, recycled wood from manufacturing residues,* which includes sawdust, shavings, and unused wood from wood manufacturing and milling businesses (*e.g.* saw mills or flooring mills);

(2) *urban wood wastes*, which includes land-clearing debris from home and business development, residential yard wastes from arborists and landscaping activities and untreated, recycled pallets; and

(3) *forest residues*, which includes logging residues, land-clearing debris from timber stand improvements and commercial development removals. Forest residues are typically whole tree chips and un-merchantable byproducts of normal timbering practices, including trunks, limbs, stumps, leaves and tree tops. Un-merchantable biomass products are traditionally left on the forest floor while high-value saw timber is sold to lumber markets.

Each of these sources is an unadulterated, qualifying sustainable biomass fuels within the meaning of C.G.S. § 16-1(a)(45). Montville Power will not accept painted, stained, pressure-treated or engineered material or any other construction or demolition waste for use as a biomass fuel for Unit 5. All biomass fuel is expected to be processed by the supplier, prior to delivery to the Station. Montville Power will specify to its suppliers that it will only accept wood chips that are no greater than two inches in size. Although Montville Power will install a wood hogger to provide limited processing

-6-

capability on site, the wood hogger will be used solely to process the limited amount of pre-processed biomass that may be larger than specified.

In addition, the Project scope includes new biomass fuel handling equipment and the retrofit of an existing fuel oil tank with storage capacity for a minimum of 50,000 gallons of ULSD fuel, which equates to enough ULSD fuel to operate Unit 5 continuously, at full output, for approximately eight hours. The Station is connected to the Algonquin pipeline by a pipeline spur owned by Yankee Gas, with sufficient capacity for plant operations.

3. Electrical Interconnection

The existing interconnection for Unit 5 will not require any modifications to accommodate the Project. Unit 5 will continue to be electrically connected to the Station's 138 kV substation, which is shared with the Station's Unit 6.

4. Site Aesthetics

The Station has been operated as electrical generation station for over 90 years, and is a fixture in the surrounding community. Visual impacts of the Project will be limited to the construction of covered fuel receiving and storage facilities. The fuel receiving facility will be located near the entrance to the Station on Lathrop Road and will receive fuel delivery vehicles, which will then convey the biomass a distance of approximately 300 yards to the nearby fuel storage facility. As designed, the storage facility will be approximately 90 feet tall. Montville Power will landscape around the wood yard receiving area to minimize its visual effects. Grass will be planted on areas

-7-

not subject to vehicle or foot traffic, and walkways and driveways will be comprised of crushed stone, asphalt or concrete.

5. Sound Attenuation

The Station is bounded by the Thames River on one side and by an upwardsloping topography of forested land on the other. This location will minimize the impact of sound emissions of Unit 5. In addition, retrofitted Unit 5 will feature highperformance silencers and noise-attenuating enclosures for the fuel processing equipment, as well as installation of acoustical barriers around the fuel unloading and handling equipment, noise emissions are expected to comply with the standards established by the state of Connecticut. A complete Noise Level Evaluation (the "Noise Study") evidencing this conclusion was conducted by Shaw Group and is discussed in detail below in Section IV. (A copy of the Noise Study is included as Attachment C to this Petition.)

6. Traffic Impacts

A complete study of the impact that construction and operation of the Project will have on local traffic (the "Traffic Study") was conducted by Shaw Environmental. Based on an analysis of the expected traffic levels during the 12-month construction period, the Project will result in very minimal impacts on roadway operations. Montville Power estimates that approximately 100 craft employees will work on the Project, of which 80 will work on the site during the heaviest work days. Existing traffic volumes along Lathrop Road and Depot Road are very light and the additional construction traffic will have only minimal and temporary impact on roadway operations. All drivers of

-8-

construction vehicles will be warned to stay off of the local residential streets. The Project's permanent impact on traffic is expected to increase slightly with the addition of 40 fuel truck deliveries each day. Despite the additional fuel deliveries, the Project will have no appreciable effect on local traffic volumes or delays. (A copy of the Traffic

; included as Attachment D to this Petition.)

C. <u>Construction Plan</u>

NRG Construction LLC, NRG's development, engineering, procurement and etion subsidiary, will directly manage and execute the construction activities for ect. (A Construction Schedule is included as Attachment E to this Petition.) onstruction activities associated with the Project include the following:

installation of new maintenance warehouse/garage;

installation of new waste water transfer pump house interconnection to city sewer;

Major c

demolition of existing maintenance garage and waste water treatment facility;

constru

site mobilization for construction activities;

civil work including foundations for the new wood yard material handling equipment, electro-static precipitators, regenerative select catalytic and booster fan:

installation of biomass material handling equipment;

40 fuel

Study is

have nc

Project'

constru

-9-

installation of emission controls equipment including dust collector and electrostatic precipitator ("ESP") for particulate controls, oxidation catalyst and RSCR for NOx, CO and VOC emissions control;

- removal of lower furnace bottom and installation of new stoker grate firing system including fuel metering system and distribution air systems;
- installation of new ash material handling systems;
- construction of a new electrical distribution system for power supply to the new equipment;
- retrofit of the No. 6 oil supply system day tank to hold ULSD fuel; and
- retrofit of Unit 5 to install low NOx burners on the boiler.

Landscaping around the wood yard receiving area also is planned in order to minimize visual effects of the operation. Grass will be planted on areas not subject to vehicle or foot traffic and walkways and driveways will be of crushed stone, asphalt or concrete. Erosion and sedimentation control procedures will be implemented to preclude any run-off into the Thames River.

III. NEED FOR THE PROJECT

In 1998, the state legislature adopted a state-wide requirement for the procurement of renewable energy, C.G.S § 16-245a, and established Connecticut's renewable portfolio standards ("RPS"). Revised several times since then, Connecticut's current RPS require that, by 2020, 20% of energy sold in the state must be produced by "Class I" renewable resources (as defined by C.G.S. § 16-245a). On March 25, 2009, NRG filed with the DPUC a Petition for a Declaratory Ruling with respect to qualification of the Project as a Class I renewable energy source pursuant to C.G.S § 6-1(a)(26). A determination on the petition is expected soon, and Montville Power will provide a copy of such determination to the Council as soon as it is received.

Opinions differ regarding the amount of available renewable generation in NEPOOL. However, there is agreement that existing resources are only sufficient through 2010 and the absence of additional capacity may cause a shortfall in RECs, requiring Connecticut electrical delivery companies to procure RECs at the penalty rate of \$55 per megawatt hour. The Project is uniquely situated to take advantage of existing infrastructure to satisfy a portion of the growing renewable requirements without constructing additional capacity in Connecticut. The modification of existing, in-state equipment allows Connecticut to benefit directly from the reinvestment in an aging facility by improving its emissions profile, while also ensuring that Connecticut customers' REC costs inure to the benefit of the Connecticut economy, by supporting local fuel supply and generation.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. <u>Air Emissions</u>

The Project is designed to meet all applicable state and federal air quality requirements, as well as the expected terms of the Air Permit to be issued by DEP under R.C.S.A. § 22a-174-3a. Overall, the Project is designed to fall within the allowable stack concentrations of hazardous air pollutants as allowed by R.C.S.A. § 22a-174-29, as well as to meet Best Available Control Technology standards for sulfur dioxide ("SO₂"), NOx, CO, VOC, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. As designed, the Project also will meet Lowest Available

-11-

Control Technology for NOx. Unit 5 will use good combustion practices when fueled by biomass, and will use ULSD fuel and natural gas up to 82 MW for the control of SO₂. The Project will be equipped with a catalytic oxidation system for the control of CO and some VOC emissions, and equipped with a new ESP for the control of PM_{10} , and $PM_{2.5}$. In addition, Unit 5 will be equipped with RSCR technology for the control of NOx.

Because the nameplate capacity of Unit 5 is greater than 25 MW, the Project also is subject to the requirements of the Federal Acid Rain Program (40 C.F.R. § 72). The Station has an Acid Rain permit issued by DEP for its existing units including Unit 5. No modification to the Acid Rain Permit is needed. Additionally, the Station has a Title V Operating Permit (Permit No. 107-0043-TV) issued by DEP on November 15, 2007. Under R.C.S.A. § 22a-174-33(f)(4), Montville Power is required to submit a request to revise the Title V Permit within 12 months of the commencement of biomass operations.

Based on the foregoing, the air emissions will meet all applicable state and federal requirements and will not have a substantial adverse environmental effect on Connecticut's air resources.

B. <u>Natural Diversity</u>

As defined in the DEP data base, the Station, and, therefore the Project, is not located within an area defined as requiring a review of the Natural Diversity Database ("NDD") to determine the presence of endangered or threatened species. However, Montville Power will submit a NDDB review form to DEP to solicit a response that either (1) confirms that this review is not needed, or (2) provides information regarding species of concern. Montville Power will provide a copy of such review form to the

-12-

Council upon filing, and will provide a copy of DEP's response to the Council upon receipt.

C. <u>Coastal Zone Consistency Review</u>

The Station is located with the Coastal Zone as identified by DEP. A Coastal Consistency Review form will be filed with DEP's Office of Long Island Sound Programs with copies to the Town of Montville, DEP's Air Bureau and the Council. No impact on the Coastal Zone is expected from the Project.

D. <u>Subsurface Environmental Conditions</u>

Phase I and Phase II studies of the Station's site, which were conducted by CL&P in 1999, indicated historic site contamination, including oil, solvent and coal ash deposits, from industrial activities that occurred prior to Montville Power's ownership of the Station. As a condition of Montville Power's 1999 purchase of the Station from CL&P, with the concurrence of DEP, Montville Power accepted responsibility for compliance with the requirements of the Connecticut Transfer Act, C.G.S. § 22a-134 (the "Transfer Act"). Pursuant to the Transfer Act, Montville Power must remediate and/or implement controls to address the site pollution. Montville Power has conducted extensive studies since it assumed ownership of the Station and has been working with a Licensed Environmental Professional from Shaw E&I, and with DEP, to remediate the contamination issues at the Station. The locations chosen for several of the facilities comprising the Project are within areas identified for remediation. Accordingly, remediation will be completed prior to or in conjunction with the completion of the Project.

E. <u>Water Resources</u>

1. Cooling Water Diversion

Montville Power holds water well registrations (Registration Nos. 4000-094-PWR-RI and 4000-095-PWR-RI) and diversions to divert 354.4 million gallons per day ("mgd") of water from the Connecticut River for once-through cooling and other uses associated with the production of electricity. Since there will be no changes to the existing once-through cooling, no changes to Montville Power's diversion registration will be needed. Moreover, no construction activities at the shoreline will be associated with obtaining this water, because the water intake infrastructure is currently in place via existing intake structures, tunnel and pump systems to the existing power plant.

2. Water Discharges

Montville Power holds a current National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") water discharge permit issued by the DEP (Permit No. CT0003115). This NPDES permit authorizes discharge of 354.4 mgd of once-through cooling water from the existing Station units. Since the cooling water needs for the Project will not change as a result of changing the fuel source, Montville Power will not seek a permit modification for this discharge.

However, the existing NPDES permit also encompasses the operation of a waste water treatment facility ("WWTF") for processing the low volume industrial waters used at the Station. Changing to biomass fuel will change inputs to the WWTF. Due to very low use of the WWTF and to the improvement of publicly-owned treatment facilities ("POTW") in the Town of Montville associated with the Project, all the low volume waste discharges will be routed to the local POTW. Initial engineering discussions with the Town of Montville have been initiated. If the plan to re-route discharged water to the POTW is approved by the Town, a new, pre-treatment discharge permit will be obtained from DEP and Montville Power's existing NPDES permit will be modified to remove the WWTF discharge.

3. Site Storm Water Runoff

Montville Power holds a registration under the General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater Associated with Industrial Activities. The Project will alter the potential inputs to the storm water discharge and a modification to the registration will be submitted to DEP by Montville Power, once an evaluation of such changes is completed and confirmed. Furthermore, if necessary to accommodate the Project, Montville Power will submit a registration under the General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activities.

F. Sound

The Noise Study conducted by Shaw Group assessed the potential noise impact of the Project. (A copy of the Noise Study is included with this Petition as Attachment C.) According to the Noise Study, the acoustical design of Unit 5 and all related equipment will yield full compliance with the performance standards established by the Connecticut DEP. Noise emissions between industrial Zone Class C sites and residential Zone Class A sites are limited to 61dba in the daytime and 51 dba at night. Modeling results show mitigated noise levels to be in compliance with daytime noise emissions limits. Evening noise levels are marginal, with only slight exceedances of state criteria along adjacent

-15-

properties, under worst case scenario conditions. However, the point at which such exceedances were measured is at the southern end of the Station's property line, more than 500 feet from the nearest residential homes, which are separated from the Station site by woods. Moreover, the measured exceedances are so slight that they fall within the ± 2 dba margin of error.

Noise attenuation controls planned for the Project include:

- enclosure of 48" feeder conveyor from truck dumper to fuel shed;
- enclosure of fuel hogger (processing) equipment;
- silencers for filters on hogger and truck dumpers; and
- berm or sound barrier around truck unloading facilities

Additionally, enclosure of the 30" conveyor from fuel storage to the boiler house may be required if observed noise levels during operations continue to exceed state limits.

As stated above, the results of the Noise Study indicate that, given the proposed acoustical design of the Project, noise emissions are expected to comply with the . standards established by the state of Connecticut.

V. STATE AND MUNICIPAL CONSULTATIONS

NRG has been in contact with a number of state and local officials as part of NRG's coordinated effort to inform and involve stakeholders in Montville Power's plan to improve the Station by adding renewable biomass generation capability. Specifically, NRG has discussed the Project with:

Council staff;

- DPUC Chairman Donald Downes, DPUC Commissioners Kevin
 DelGobbo, Jack Betkowski and Tony Palermino and DPUC staff;
- DEP staff (Gary Rose, Ric Pirolli, Ernie Bouffard and Jim Grillo);
- Town of Montville Mayor Joseph Jaskiewicz;
- Town of Montville Police officials (regarding the Traffic Study) Police
 Lieutenant Bunnell and Resident State Trooper Collins; and
- the Montville legislative delegation Senator Edith Prague,
 Representative Betsy Ritter, Representative Kevin Ryan and
 Representative Tom Reynolds.

Conversations with all of these stakeholders regarding the Project were positive. All stakeholders recognize the benefits of developing new, environmentally-beneficial, renewable generation at the current Station site. Project-specific issues raised by these stakeholders and addressed with them by NRG (and in this Petition) included (1) environmental and public policy benefits of adding a renewable energy component to the Station; (2) staffing levels or increasing employment at the Station; and (3) maintaining a facility on the tax roll and increasing as additional equipment is added. Going forward, stakeholders' issues will be addressed in the overall Project plan.

The Traffic Study results have been presented to the Mayor and police officials. NRG also will present the results of the Noise Study to the Town of Montville in the near future. NRG has held several meetings with the Mayor and is presently working with the Mayor to schedule meetings with key department heads, community meetings, plant tours and informational sessions. NRG will notify the Council of these events and invites the Council to participate.

VI. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing and the attached exhibits, Montville Power respectfully requests that the Council approve the Project by Declaratory Ruling as allowed under C.G.S. § 16-50k. The Project will provide much needed renewable energy, electric generation capacity and reliability in Connecticut and it will do so without substantial adverse environmental effects.

Finally, in accordance with R.C.S.A. § 16-50j-39, the names addresses and telephone numbers of the persons to whom correspondence or communications in regard to this Petition are to be directed are:

Andrew W. Lord, Esq. Murtha Cullina LLP CityPlace I, 29th Floor 185 Asylum Street Hartford, CT 06103 Telephone: (860) 240-6180 Facsimile: (860) 240-6150

Judith Lagano Director -- Asset Management NRG Energy, Inc. c/o Montville Power LLC 74 Lathrop Road Uncasville, CT 06382 Telephone: (203) 854-3625 Facsimile: (203) 854-3658 Julie L. Friedberg, Esq. Senior Counsel NRG Energy, Inc. 211 Carnegie Center Princeton, NJ 08540 Telephone: (609) 524-5232 Facsimile: (609) 524-4941

Jonathan Baylor Senior Analyst, Development & Asset Management NRG Energy, Inc. 211 Carnegie Center Princeton, NJ 08540 Telephone: (609) 524-4958 Facsimile: (203) 524-4941 Respectfully submitted, MONTVILLE POWER LLC

Andrew W. Lord, Esq. Murtha Cullina LLP CityPlace I, 29th Floor 185 Asylum Street, Hartford, CT 06103 Telephone: (860) 240-6180 Facsimile: (860)240-6150 Its Attorneys

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Site Location Map
- B. General Arrangement Plan
- C. Noise Study
- D. Traffic Study
- E. Construction Schedule







Noise Assessment Unit #5 Biomass Conversion Project NRG Montville Power LLC

Prepared for Montville Power LLC 74 Lathrop Road Montville, Connecticut 06382

Prepared by Shaw Environmental, Inc. 88C Elm Street Hopkinton, Massachusetts 01748



June 2009

P:\NRG\Montville\Draft\Reports\NRG Montville Traffic & Noise\NRG Montville Biomass Noise Report Final June 19 2009.doc

MONTVILLE POWER LLC

Noise Assessment of Unit 5 Biomass Conversion

June 2009

Introduction

Montville Station (Montville) is located in Montville, CT. Montville operates two steam-electric generating units, Units 5 and 6, as required to supply electricity to the ISO New England system. Unit 5 has a rated capacity of 88 MW. Unit 6 has a rated capacity of 417 MW. Both units burn either oil or natural gas.

This report addresses ambient sound levels and noise issues at Montville in support of a project to add biomass (woodchips) as a primary fuel to Unit 5.

New Equipment

Wood chips will be conveyed to the site in trucks, which will enter the plant from Lathrop Road. Trucks will back into a dumper, and will discharge their loads onto a 48-inch-wide receiving conveyor. The dumper will be equipped with an air blower and filter for dust control.

The conveyor will transport the wood chips to a hogging machine to ensure they are ground to an appropriate maximum size, before another 48-inch-wide wide conveyor transports the chips across the railway line to a Processed Fuel Storage Building on the north side of Unit 5. The hogger will also be equipped with an air blower and filter for dust control.

The aforementioned new plant items will be run only in the daytime.

Fuel will be conveyed continuously from the storage building to Unit 5 along a 30-inch-wide conveyor when Unit 5 is utilizing biomass.

Additional plant equipment considered during this assessment was a Combustion Air (CA) Fan, an electrostatic precipitator, an Induced Draft (ID) fan, and fan filters at metering bins. We also included an approximation for the RSCR fan unit and ducting; the overfire air fan is assumed to draw air from within the building. Appendix C includes a list of inputs into the model.

Unit 5 will use the existing boiler and turbine-generator, which are both located indoors, and no further noise assessments are necessary for this equipment.

Regulations

The Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (CTDEP) has Regulations for the Control of Noise, Section 22a-69, the relevant parts of which may be summarized as follows:

- Land use classified into zones; A is residential, B is commercial, C is industrial;
- A general prohibition of "excessive noise" beyond zone boundaries;
- The noise emission limit from Zone Class C to Zone Class A is 61 dBA in the daytime, 51 dBA at night (10pm to 7am);
- The limits are reduced by 5 dBA if tones are present;

P:\NRG\Montville\Draft\Reports\NRG Montville Traffic & Noise\NRG Montville Biomass Noise Report Final June 19 2009.doc

• There is an allowance of 5 dBA if sources of noise were present between 1 Jan 1960 and 15 Jun 1978 (the date of the Regulations), and an allowance of 10 dBA if the sources existed before 1960. Montville was in operation prior to 1960.

The town of Montville, in which the plant is sited, has no local noise ordinance. Receptors to the south of the plant, particularly the residents along Lower Bartlett Road, are located within the jurisdiction of the Town of Waterford. Waterford does have a noise ordinance, which is less detailed than the CTDEP regulations, but uses the same criterion of Zone Class C to Zone Class A emissions as the State, which is 61 dBA in the daytime and 51 dBA at night.

Ambient Noise

Sound level measurements were undertaken without any generating units running on Monday April 13, 2009 during the daytime and into the following night. These measurements were obtained at locations around the station boundary shown in Figure 1 and described in Table 1, below.

Location	Description (see also Figure 1)
1	Bottom of Lower Bartlett Road, below last house on
	this road, with a clear line of sight to the power station
2	Opposite #31 Lower Bartlett Road, on the power
	station side of the road
3	The most southerly boundary on Lathrop Road,
	outside the boundary fence near houses
4	At the main site entrance on Lathrop Road
5	The northern end of the boundary on Lathrop Road,
	outside the boundary fence opposite houses
6	The north boundary fence in a clearing on a hill within
	the site, behind trees
7	The most northwest boundary fence within the site,
	overlooked by a large house
8	At the southern boundary within the site and among
	trees, with a direct view of the plant
9	On the bridge of the railway track with a direct view of
	the plant

Table 1Location Description for Ambient Measurements June 2008

The measurements were undertaken using Rion model NA-29E integrating octave band sound level meters (serial numbers 10790058 and 10810374), with the microphones at 1.5 m above ground level. These instruments meet the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) requirements for Type 1 accuracy and have calibration traceable to National Institute of Standards Technology (NIST). The meters were also field calibrated (B&K 4230 no. 782537) before and after each set of measurements. The measurements were conducted in compliance with Sec. 22a-69-4, *Measurement Procedures of the Connecticut Regulations for the Control of Noise*.

The environmental sound level data consisted of A-weighted statistical samples, which provided the simultaneous measurement of L_{eq} , the equivalent continuous level, and L_{10} , L_{50} and L_{90} , which are the levels exceeded for 10%, 50% and 90% of the time. The L_{90} value is used to estimate the background sound level because it is least affected by short-term variations in sound. The measurements were for periods of 15 minutes in the daytime and 5 minutes at night. Octave band frequency measurements were also obtained.

This ambient data is presented in Appendix A (Tables A1 and A2). The west side of the site, especially at positions along Lathrop Road, was subjected to a strong hum (a tonal component) at times from the electric switchyard. The switchyard is owned by Northeast Utilities (NU), not NRG, and hence does not originate from NRG's power plant. However, since the presence of this tone complicates the study, we have "corrected out" this hum at 120 Hz from the octave band data of Table A2 in order to arrive at corrected background levels without the hum.

A summary of the L_{90} ambient values, after this hum correction has been applied at locations 3 and 4 on Lathrop Road, is given in Table 2, below.

Location	Ambient L ₉₀
Daytime	
1 Lwr Bartett (lwr)	42.9
2 #31LwrBartlett	43.1
3 Lathrop (south)	43.8 *
4 Entrance	42.9 *
5 Lathrop (north)	43.4
6 Mid north bdry	43.6
7 Far N corner	43.0
8 S boundary	42.7
9 Railway bridge	44.9
Night-time	
1 Lwr Bartett (lwr)	39.6
2 31Lwr Bartlett (31)	39.5
4 Entrance	47.3 *
5 Lathrop (north)	40.8 *
* hum corrected	

Table 2Ambient Noise Levels Summary L90 dBA

Overall, the ambient daytime noise level was determined to be approximately 43 dBA, reducing to 40 dBA at night. Hum from the switchyard does add considerably to levels along Lathrop Road at times (by about 6 dBA), but this switchyard is not part of the Power Plant.

On the south side of the plant, measured ambient levels have included residual transformer noise at locations 1, 2, 8 and 9 which was clearly audible at these sites, and is likely to remain as a significant contributor to the total noise level on the south side when Units 5 and 6 are running.



Fig 1 Measurement Positions

P:\NRG\Montville\Draft\Reports\NRG Montville Traffic & Noise\NRG Montville Biomass Noise Report Final June 19 2009.doc

4

Operational Plant Noise

Noise readings with Unit 5 and also with Units 5 and 6 running together, had been taken in June 2008 for the earlier study. These results are included in Appendix B and are summarized in Table 3, below. (The level of noise from the plant itself is independent of day or night.) It has been concluded that the plant meets the Connecticut Regulations boundary conditions by day and night.

Location 1 Lwr Bartett (lwr)	Unit 5	Unit 5,6
2 #31LwrBartlett	44	47
3 Lathrop (south)	44	47
4 Entrance	49	47
5 Lathrop (north)	45	47
6 Mid north bdry	47	50
7 Far N corner	50	51
8 S boundary	47	50
9 Railway bridge	-	58

Table 3	Plant Noise	Levels June	2008 L ₉₀ (dBA
---------	-------------	-------------	------------------------	-----

Computer Modeling

Our SoundPlan computer modeling program has been used to predict noise levels resulting from the installation of biomass equipment to feed wood chips to Unit 5. The likely sound power levels of Units 5 and 6 had been determined from the previous measurements taken last year, and these values were used as the basis for the model for Unit 5, and Units 5 and 6 together, under present conditions.

We understand that Unit 6 runs very infrequently and, even when it does run at night, it operates under minimum load. Hence the consideration of Units 5 and 6 together does represent a worst case that occurs on only a few days (or nights) in the year.

There are differences between the plots for predicted and measured values because the measured noise is also affected by extraneous sounds from the switchyard along Lathrop Road in particular (locations 3, 4 and 5) and the shipyard and steam generation plant to the north (location 7). The model over-predicts by about 3 dBA at locations 8 and 9, because the existing plant buildings screen the noise to a greater extent than we have been able to model at present.

The noise contours produced by the model should not be regarded as plots of precise levels, but rather as <u>indications</u> of how the sound levels increase at the Plant boundaries with the introduction of the biomass equipment, and how and where they reduce with subsequent mitigation (broadly treated as a reduction of 15 dB in some plant items at this stage of design – see later discussion).

The SoundPlan figures represent a downwind situation in all cases, and hence present a slightly pessimistic overall picture, compared with what will likely be experienced most times in practice, with a bias of about + 2dB at the boundary lines.

Ten cases have been considered:

Unit 5

- 1) Unit 5 running alone, before conversion (Figure 2). This is the current situation. Predicted levels on the south side of the computer model shown are slightly pessimistic for most circumstances because they represent approximations in the sound power, and downwind conditions. The plant's output sound levels are very directional, and in practice, more sound tends to be generated to the north and west, than to the south. The large brick building, currently used for administrative offices, presents a noise barrier to much of the sound emanating westwards.
- 2) Unit 5 with biomass running alone in the daytime (Figure 3). The following assumptions have been made for the present model, which may be modified when more defined details of plant items become available:
 - CA and ID fans, 84 dBA sound pressure level, from data supplied by Babcock Power;
 - Electrostatic precipitator, 84 dBA sound power level (sound power is a measure of the total sound generated in all directions), from Shaw file data;
 - Truck dumper (down), 100 dBA sound power level, from Zachary Engineering Corporation and using SoundPlan library for hydraulic lift spectrums;
 - Truck Dumper (idle), 90 dBA sound power level, from Zachary Engineering Corp.;
 - Filters at Dumpers and at hogger, 114 dBA sound power level, from Zachary Engineering Corp. and spectrum from measured 100 HP fan;
 - Hogger, 111 dBA sound power level, from quoted level of 85 dBA at 25 ft., from Zachary Engineering Corp.
 - Conveyors, 90 dBA per meter sound power, from UE&C coal handling manual;
 - Unit 5, with an overall sound power level of 103 dBA, and Unit 6 with 118 dBA, from previous field measurements.
- 3) Unit 5 running with biomass at night (Figure 4), without the unloading operations and wood hogging, but assuming the transfer conveyor from the storage shed would be running;
- 4) Daytime Unit 5 biomass case, but with 15 dB noise reduction applied to the 48-inch wide conveyor, hogger, and filter fan silencers for hogger and dumpers (Figure 5). This is a generalized assumption of mitigation without specific details on noise reduction methods, since more detailed vendor and design information will, in time, dictate the method of noise reduction. For example:
 - If the conveyor is quieter than predicted from coal handling, it may only be necessary to treat sections of it, rather than all, by enclosure. (There is every indication that the conveyor is quieter than for coal handling because the wood chip conveyors will run at half the speed of coal conveyors. Also, with a 6-inch idler, the rpm on the equipment will be quite low and thus will have less noise, and the conveyor will be covered on top and sides to confine dust and noise further.)
 - Treatment of the hogger by enclosure will depend on design details of this machine, and how the feed inlet (through which much noise is likely to escape) can be treated. At present, either enclosures or barriers, or a combination of both, are envisioned for this machine (see later);
 - Silencers for the filters on the hogger and dumpers are available that reduce the noise by 15 dBA if this is necessary;
 - Six-inch lagging applied to RSCR booster fan and ducts to reduce output by 7 dBA.

P:\NRG\Montville\Draft\Reports\NRG Montville Traffic & Noise\NRG Montville Biomass Noise Report Final June 19 2009.doc

5) Night-time Unit 5 biomass situation (Figure 6), with mitigation of RSCR fan and ducting, and an assumed reduction of 10 dBA on the transfer conveyor to allow for the "quieter than coal" conveying condition and partial enclosure (as described above).

Units 5 and 6

- 6) Unit 6 added to the current situation before Unit 5 is converted to biomass (Figure 7);
- 7) Unit 6 added to the daytime Unit 5 biomass case (Figure 8);
- 8) Unit 6 added to the night-time Unit 5 biomass case (Figure 9);
- 9) Unit 6 added to the daytime Unit 5 biomass case with 15 dB mitigation applied (Figure 10), as described for (4);
- 10) Unit 6 added to the night-time Unit 5 biomass case (Figure 11) with mitigation of RSCR fan and ducting.

The computer model results are summarized in Table 4, below. The model over-predicts the current situation by up to 2 dBA at locations 8 and 9, because the existing buildings further screen the sound directed southwards, and downwind effects contribute to the increase.

Figure	Unit 5	Period	Locations in computer generated images								
	condition		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8*	9*
Unit 5 alone											
Fig. 2	Current	Day/night	46	41	41	37	34	38	32	49	52
Fig. 3	Biomass	Day	50	43	60	65	68	71	52	57	58
Fig. 4	unmitigated	Night	49	42	52	52	44	46	48	54	57
Fig. 5	Biomass	Day	47	38	50	54	59	61	46	51	54
Fig. 6	Mitigated	Night	47	38	47	48	39	42	45	50	53
Unit 5 pl	us Unit 6 runr	ning in curre	ent conc	lition**							
Fig. 7	Current	Day/night	51	41	45	41	44	49	38	53	56
Fig. 8	Biomass	Day	54	43	60	65	68	73	56	58	60
Fig. 9	unmitigated	Night	52	43	52	52	45	46	50	56	58
Fig. 10	Biomass	Day	51	41	51	54	59	61	47	54	58
Fig. 11	Mitigated	Night	51	41	48	49	41	43	46	53	58

Table 4Summary of Predicted Noise Levels, Leq (dBA)

*Locations 8 and 9, although technically on plant boundaries are nowhere near residential property, the closest being on the other side of Lower Bartlett Road, about 150 meters away.

** These are worst case: it is unusual for Unit 6 to run at all, and at night it would run on reduced load.

P:\NRG\Montville\Draft\Reports\NRG Montville Traffic & Noise\NRG Montville Biomass Noise Report Final June 19 2009.doc

Noise Control

The results show that, if the Unit 5 Biomass plant were operated without noise reduction applied to the components, then the State daytime criterion of 61 dBA would be exceeded at some locations around the property line of the Plant.

For daytime conditions, it is believed that the main contributors already described above will have to be reduced by a minimum of 15 dBA to avoid daytime exceedances of the 61 dBA criterion.

At night, the situation would be marginal even without mitigation applied because so much of the noise-producing equipment does not operate. Table 4 above and Figure 4 show that the 51 dBA criterion is barely exceeded at locations 3 and 4, and refinement of the model, once more detail of the proposed plant becomes available is likely to result in a further decrease in predicted noise. Indeed, although the 30-inch transfer conveyor could have been the highest contributor to the new plant noise at night, recent information indicates lower noise levels will be emitted by this conveyor. Since the noise level is likely to be at least 10 dBA less than the "unmitigated" condition assumed in Figure 4. We have allowed for this in our mitigated condition for night-time operation of Unit 5 alone, and thus Table 4 and Figure 6 demonstrate the plant can achieve noise levels at night which do not exceed the 51 dBA criterion.

The model also introduces about a 2 dB increase at the boundaries to allow for a downwind situation, which may over-estimate the noise for most occasions.

Vehicles

The noise from vehicles delivering wood chips on the west side of the Plant has not been considered in this study. In order to avoid complaints of excessive noise from idling engines and from reverse warning alarms, a barrier may be required between the vehicles and the fence line on Lathrop Road. The barrier should be high enough to shield residents from the tall exhaust stacks on the tractor trailers.

Additionally, a berm, or berm and barrier combination, is likely to be required on the north and east sides of the dumper zone to restrict line of sight to the houses along Lathrop Road and to the northwest near Location 6. For better shielding of this noise, line of sight plus 1 meter should be allowed for the barrier wall height.

Wood Hogger

Noise reduction of the wood hogger is achieved in part by enclosing the machine in sound resisting material, internally lined with sound absorptive material. However, this only achieves noise reduction for sound radiated by the body of the machine; significant noise will be emitted through the feed intake of the machine. It is necessary to protect dwellings to the west along Lathrop Road, to the south close to Location 3, and to the north close to Location 6. A three-sided barrier is envisioned, that provides at least line of sight plus 1 meter to these dwellings. Calculations indicate that such a barrier would achieve at least the required 15 dBA reduction in total noise from the inlet, if it was constructed within a distance of 2 meters from the edge of the hopper. Alternatively, the barrier could be a combination of berm and barrier for the last few meters of height.

The barrier is penetrated by the conveyor on the west side, and this would, if left untreated, allow sound to be directed toward residents along Lathrop Road. In order to mitigate this effect, the conveyor should feed through the barrier through a sound-reducing tunnel, lined internally with sound absorptive material, and about 3 meters long (but depending on the construction, shape and sound absorption applied).

48-Inch Conveyor

In the absence of other information, we have made use of published data for coal conveyors in our computer model and have concluded that 15 dB noise reduction would be required. At present, it is envisioned that the conveyor will have to be enclosed to achieve this noise reduction. We are presently advised that the conveyor is quieter than for coal handling because the wood chip conveyors will run at half the speed of coal conveyors. Also, with a 6-inch idler, the rpm on the equipment will be quite low and thus will have less noise, and the conveyor will be covered on top and sides to confine dust and noise further. The 15 dB assumption for mitigation therefore seems reasonable in the light of this information.

30-Inch Conveyor

We have similarly used coal industry data for this conveyor. We have already discussed the benefit of reducing the noise from this conveyor, as it dominates the night-time total levels from the new plant. We are similarly advised that the new woodchip conveyor would be quieter for the reasons described above and we have allowed for a conservative 10 dB noise reduction in the mitigated level, which brings the total noise levels at the important boundaries and receptors to 51 dBA or less.

Conclusions and Recommendations

On-site noise measurements have shown that the ambient daytime noise in the absence of Units 5 and 6 is 43 dBA in the daytime and 40 dBA at night. There is tonal hum from the switchyard which is especially noticeable along Lathrop Road, but this switchyard is not part of the Power Plant.

Measurements have shown that Units 5 and 6 currently run without exceeding the State criteria of 61 dBA in the daytime and 51 dBA at night.

Noise modeling of the proposed biomass conversion of Unit 5 indicates that, without mitigation to the new plant, the daytime criterion would be exceeded along Lathrop Road in particular, where there are dwellings. This applies to Unit 5 running alone, or in conjunction with Unit 6. Recommendations have been made for controlling the noise as follows:

- Enclosure of part or all of the 48-inch feeder conveyor (the proposed quieter conveyor system will have top and side covers to control dust and thus further control noise);
- Enclosure of the 30-inch transfer conveyor (for which the same comments apply as for the 48" conveyor);
- Treatment of the hogger by enclosure and the hogger feed inlet. At present, either enclosures or barriers, or a combination of both, are envisioned for this machine;
- Silencers for the filters on the hogger and dumpers are available that reduce the noise by 15 dBA if this is necessary;
- Six-inch lagging applied to RSCR booster fan and ducts to reduce output by 7 dBA;
- A berm, or berm and barrier combination, is likely to be required on the north and east sides of the vehicle dumper zone to restrict line of sight to the houses along Lathrop Road and to the northwest near Location 6;
- A barrier may be required between the delivery vehicles and the fence line on Lathrop Road.

At night, it is believed that the new plant can be operated without exceedances of the 51 dBA State criterion.

Once all noise controls have been applied to the plant, the following noise levels are predicted (Table 5).

Table 5	Summary	of Final Noise	Levels, L _{eq} (dBA)
---------	---------	----------------	-------------------------------

Figure	ure Unit 5 Period		Locations in computer generated images									
	condition		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8*	9*	
Unit 5 al	lone											
Fig. 5	Biomass	Day	47	38	50	54	59	61	46	51	54	
	Mitigated	-									_	
Fig. 6	Nig	ht	47	38	47	48	39	42	45	50	53	
Unit 5 plus Unit 6 running in current condition**												
Fig. 10	Biomas	s Day	51	41	5	1	54	59	61	47	54	58
Fig. 11	Mitigate	d Night	51	41	4	.8	49	41	43	46	53	58

*Locations 8 and 9, although technically on plant boundaries, are nowhere near residential property, the closest being on the other side of Lower Bartlett Road, about 150 meters away.

** These are worst case: it is unusual for Unit 6 to run at all, and at night it would run on reduced load.


P:\NRG\Montville\Draft\Reports\NRG Montville Traffic & Noise\NRG Montville Biomass Noise Report Final June 19 2009.doc



P:/NRGMontville/Draft/Reports/NRG Montville Traffic & Noise/NRG Montville Biomass Noise Report Final June 19 2009.doc

Figure 3



P:\NRG\Montville\Draft\Reports\NRG Montville Traffic & Noise\NRG Montville Biomass Noise Report Final June 19 2009.doc







P:\NRG\Montville\Draft\Reports\NRG Montville Traffic & Noise\NRG Montville Biomass Noise Report Final June 19 2009.doc



P:INRGMontville\Draft\Reports\NRG Montville Traffic & Noise\NRG Montville Biomass Noise Report Final June 19 2009.doc

Figure 7



P:\NRGMontville\Draft\Reports\NRG Montville Traffic & Noise\NRG Montville Biomass Noise Report Final June 19 2009.doc



P:\NRGMontville\Draft\Reports\NRG Montville Traffic & Noise\NRG Montville Biomass Noise Report Final June 19 2009.doc







P:/NRGMontville/Draft/Reports/NRG Montville Traffic & Noise/NRG Montville Biomass Noise Report Final June 19 2009.doc

APPENDIX A

AMBIENT NOISE MEASUREMENTS

Table A1 I	Daytime and Nigl	ht-time Ambient	Noise Measure	ments for the Mo	ontville Station	April 13 th /14 th 2009
	Ë		Sound le	vels dBA		Notes
LOCAUON		Leq	L10	L50	L90	
1 Lwr Bartett	12.20	44.8	46.4	44.4	42.9	Plant (xfmrs?) clearly heard, wind, birds
2 #31LwrBartlett	11.40	48.7	47.7	44.2	43.1	Wind chimes, xfmrs?, birds, far train
3 Lathrop (south)	15.15	61.8	63.9	50.4	48.2	Strong hum, many vehicles
4 Entrance	14.50	59.8	57.2	50.8	49.0	Strong hum, some traffic
5 Lathrop (north)	14.30	59.8	59.9	46.2	43.4	Slight hum, traffic
6 Mid north bdry	14.10	46.1	48.2	44.9	43.6	Slight transmission hum, birds, traffic
7 Far N corner	13.40	45.4	47.4	44.7	43.0	Nearby plant clear, shipyard activity
8 S boundary	16.30	44.0	45.0	43.9	42.7	Buzz from xfmrs? clearly audible
9 Railway bridge	16.05	46.3	48.1	45.8	44.9	Buzz from xfmrs? clearly audible
	Night of 14th					
1 Lwr Bartett	00.00	41.0	42.3	40.7	39.6	
2 31Lwr Bartlett	00.15	41.1	42.7	40.7	39.5	
4 Entrance	00.40	55.7	55.7	55.6	55.6	Strong hum
5 Lathrop (north)	01.00	46.2	46.7	46.1	45.6	Slight hum

mte for the Montville Station Anril 13th /14th 2009 d Night-time Amhient Noise Me

Appendix A - Ambient Noise Measurements

Daytime and Night-time Ambient Octave Band Levels L₉₀ A-weighted dB April 13th /14th 2009 Table A2

Freq:	31.5	63	125	250	500	1K	2k	4k	8k
				Daytime A	-wtd dB				
1 Lwr Bartett	17	30	36	35	38	35	25	21	16
2 #31LwrBartlett	17	27	33	35	39	36	30	24	17
3 Lathrop (south)	15	27	32	35	38	37	29	19	14
4 Entrance	15	31	47	37	36	35	28	24	17
5 Lathrop (north)	17	28	37	34	36	37	30	24	18
6 Mid north bdry	17	28	37	35	37	36	25	19	15
7 Far N corner	15	27	32	35	38	37	29	19	14
8 S boundary	15	28	33	35	40	37	27	18	13
9 Railway bridge	15	29	35	36	41	37	27	18	13

	12	12	18	13
	14	14	24	17
	21	20	29	28
	33	32	37	37
-wtd dB	35	36	39	35
Night-time A	32	29	40	31
	32	34	55	44
	26	23	38	28
	13	10	16	13
	1 Lwr Bartett	2 31Lwr Bartlett	4 Entrance	5 Lathrop (north)

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF NOISE READINGS

Appendix B

Table B1 Sur

Summary of Noise Readings for Continuous Plant Operation $_$

5 Jun 08 –		Leq dBA	L90 dBA	Notes
Unit 5 only				
Daytime conditions: Wi	ind from North 5 mp	h, occasional gi	usts to 10 mpł	1; 75-80% RH; temperature from 65 in
morning, rising to 69 du	uring day, then fallin,	g to 65 evening	time.	
Location				
Lower Bartlett Rd (2)	1530	45.6	44.1	Plant clearly audible
Lathrop south (3)	1530	54.0	44.4	Plant scarcely audible, some hum
Entrance (4)	1545	49.0*	48.7*	Strong hum
Lathrop north (5)	1610	54.3	44.6	Plane/ traffic/ some hum and plant
Mid north bndry (6)	1620	48.5	47.4	Distant traffic, some hum and plant
Far N corner (7)	1700	52.0	50.3	Distant coal plant, boatyard + plant
S Boundary (8)	1330	48	47	Plant strongly audible
		* after hum	correction	
10 Jun 08 – Units				
5+6				
Early morning condition	ns: Wind from East,	less than 2mph;	70 F; later in	day wind rising to 5 mph E, 90 F
Lower Bartlett Rd (2)	0115	48.5	47.4	Plant clearly audible
Lathrop south (3)	0300	48.9	47.3	Plant audible slightly, also hum
4 in Fig 1 (entrance)	0315	49.1	47.3	Plant audible, distant traffic, plus hum
Lathrop north (5)	0330	48.9	47.0	Plant audible slightly, also hum
Mid north bndry (6)	1300	51.0	50.3	Distant traffic, some hum and plant
Far N corner (7)	0730	53.9	51.5	Distant coal plant, boatyard + plant
S Boundary (8)	0630	51.5	50.0	Plant strongly audible
Upper Bartlett Rd	0340	48.2	43.6	Distant traffic and nearby main road

APPENDIX C

INPUT SOUND LEVELS ASSUMED FOR SOUNDPLAN MODEL

Appendix C

Table C1 Input Sound Levels Assumed for SoundPlan Model

	Assumptions Applied	y Spectrum from Air blower and 100 HP fan from Brayton pt	y Spectrum from 25 HP fan from Brayton pt	Added 26 dB area factor for point source Lw	 Used SoundPlan system library for hydraulic lift and added 8 dB area factor for point source Lw 	y Assumed Idling truckLw was 10 dBA less than during dumping.	y Spectrum from Soundplan system library and total Lw based on 85 dBA at 25 ft.	Std transformers-in house data	Std transformers-in house data	Lws based on Graham Custard's field measurements at the job site	Lws based on Graham Custard's field measurements at the job site
		from Zachar Engr Corp	from Zachar Engr Corp	from Babcoc power	From Zachar Engr Corp	From Zachar Engr Corp	From Zachar Engr Corp				
		114.1	114.1	84.4	100.0	90.06	110.6	96.2	105.5	102.9	118.7
		95.9	95.9	35.0	93.1	83.0	102.5	72.8	82.1	83.1	103.0
		104.9	104.9	41.0	93.0	83.0	104.5	79.8	89.1	90.1	109.0
		110.9	110.9	49.0	92.8	83.0	104.5	84.8	94.1	93.1	112.0
		106.0	106.0	63.0	93.0	83.0	103.5	89.8	99.1	95.1	111.0
		101.7	101.7	77.0	93.2	83.0	100.5	95.8	105.1	100.1	114.0
		104.0	104.0	90.0	92.6	83.0	94.5	95.8	105.1	103.1	118.0
		109.0	109.0	93.0	93.1	83.0	87.5	100.8	110.1	112.1	124.0
	31	114.0	114.0	104.0	93.2	83.0	77.5	98.8	108.1	113.1	129.0
	Run	111.0	111.0	104.0	106.0	96.0	77.5	98.8	102.1	117.1	132.0
Montville Biomass Noise Control	3 Jun-09	Filters at Hogger, Lw	Filters at Metering Bins. Lw	ID fan, SPL	Truck Dumper, (Down), Lw	Truck Dumper, (idling), Lw	Hogger, Lw	Transformers-Aux; Lw	Transformers-main; Lw	Unit 5 bldg, Lw	Unit 6 bldg, Lw

Traffic Report

NRG Montville Power Biomass Project Montville, Connecticut

Shaw Environmental, Inc. May 22, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2
EXISTING ROAD CONDITIONS	3
TRIP GENERATION (During Construction)	
TRIP GENERATION (During Operation)	7
TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT	
LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) ANALYSIS	
Level of Service Defined	
Existing Level of Service	10
No Build Level of Service	11
Future Level of Service During Construction	12
Future level of Service After Project Completion	12
ACCIDENT DATA	14
RECOMMENDATIONS	16

LIST OF FIGURES

C-1	Civil Site Plan	6
VM-1	Vicinity Map and Trip Distribution	8

LIST OF TABLES

1	Manpower Loading Estimate	4
2.	Trip Generation Table – Traffic During Construction Vehicle Trips	5
3.	Trip Generation Table – During Operation Traffic Vehicular Trips	7
4.	Level of Service Defined	9
5.	Level of Service Summary	13
6.	Accident Summary	14
7.	Turn Radius Table	16

APPENDIX

- A. Traffic Flow Maps
- B. Highway Capacity Software (HCS+) Level of Service Calculations
- C. Photographs
- D. CDOT Accident Experience Report
- E. Manual Traffic Counts
- F. ConnDOT Maximum Vehicle Loads
- G. Minimum Turning Radius (WB-62) Semi-trailer Truck with Aerial Photos

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This traffic study has been prepared by Shaw Environmental, Inc. (Shaw) for NRG Montville Power. The Montville Power generating station (Montville) is located in Montville, CT, east of Lathrop Road, approximately 0.25 miles east of State Route 32, just south of Power House Road, and west of the Thames River (Figure VM-1). Montville plans to convert an existing steam boiler to be capable of firing biomass (woodchips), in addition to its existing fuel capabilities.

The Biomass project includes construction of material handling facilities, emission controls and other modifications. Located just north of the substation, the civil site plan (Figure C-1 on pg 6) shows a truck loop road with weigh scales, truck dumpers, receiving hoppers, fuel hog, disc screens, dust collector, and belt conveyors. The biomass (wood chips) will be conveyed to an area just east of the rail spur. At this location the biomass is directed to the rotary screw reclaimer, live storage pile, auxillairy reclaimer, inactive storage pile, and the boiler feed conveyor. The biomass is then conveyed to Unit #5 for combustion. Mechanical dust collectors and a Regenerative Selective Catalyst Reactor will be added to the back end of the boiler.

EXISTING ROAD CONDITIONS

Lathrop Road – The posted speed limit on Lathrop Road is 25 mph. The road is asphalt paved and is generally 24 feet wide, with 2-ft wide gravel and grass shoulders. There is a single yellow centerline. The pavement is in fair condition, and some joint and crack seal repairs have occurred. In the section between Route 32 and the NRG Site Entrance, Lathrop Road is posted "No Thru Traffic Residents Only". For this study, no vehicles will be assigned to the segment of Lathrop Road between Route 32 and the NRG Site driveway.

<u>NRG Site Entrance</u> – The road is asphalt paved and varies in width from 24 to 28 feet. A stop sign is located on the NRG Site Drive at Lathrop Road, however the white stop line is faded.

<u>Power House Road</u> – This local residential street connects Route 32 with Lathrop Road. The posted speed limit is 25 mph. Power House Road is asphalt paved and is approximately 20 feet wide with no shoulders. There is no yellow centerline, and the pavement is in fair condition. The road has a steep profile grade, and has several large trees with low canopies.

<u>Route 32 (Norwich New London Turnpike)</u> – The section of Route 32 from Lathrop Road to Route 163 is posted 40 mph. The road is asphalt paved and is approximately 24 feet wide, with 3 to 6 ft wide paved shoulders. There is a double yellow centerline and the pavement is in very good condition. There is a yellow flashing beacon at Power House Road, a traffic signal at Maple Avenue Extension, and a traffic signal at Route 163. The Rte 163/Rte 32 signal is fully actuated, with variable signal timing.

<u>Route 163</u> – Palmertown Road - The posted speed limit on Route 163 west of Route 32 is 30 mph. The road is asphalt paved and is generally 24 feet wide with 1-2 foot wide paved shoulders. There is a double yellow centerline, and the pavement is in very good condition.

<u>Depot Road</u> - The posted speed limit on Depot Road east of Route 32 is 25 mph. The road is asphalt paved and is approximately 24 feet wide with no shoulders. There is a single yellow centerline and the pavement is in fair condition, and some crack sealing is evident. Metal w-beam guardrail follows most of the north shoulder. Three structures are located within 5 feet of the road way edge.

<u>I-395 Southbound off ramp at Route 163</u> – This off ramp meets at a tee-intersection with Route 163. The ramp widens to provide one left-, and one right-turn lane. The ramp is stop sign controlled, and the white stop line is in good condition. The pavement on both roads is in very good condition.

<u>1-395 Northbound off ramp at Route 163</u> – This off ramp meets at a tee-intersection with Route 163. The ramp widens to provide one left-, and one right-turn lane. The ramp is signal controlled, and the signal cycle varies from 32 to 45 seconds. The pavement markings and white stop lines are in good condition. The pavement on both roads is in very good condition.

TRIP GENERATION (During Construction)

This section estimates the "temporary" traffic related to the additional construction traffic entering and exiting the project site. The plant construction period is estimated to be 21 months, beginning in Early 2010 and ending in Fall 2011. The projected commercial operation date (COD) is November 2011.

The NRG Design Engineer has prepared a "Manpower Loading Estimate" that describes by construction phase the following topics:

- The demolition of various structures, and facilities
- The excavation and construction of new buildings and facilities
- The on-site equipment and manpower needs during construction
- The estimated heavy vehicles arriving at the site that will import and export soil, haul away construction debris, and deliver new materials and equipment.

According to the "Manpower Loading Estimate," the heaviest period for construction traffic will occur in the second quarter of 2011, and the following craft employees are projected.

(A) Quarter, Year	(B) Dayshift Employees	(C) Evening Shift Employees	(C) Total Employees
Q1 2010	10	0	10
Q2 2010	20	0	20
Q3 2010	50	0	50
Q4 2010	50	0	50
Q1 2011	80	0	80
Q2 2011	80	20	100
Q3 2011	40	0	40

Table 1- Manpower Loading Estimate (During construction)

During construction, numerous trades and crafts will be required. The peak quarter (Q2 2011) will have approximately 80 craft employees working the dayshift, and 20 employees working the evening shift. Also, in this quarter about 18 tons of material will be delivered daily, and using a 6 ton truck capacity, then 3 trucks per day will enter the site.

Using the above manpower loading chart, we have developed the "Trip Generation Table – Traffic During Construction".

ΟΤΥ		Daily Tripe	AM 7:15	Peak I to 8:1	Hour 5 AM	PM 4:00	Peak to 5:(Hour 00 PM
Set 1	Trip	(in+out)	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
18	18 ton delivery at 6 tons/truck≕ 3 trucks in/3 trucks out Dayshift 7AM to 4PM Construction Traffic Truck Trips	6	1	0	1	0	1	1
80	Employees Dayshift 7AM to 4PM: Construction Craft Employee Auto Trips	240	40	0	40	0	80	80
20	Employees Evening Shift 4PM to 12Mid Construction Craft Employee Auto Trips	40	0	0	0	20	0	20
	TOTAL		41	0	41	20	81	101

Table 2Trip Generation Table – Montville StationTraffic During Construction (Vehicle Trips)

It is important to note that the above "site trips" are during construction only. This trip generation table includes a number of conservative trip generation assumptions:

- The typical daytime construction work shift is Monday to Friday 7 AM to 4 PM.
- The construction traffic (generator) will arrive prior to the start of the 7:00 dayshift. The peak
 hour of the adjacent street traffic is 7:15 AM to 8:15 AM. We conservatively assume that
 half of the Contractors will arrive on-site prior to 7:15 AM, and half will arrive after 7:15 AM.
- The PM peak hour for the construction traffic (generator) is 4:00 to 5:00 PM, and generally coincides with the PM peak hour of the adjacent street traffic.
- The vehicle occupancy will be 1.0 for all drivers, craft labor, engineers, and inspectors. No employees will carpool.
- For material deliveries, 3 trucks/day will enter, and 3 trucks/day will exit the site. We assume that 15% (rounded up to one truck) will enter during the AM peak hour.
- For material deliveries, 3 trucks/day will enter, and 3 trucks/day will exit the site. We assume that 15% (rounded up to one truck) will exit during the PM peak hour.
- Half of the day workers (40) will exit the site for their lunch break and then return at 1 pm. The vehicle occupancy is 1.0. Daily trips by craft labor are estimated to be 80+40+40+80 = 240 daily trips.
- It is conservatively assumed that all craft site trips entering and exiting the study area are new trips, and that these site trips are not captured or diverted from trips that may already occur on the adjacent street system (i.e. No trips are intercepted or diverted).



Figure C-1 Civil Site Plan

TRIP GENERATION (During Operation)

This section estimates the "site trips" related to operating the NRG Montville facility. After project completion in 2011, during biomass operations we expect the following vehicle trips.

Employee	Daily	A	M Peak Ho	our	Р	M Peak H	our
Employee	(in+out)	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Trucker (woodchips)	40+40	6	6	12	6	6	12

lable 3
Trip Generation Table
Project Completed - Traffic During Biomass Operations (Vehicle Trips)

The above trip generation table includes the following assumptions:

- The typical daytime work shift is Monday to Friday 8 AM to 5 PM.
- For woodchip deliveries, 40 trucks/day will enter the site. We assume that 15% (6 trucks) will enter during the AM peak hour.
- We assume that $15\% \times 40 = 6$ trucks will exit during the PM peak hour.
- NRG proposes to reassign current employees to operate and maintain the biomass conveyors and the facility.

The woodchip truck and trailer length is approximately 69-70 feet. The truck is 8'-6" wide and 13'-0" high. The empty weight of a truck and 2 axle trailer is around 34,000 lbs. They carry a payload of 46,000 lbs of woodchips, and the maximum gross vehicle weight (GVW) is 80,000 lbs. The State of Connecticut maximum GVW is 80,000 lbs for a 4-, 5- or 6- axle semi-trailer. (See details in Appendix F)



TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

Since the segment of Lathrop Road, between Route 32 and the NRG Plant Entrance is posted "No Thru Traffic - Residents Only", no vehicles will be distributed and assigned to this road segment.

Trip Distribution:

The trip distribution is shown on Figure VM-1. All vehicles leaving the NRG plant will be assigned to travel north on Lathrop Road, west on Depot Road to Route 163, and northwest to the I-395 interchange. This is the shortest route to/from I-395 and Exit #79.



FIGURE VM-1 Vicinity Map & Trip Distribution

LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) ANALYSIS

Levels of Service Defined:

The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) is published by the National Science Foundation's Transportation Research Board (TRB). The HCM's analyses are based on determining the capacity of a facility compared to the demand to use the facility. Capacity is determined by such factors as the number of lanes, the type of control (signal or stop sign), the length of a signal cycle, and the amount of green time provided for each movement. The traffic demand on the facility is based on either traffic data collected or a projection of traffic anticipated to use the facility due to anticipated developments. These traffic volumes are adjusted for many factors including the types of vehicles in the traffic stream, the grade of the roadway, and the characteristics of the traffic flow during peak times.

The methodology, in its simplest form, compares the demand to the capacity and identifies the operational conditions as a level of service. Level of service is a letter designation assigned to a specified range of traffic delay values. Delay as calculated using the methodologies of the HCM is the average amount of time required to complete a movement through the intersection. Weighted averages of the movement delays are also reported for each approach to the intersection, and for all intersection approaches.

Table 4 shows the level of service assignments and their associated range of delays in seconds, for both unsignalized (stop controlled) and signalized intersections. The level of service designations and the number of seconds of delay associated with unsignalized intersections varies from signalized intersections because driver perception differs. Longer delays are accepted at signalized intersections since the driving task is simplified through the assignment of the right of way by the traffic signal.

The HCM also calculates queue lengths for movements at the intersection. These queue lengths report the number of vehicles stored while waiting to make each particular movement.

	Unsignalized	d Intersection	Signalized Intersection				
LOS	Control Delay Per Vehicle (sec)	Expected Delay to Minor Street Traffic	Control Delay Per Vehicle (sec)	Expected Delay At Intersection			
A	0 -10	little or no delay	0 - 10	very low delay			
В	10-15	short traffic delays	10 - 20	short traffic delays			
С	15-25	average traffic delays	20 – 35	Average delays, fair progression, number of vehicles stopping is significant though many pass without stopping			
D	25 – 35	long traffic delays	35 – 55	Longer delays, poor progression, influence of congestion becomes more noticeable			
E	35 – 50	very long traffic delays	55 - 80	High delays, long cycles, limit of acceptable delay			
F	50+	extreme delays	80+	over-saturated, arrivals exceed capacity			

Table 4 - Level of Service Defined

Source: Highway Capacity Manual - Special Report 209, TRB, National Research Council, Washington, D.C. 2000.

One great benefit of the HCM is that it provides a standard analysis method for each facility type regardless of where the facility is located.

EXISTING LEVEL OF SERVICE

The study area includes the following intersections:

- 1. Route 163 at I-395 SB Ramp
- 2. Route 163 at I-395 NB Ramp
- 3. Route 163 at Route 32
- 4. Lathrop Road at Route 163
- 5. Lathrop Road at NRG Montville Site Entrance

AM and PM peak hour manual traffic counts were conducted from April 6, 2009 through April 8, 2009. The two-hour AM, and two-hour PM counts, with 15-minute summaries are shown in Appendix E.

<u>Route 163 at I-395 SB Ramp</u>: The AM/PM peak hour volume is 854/803 vph at this location. The AM peak hour occurred from 7:15 to 8:15 AM and the PM peak hour occurred from 4:15 to 5:15 PM. The existing AM/PM level of service is LOS C/B. The vehicle delay and LOS calculations are shown in Appendix B.

<u>Route 163 at I-395 NB Ramp</u>: The AM/PM peak hour volume is 750/847 vph at this location. The AM peak hour occurred from 7:15 to 8:15 AM and the PM peak hour occurred from 4:30 to 5:30 PM. The existing AM/PM level of service is LOS A/A. The vehicle delay and LOS calculations are shown in Appendix B.

<u>Route 163 at Route 32:</u> The AM/PM peak hour volume is 1190/1496 vph at this location. The AM peak hour occurred from 7:15 to 8:15 AM and the PM peak hour occurred from 4:00 to 5:00 PM. The existing AM/PM level of service is LOS B/B. The vehicle delay and LOS calculations are shown in Appendix B.

Lathrop Road at Route 163 (Depot Road and Pink Row): The AM/PM peak hour volume is 100/145 vph at this location. The AM peak hour occurred from 7:15 to 8:15 AM and the PM peak hour occurred from 5:00 to 6:00 PM. The existing AM/PM level of service is LOS A/A. The vehicle delay and LOS calculations are shown in Appendix B.

Lathrop Road at NRG Montville Site Entrance: The AM/PM peak hour volume is 36/78 vph at this location. The AM peak hour occurred from 7:15 to 8:15 AM and the PM peak hour occurred from 5:00 to 6:00 PM. The existing AM/PM level of service is LOS A/A. The vehicle delay and LOS calculations are shown in Appendix B.

NO BUILD LEVEL OF SERVICE

Based on discussion with the Town of Montville Public Works Department, Mr. Don Bourdeau, there are no roadway or signal improvements planned for Rte 163, Depot Road or Lathrop Road. We have contacted the Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT) and the Traffic Forecasting Section (Mr. Mike Connors) suggested that we apply a 1% per year annual traffic growth rate to account for normal traffic growth.

Traffic volumes were projected that should exist in the year 2011, without construction of the NRG project. The existing 2009 volumes were increased by a 1% per year annual growth rate. This No Build condition is used as the baseline to understand what the future LOS would be in 2011 without the proposed NRG project (Table 7.2). The HCS+ level of service worksheets are shown in Appendix B.

FUTURE LEVEL OF SERVICE DURING CONSTRUCTION (Qtr 1 2010 to Qtr 3 2011)

The "During construction" traffic shown in Trip Generation Table 2 was added to the "2011 No Build" traffic volumes, and the LOS calculations were performed. Table 5 shows the LOS summary.

<u>Route 163 at I-395 SB Ramp:</u> The AM/PM peak hour volume will increase by 21/51 vph at this location. The AM/PM level of service during construction is projected to be LOS C/B.

<u>Route 163 at I-395 NB Ramp</u>: The AM/PM peak hour volume will increase by 41/101 vph at this location. The AM/PM level of service during construction is projected to be LOS A/A.

<u>Route 163 at Route 32:</u> The AM/PM peak hour volume will increase by 41/101 vph at this location. The AM/PM level of service during construction is projected to be LOS B/B.

Lathrop Road at Depot Road and Pink Row: The AM/PM peak hour volume will increase by 41/101 vph at this location. The AM/PM level of service during construction is projected to be LOS A/A.

Lathrop Road at NRG Montville Site Entrance: The AM/PM peak hour volume will increase by 41/101 vph at this location. The AM/PM level of service during construction is projected to be LOS A/A.

FUTURE LEVEL OF SERVICE AFTER PROJECT COMPLETION

The permanent traffic shown in the Trip Generation Table 3 was added to the 2011 No Build traffic volumes, and the LOS calculations were performed. Table 5 shows the LOS summary.

<u>Route 163 at I-395 SB Ramp</u>: The AM/PM peak hour volume will increase by 3/3 vph at this location. The AM/PM level of service during construction is projected to be LOS C/B.

<u>Route 163 at I-395 NB Ramp</u>: The AM/PM peak hour volume will increase by 6/6 vph at this location. The AM/PM level of service during construction is projected to be LOS A/A.

<u>Route 163 at Route 32:</u> The AM/PM peak hour volume will increase by 6/6 vph at this location. The AM/PM level of service during construction is projected to be LOS B/B.

Lathrop Road at Depot Road and Pink Row: The AM/PM peak hour volume will increase by 6/6 vph at this location. The AM/PM level of service during construction is projected to be LOS A/A.

Lathrop Road at NRG Montville Site Entrance: The AM/PM peak hour volume will increase by 6/6 vph at this location. The AM/PM level of service during construction is projected to be LOS A/A.

TABLE 5 LOS SUMMARY TABLE

Level of Service 2009 Existing, 2011 No Build, 2011 During Construction and 2011 Project Complete Conditions																
	AM Peak Hour								PM Peak Hour							
	2009 Exist		2011 No-Build		2011 During Construction		2011 Project Complete		2009 Exist		2011 No-Build		2011 During Construction		2011 Project Complete	
Intersection	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
Route 163 at I-395 SB Ramp	С	18.5	с	19.1	С	21.9	с	19.8	в	13.1	В	13.3	В	13.9	В	13.4
Route 163 at I-395 NB Ramp (signal)	A	6.1	A	6.2	A	7.0	А	6.2	A	8.2	A	8.2	A	8.2	A	8.3
Route 163 Depot Rd at Route 32 (signal)	В	12.6	В	12.8	В	12.8	В	12.8	в	17.1	В	18.5	В	18.7	В	18.5
Lathrop Rd Depot Rd Pink Row	A	7.4	A	7.4	A	7.3	A	7.5	А	7.5	А	7.5	A	8.2	A	7.8
Lathrop Rd at NRG Site Entrance	A	8.6	A	8.6	A	8.9	A	9.4	A	8.7	A	8.7	A	9.0	A	8.9

ACCIDENT DATA

The Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT) uses historical accident data as an important component in its ongoing evaluation of Connecticut's public highways, streets and roads. Accident data plays an integral part in ConnDOT's responsibilities for maintaining the state highway system, and is a key factor in the decision making process for roadway improvements and modifications.

Shaw contacted ConnDOT (Mr. Angelo Asaro and Mr. Craig Mandell) and requested and received accident data for the most recent 3-year period (July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008) for the following locations:

Intersection	Total Acc.	Fatal	Inj A	Inj B	Inj C	PDO	Day/ night	Wet/ dry	Cars,Vans, Truck ST	Truck DT, Combin.
I-395 SB Ramp near Rte 163	4	0	1	0	2	1	3/1	1/3	4	0
I-395 NB Ramp near Rte 163	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Rte 32 near Rte 163	15	0	0	1	0	14	12/3	2/13	14	1
Rte 163 near Rte 32	6	0	0	1	0	5	4/2	1/5	6	0
Depot Rd at Pink Row at Lathrop Rd	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Lathrop Rd at Site Entry	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Lathrop Rd near Dock Rd	1	0	0	0	0	-1	0/1	0/1	0	1
Rte 32 near Powerhouse Rd	6	0	0	0	2	4	5/1	0/6	6	0
Total	32	0	1	2	4	25	24/8	4/28	30	2 ·

TABLE 6 ACCIDENT SUMMARY TABLE

Footnotes:

ND = No ConnDOT accident data provided.

Inj A = Incapacitating Injury

Inj B = Non-incapacitating Injury

Inj C = Possible Injury

PDO = Property damage only

Truck ST = Truck Single Unit Single Tires

Truck DT, Combin. = Truck Dual Tires, truck trailer combination

The above data is shown in Appendix D. The ConnDOT Accident Records and Statistics Section of the Office of Inventory and Forecasting is responsible for the codification, maintenance and compilation of motor vehicle traffic accident data. Each police department investigates and documents the reportable motor vehicle accidents, and forwards a copy of the police accident report to ConnDOT. A reportable motor vehicle accident is defined as one in which any person is killed or injured, or in which damage to the property of any one individual is in excess of one thousand dollars.

At the above locations, the contributing factors to each accident were:

- 9 by following too close,
- 8 by failure to grant right of way,
- 3 by an improper passing maneuver.
- 3 by speeding or too fast for conditions
- 3 by lost control,
- 2 by mechanical failure
- 1 by driving wrong way on ramp
- 1 by driver being inattentive,
- 1 by using the wrong turn signal, and
- 1 by unknown or conflicting stories.

Most accidents occurred during the day (24 of 32), and most accidents occurred on a dry road surface (28 of 32).

At the above locations, the types of accidents were:

- Zero fatality type accidents
- 1 Injury Type A accidents (Incapacitating)
- 2 Injury Type B accidents (non-incapacitating)
- 4 injury Type C accidents (possible injury)
- 25 Property damage only accidents

There were 2 accidents involving a truck (with dual tires or trailer combination).

- A truck was on Lathrop Road near Dock Road turning right and struck a fire hydrant. This was a single vehicle, property damage only type accident.
- A truck heading north on Rte 32 passed a NB car on the right side, and had a sideswipe accident. Two vehicles were involved, and was a property damage only type accident.

Shaw requested that ConnDOT provide us with the "Suggested List of Surveillance Study Sites" (SLOSSS). The SLOSSS list provides locations that experienced abnormally high accident rates for the corresponding 3-year period. The objective in developing SLOSSS is to define those locations which have the greatest promise of accident reduction and thus to give a broad measure of overall needs of highway safety improvements. Unfortunately, Mr. Craig Mandell (ConnDOT) stated that due to an ongoing State Court case, ConnDOT cannot provide us with a copy of the SLOSSS list.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Roadway Operations During Construction (Qtr 1 2010 to Qtr 3 2011):

The construction-related traffic will arrive on-site just prior to the start of the 7:00 AM dayshift. The peak hour of adjacent street traffic is 7:15 to 8:15 AM. To be conservative, we have assigned half of these AM construction worker trips to occur in the 7:15 to 8:15 AM peak hour window. The construction traffic will depart after 4:00 PM, which coincides with the PM peak hour of adjacent street traffic. The existing traffic volumes are very light along Lathrop Road. The contractor traffic can be easily accommodated on the existing road network. The additional construction traffic will have a minimal and temporary impact on intersection delays and operations. The AM and PM intersection delays will increase, but the level of service (LOS) at the 5 intersections will remain unchanged. All locations will operate at LOS C (or better) levels. No capacity-related improvements are required.

Roadway Operations after Project Completion:

The Biomass project will generate 6 inbound and 6 outbound truck trips during the AM and PM peak hours. The completed project will generate fewer trips than the "During Construction" scenario. The AM and PM intersection delays will increase slightly as compared to 2009 Existing conditions, but the level of service (LOS) at the 5 intersections will remain unchanged. No capacity-related improvements are required.

Turning Geometry:

The Biomass woodchip trucks will be conducting left- and right-turn moves at 4 of the study area intersections. The minimum turning template for the woodchip semi-trailer (WB-62) is shown in Appendix G. The minimum turn radius of the inside tire for the woodchip semi-trailer is 45 feet.

Location	Movement	Measured Radius* (inside tire)	Acceptable?
Route 163 at I-395 SB Ramp	WB to NB right turn	90 ft	Yes
Route 163 at I-395 NB Ramp (signal)	WB to NB right turn	90 ft	Yes
Route 163 at Route 32 (signal)	EB thru, and WB thru	Straight movement	Yes
Depot Road at Pink Row at Lathrop Road	EB to SB right turn	110 ft	Yes
Lathrop Road at NRG Site Entrance	WB to NB right turn	60 ft	Yes

TABLE 7: Turn Radius Table

* See Appendix G for aerial photo and measured radius at each intersection.

We have measured the actual curb (fillet) radius for the above intersections. All curb (fillet) radii exceed 45 feet and are acceptable, and the swept path of the wood chip truck tires will stay on the pavement surface.

Parking:

It is expected that the contractor vehicles and equipment will be located on the NRG property about 100 yards east of Lathrop Road in the temporary staging and parking area. No NRG or Contractor vehicles will be parking along Lathrop Road. All visitors will be directed to park at the Visitor parking lot, inside the property fence.

Pavement markings:

During our site visit we noted the following roadway pavement marking issues.

A white stop line should be re-applied at the following locations: NRG Site Drive at Lathrop Road (WB approach) Lathrop Road at Depot Road (NB and EB approaches)

A yellow centerline should be re-applied on:

Route 163 from Route 32 to Lathrop Road (1,200 ft) Lathrop Road from Route 163 to Route 32 (4,500 ft).

Re-applying the above pavement markings are routine maintenance tasks, typically scheduled every 2 or 3 years, and the markings are not required for conditional approval of this project.
APPENDIX A

TRAFFIC FLOW MAPS





















APPENDIX B

Level of Service Calculations HCS+ Software for Intersections

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY_____

Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed Analysis Time Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. C Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Stre North/South St Intersection O	The : 4/2: Period: AM 1 1 ustomary 200: et: Rout reet: Rout rientation:	Shaw Gro 2/2009 Exist 9 te 163 te 395 S EW	Dup Ramps		Study p	eriod (h	rs): 1.0	
• •	Voh			d 7.45				
Major Street.	Approach	ICIE VOIG	umes an	α Ααງ	ustment	S	und	
	Movement	 1	2	3	1 4	westbo	ana c	
	110 / 6110110	т.	<u>ሮ</u> ጥ	R	1 7	່ ຫ	U a	
			-		1 -	· -	IX IX	
Volume	***	179	290			10	2 84	
Peak-Hour Fact	or, PHF	0.95	0.95			· 0.	95 0.95	
Hourly Flow Ra	te, HFR	188	305			10	7 88	
Percent Heavy	Vehicles	4						
Median Type/St	orage	Undivi	ded		1			
RT Channelized	?	•						
Lanes		0	1			1	0	
Configuration		LJ	7				TR	
Upstream Signa	1?		No			No		
	•							
Minor Street:	Approach	Nor	thboun	d		Southb	ound	
	Movement	7	8	9	1	0 11	12	
		\mathbf{L}	Т	·R	L	т	R	
Volume					1	11	88	
Peak Hour Facto	or, PHF				0	.95	0.95	
Hourly Flow Rat	te, HFR	·		*	1	16	92	
Percent Heavy	Vehicles				4		4	
Percent Grade	(응)	_	0			0		
Flared Approach	h: Exists?/	Storage			/			1
Lanes						1	1	•
Configuration						\mathbf{L}	R	
	····							
	_							
	Delay, Ç	ueue Len	gth, a	nd Lev	vel of	Service		
Approach	EB	WB	Nor	thbour	nd	Sc	outhbound	
Movement	1	4	7	8	9	10	11	12
Lane Config	LT					L		R
	100							
v (vph)	188					116		92
C(m) (vph)	1366					290		890
V/C	0.14					0.40		0.10
95% queue lengt	ch 0.48					1.96		0.35
Control Delay	8.1					25.6		9.5
LOS	А					D		А
Approach Delay							18.5	
Approach LOS							С	
					······			

٠

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY_____

Vehicle Volumes and AdjustmentsMajor Street:Approach MovementEastbound IWestbound Movement123 456LTR LTRVolume18329610486Peak-Hour Factor, PHF0.950.950.95Hourly Flow Rate, HFR192311109Percent Heavy Vehicles4Madian Type/StorageUndivided//RT Channelized?0110ConfigurationLTRIUpstream Signal?NoNoNoMinor Street:Approach MovementNorthboundSouthbound MovementMoume789 1011Percent Heavy Vehicles127Percent Heavy Vehicles44Percent Heavy Vehicles00Percent Heavy Vehicles00Percent Grade (%)00Plared Approach:Exists?/Storage/Lane Config1478V(vph)19211694Volume203867v(vph)1361263867v/c0.140.420.11St queue length0.420.11St queue length019.1St queue length00St queue length0.420.12St queue length0.492.09 </th <th>Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed: Analysis Time Performed: Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Cus Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street North/South Street Intersection Or:</th> <th>The 4/22 eriod: AM N 1 stomary t: Rout t: Rout ientation:</th> <th>Shaw Gr /2009 o Build e 163 e 395 S EW</th> <th>Ramps</th> <th>S</th> <th>Study</th> <th>peri</th> <th>od (hrs)</th> <th>: 1.00</th> <th></th>	Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed: Analysis Time Performed: Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Cus Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street North/South Street Intersection Or:	The 4/22 eriod: AM N 1 stomary t: Rout t: Rout ientation:	Shaw Gr /2009 o Build e 163 e 395 S EW	Ramps	S	Study	peri	od (hrs)	: 1.00	
Vehicle Volumes and AdjustmentsMajor Street:Approach MovementEastbound IWestbound MovementMajor Street:Approach LTRIIMajor Street:Approach LTRIIVolume183296 S10486 SPeak-Hour Factor, PHF1.92311 Percent Heavy Vehicles10990Percent Heavy Vehicles4 I I I IMedian Type/Storage UndividedUndivided I/TRRT Chanelized? Lanes0110Configuration MorementT891011Minor Street:Approach MovementNorthbound NoSouthbound MovementMinor Street:Approach ResterNorthbound NoSouthbound MovementMourly Flow Rate, HFR Percent Heavy Vehicles113 490 4Percent Grade (%) Flared Approach:011Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service Approach11Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service Approach111Lanes C1111Volume1361 4283 4887 4112 4Approach192 4118 494Charles C0.14 420.9 40.36 4Approach192 4118 494Configuration111Movement	1 - 22 - 222									
Major Street:Approach MovementLastbound LWestbound TWestbound TMovement123 456LTR LTRVolume1832960.950.950.95Peak-Hour Factor, PHF0.950.950.950.95Hourly Flow Rate, HFR19231110990Percent Heavy Vehicles4Median Type/StorageUndivided/rrrrRT Channelized?0110Lanes01112ConfigurationNoNoNoMinor Street:Approach MovementNorthbound MovementSouthbound MovementPeak Hour Factor, PHF0.950.95Hourly Flow Rate, HFR Percent Grade (%)00Parcent Heavy Vehicles44Percent Grade (%)00Flared Approach Movement11Lanes111Configuration111Lanes111Lanes111Delay, Queue Length, and Level of ServiceSouthboundMovement184ApproachEBWBNorthboundMovement111Lanes111Lanes111ConfigLT11Movement <th>Maton Chaster 1</th> <th>Vehi</th> <th>cie Voi</th> <th>umes ai</th> <th>nd Adju</th> <th>istmei</th> <th>nts</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Maton Chaster 1	Vehi	cie Voi	umes ai	nd Adju	istmei	nts			
Hovement 1 2 3 1 4 5 6 L T R I L T R Volume 163 296 104 86 Peak-Hour Factor, PHF 0.95 0.95 0.95 0.95 Hourly Flow Rate, HFR 192 311 109 90 Percent Heavy Vehicles 4 Median Type/Storage Undivided / TR 109 90 Percent Heavy Vehicles 0 1 1 0 Configuration LT TR Upstream Signal? No No No Movement 7 8 9 10 11 12 L T R I L T R 10 11 12 L T R I L T R 4 4 Percent Signal? 0 0 0 0 0 118 94 Percent Heavy Vehicles 4 4 4<	Major Screet: A	Approach	Ea	stbound	1		W	estbound	~	
J I K I T R Volume 183 296 104 86 Peak-Hour Factor, PHF 0.95 0.95 0.95 0.95 Hourly Plow Rate, HFR 192 311 109 90 Percent Heavy Vehicles 4 Median Type/Storage Undivided / RT Channelized? 0 1 1 0 Configuration LT TR 1 0 Configuration LT TR No No Minor Street: Approach Northbound Southbound Southbound Movement 7 8 9 10 11 12 L T R L T R 4 4 Percent Heavy Vehicles 0 0 0 1 1 1 Configuration L R 1 1 1 1 1	Ľ	lovement	L T	۲ ۳	3 n	1	4 T	5	6	
Volume 183 296 104 86 Peak-Hour Factor, PHF 0.95 0.95 0.95 0.95 Hourly Flow Rate, HFR 192 311 109 90 Percent Heavy Vehicles 4 Median Type/Storage Undivided / RT Tamesignal? Lanes 0 1 1 0 Configuration LT TR TR Upstream Signal? No No Minor Street: Approach Northbound Southbound Movement 7 8 9 10 11 12 L T R L T R 4 Percent Factor, PHF 0.95 0.95 0.95 118 94 Percent Factor, PHF 0.95 0.95 0 0 12 Flared Approach: Exists?/Storage / / 1 1 Configuration L R - - - -			Ц	T	R	ł	Ъ	1.	R	
Peak-Hour Factor, PHF 0.95 <t< td=""><td>Volume</td><td></td><td>183</td><td>296</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>104</td><td>06</td><td></td></t<>	Volume		183	296				104	06	
Hourly Flow Rate, HFR192311 0.93 0.93 0.93 Percent Heavy Vehicles4Median Type/StorageUndivided/10RT Channelized?0110Lanes0110ConfigurationLTTRUpstream Signal?NoNoMinor Street:ApproachNorthboundSouthboundMovement7891011LTR11Peak Hour Factor, PHF0.950.95Hourly Flow Rate, HFR11894Percent Heavy Vehicles44Percent Grade (%)00Flared Approach:Exists?/Storage/	Peak-Hour Factor	· PHF	0 95	0 95				104		
Percent Heavy Vehicles410390Median Type/StorageUndivided/RT Channelized?110Lanes0110ConfigurationLTTRUpstream Signal?NoNoMinor Street:ApproachNorthboundSouthboundMovement789101112LTRLTRVolume11390Peak Hour Factor, PHF0.950.95Hourly Flow Rate, HFR11894Percent Grade (%)00Flared Approach:Exists?/Storage/Lanes111ConfigurationLRMovement147ApproachEBWBNorthboundMovement147Lanes1112Lane ConfigLTIRv (vph)19211894C(m) (vph)1361283Squeue length0.420.112.090.360Control DelayADApproach LoSADApproach DelayAApproach LoSALane19.1Approach DelayAApproach LoSC	Hourly Flow Rate	A HFR	192	311				100	0.95	
Median Type/Storage Undivided / RT Channelized? 0 1 1 0 Configuration LT TR Upstream Signal? No No Minor Street: Approach Northbound Southbound Movement 7 8 9 10 11 12 L T R L T R Volume 113 90 Peak Hour Factor, PHF 0.95 0.95 Hourly Flow Rate, HFR 118 94 Percent Grade (%) 0 0 Flared Approach: Exists?/Storage / / Lanes 1 1 1 Configuration L R	Percent Heavy Ve	hicles	4					109	90	
RT Channelized? Lanes 0 1 1 0 Configuration LT TR Upstream Signal? No No Minor Street: Approach Northbound Southbound Movement 7 8 9 10 11 12 L T R L T R Volume 113 90 Peak Hour Factor, PHF 0.95 0.95 Hourly Flow Rate, HFR 118 94 Percent Heavy Vehicles 4 4 Percent Grade (%) 0 0 Flared Approach: Exists?/Storage / / / Lanes 1 1 Configuration L R 	Median Type/Stor	aue	Undiv	ided			,			
Lanes 0 1 1 0 Configuration LT TR Upstream Signal? No No Minor Street: Approach Northbound Southbound Movement 7 8 9 1 10 11 12 L T R L T R Volume 113 90 Peak Hour Factor, PHF 0.95 0.95 Hourly Flow Rate, HFR 118 94 Percent Heavy Vehicles 4 4 Percent Grade (%) 0 0 Flared Approach: Exists?/Storage / / / Lanes 1 1 1 Configuration L R Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service Approach EB WB Northbound Southbound Movement 1 4 7 8 9 10 11 12 Lane Config LT L R v (vph) 192 118 94 v (vph) 192 118 94 v/c 0.14 0.42 0.11 95% queue length 0.49 2.09 0.36 Control Delay 8.1 266.7 9.5 LOS A M D A Approach Delay 19.1 Approach Delay 19.1 Approach Delay 19.1 Approach Delay 19.1 Approach LOS C	BT Channelized?	.ugc	onarv	Ideu						
Configuration LT TR Upstream Signal? No No Minor Street: Approach Movement Northbound T Southbound Movement Volume 7 8 9 10 11 12 L T R L T R Volume 113 90 Peak Hour Factor, PHF 0.95 0.95 Hourly Flow Rate, HFR 118 94 Percent Grade (%) 0 0 Flared Approach: Exists?/Storage / Lanes 1 1 Configuration L R	Lanes	· ·	0	1				1 (h	
Destream Signal? No No Minor Street: Approach Movement Northbound L Southbound Southbound L Southbound II Volume 7 8 9 10 11 12 L T R L T R Volume 113 90 Peak Hour Factor, PHF 0.95 0.95 Hourly Flow Rate, HFR 118 94 Percent Heavy Vehicles 4 4 Percent Grade (%) 0 0 Flared Approach: Exists?/Storage / / Lanes 1 1 1 Configuration L R	Configuration		т.,	ጥ				יים בייט ניתי) 2	
Portoun organ:NONOMinor Street:Approach MovementNorthbound SouthboundSouthbound 11 $Minor Street:ApproachLTRITRIILTRLTVolume11390Peak Hour Factor, PHF0.950.95Hourly Flow Rate, HFR11894Percent Heavy Vehicles44Percent Grade (%)00Flared Approach:Exists?/Storage/Lanes11ConfigurationLR$	Upstream Signal?	>	Ц	No			•	No	(
Minor Street:Approach MovementNorthbound 7Southbound 1111LTR101112LTRLTRVolume11390Peak Hour Factor, PHF0.950.95Hourly Flow Rate, HFR11894Percent Heavy Vehicles44Percent Grade (%)00Flared Approach:Exists?/Storage/Lanes11ConfigurationLRMovement14147SouthboundSouthboundMovement14111Lane ConfigLTV (vph)192118Queue Length11894283887v/c0.1495% queue length0.492090.36Control Delay8.1Approach LoS19.1Approach LoSC	opooloum orgnur.	•		NO				NO		
Movement789 101112LTRILTRVolume11390Peak Hour Factor, PHF0.950.95Hourly Flow Rate, HFR11894Percent Heavy Vehicles44Percent Grade (%)00Flared Approach:Exists?/Storage//Lanes111ConfigurationLRDelay, Queue Length, and Level of ServiceSouthboundMovement147811112Lane ConfigLTILRV (vph)1361283887v (vph)19211894C(m) (vph)13612.090.36Control Delay8.126.79.5LOSADAApproach LoSC19.1	Minor Street: A	Approach	No	rthbour	nd		S	authhound	1	
LTRIITRVolumeII390Peak Hour Factor, PHF0.950.95Hourly Flow Rate, HFR11894Percent Heavy Vehicles44Percent Grade (%)00Flared Approach:Exists?/Storage/Lanes11ConfigurationLRDelay, Queue Length, and Level of Service/ApproachEBWBNorthboundMovement1478V (vph)19211894C(m) (vph)1361283887v/c0.140.420.1195% queue length0.492.090.36Control Delay8.126.79.5LOSAD19.1Approach LOSC19.1	N	lovement	7	8	9	t	10	11	12	
Volume 113 90 Peak Hour Factor, PHF 0.95 0.95 Hourly Flow Rate, HFR 118 94 Percent Heavy Vehicles 4 4 Percent Grade (%) 0 0 Flared Approach: Exists?/Storage / / Lanes 1 1 1 Configuration L R			T.	С Т	R	1 	т.	ሞ	D D	
Volume11390Peak Hour Factor, PHF 0.95 0.95 Hourly Flow Rate, HFR 118 94 Percent Heavy Vehicles 4 4 Percent Grade (%) 0 0 Flared Approach: Exists?/Storage $/$ $/$ Lanes 1 1 ConfigurationLR			-	-		•		-	IX.	
Peak Hour Factor, PHF 0.95 0.95 Hourly Flow Rate, HFR 118 94 Percent Heavy Vehicles 4 4 Percent Grade (%) 0 0 Flared Approach:Exists?/Storage $/$ Lanes 1 1 Configuration L R	Volume						113		90	
Hourly Flow Rate, HFR11894Percent Heavy Vehicles00Percent Grade (%)00Flared Approach: Exists?/Storage//Lanes11ConfigurationLR	Peak Hour Factor	, PHF					0.95		0.95	
Percent Heavy Vehicles 4 4 Percent Grade (%) 0 0 Flared Approach: Exists?/Storage / / Lanes 1 1 Configuration L R	Hourly Flow Rate	HFR					118		94	
Percent Grade (%)000Flared Approach:Exists?/Storage//Lanes11ConfigurationLR	Percent Heavy Ve	hicles					4		4	
Flared Approach: Exists?/Storage / / Lanes 1 1 Configuration L R	Percent Grade (%	;)		0				0	-	
Lanes Configuration111Delay, Queue Length, and Level of ServiceApproachEBWBNorthboundMovement14789Lane ConfigLTILRv (vph)19211894C(m) (vph)1361283887v/c0.140.420.1195% queue length0.492.090.36Control Delay8.126.79.5LOSADAApproach LOSC19.1	Flared Approach:	Exists?/	Storage			1		-		1
Configuration L R	Lanes		-			•	1	1		•
Delay, Queue Length, and Level of ServiceApproachEBWBNorthboundSouthboundMovement14789101112Lane ConfigLTIIIRRv (vph)19211894C(m) (vph)1361283887v/c0.140.420.1195% queue length0.492.090.36Control Delay8.126.79.5LOSADAApproach DelayLOSC	Configuration						- 1	', R	•	
Delay, Queue Length, and Level of ServiceApproachEBWBNorthboundSouthboundMovement14789101112Lane ConfigLT LRRv (vph)19211894C(m) (vph)1361283887v/c0.140.420.1195% queue length0.492.090.36Control Delay8.126.79.5LOSADAApproach Delay19.1Approach LOSCC		_					-			
Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service Approach EB WB Northbound Southbound Movement 1 4 7 8 9 10 11 12 Lane Config LT I I R R v (vph) 192 118 94 C(m) (vph) 1361 283 887 v/c 0.14 0.42 0.11 95% queue length 0.49 2.09 0.36 Control Delay 8.1 26.7 9.5 LOS A D A Approach Delay A D A								······		
Approach EB WB Northbound Southbound Movement 1 4 7 8 9 10 11 12 Lane Config LT L R 11 12 v (vph) 192 118 94 C(m) (vph) 1361 283 887 v/c 0.14 0.42 0.11 95% queue length 0.49 2.09 0.36 Control Delay 8.1 26.7 9.5 LOS A D A Approach Delay 19.1 C 19.1 Approach LOS C C C		Delay, Qu	ieue Ler	ngth, a	nd Lev	el of	Serv	vice		
Movement 1 4 7 8 9 10 11 12 Lane Config LT I I R R v (vph) 192 118 94 C(m) (vph) 1361 283 887 v/c 0.14 0.42 0.11 95% queue length 0.49 2.09 0.36 Control Delay 8.1 26.7 9.5 LOS A D A Approach Delay 19.1 C	Approach	EB	WB	Nor	thboun	d		South	bound	
Lane Config LT I I R v (vph) 192 118 94 C(m) (vph) 1361 283 887 v/c 0.14 0.42 0.11 95% queue length 0.49 2.09 0.36 Control Delay 8.1 26.7 9.5 LOS A D A Approach Delay 19.1 C	Movement	1	4	7	8	9	ł	10 1	.1	12
v (vph) 192 118 94 C(m) (vph) 1361 283 887 v/c 0.14 0.42 0.11 95% queue length 0.49 2.09 0.36 Control Delay 8.1 26.7 9.5 LOS A D A Approach Delay 19.1 200 Approach LOS C C	Lane Config	\mathtt{LT}	ł				1	L	3	R
v (vph) 192 118 94 C(m) (vph) 1361 283 887 v/c 0.14 0.42 0.11 95% queue length 0.49 2.09 0.36 Control Delay 8.1 26.7 9.5 LOS A D A Approach Delay 19.1 C Approach LOS C C										
C(m) (vph) 1361 283 887 v/c 0.14 0.42 0.11 95% queue length 0.49 2.09 0.36 Control Delay 8.1 26.7 9.5 LOS A D A Approach Delay 19.1 C	v (vph)	192						118		94
v/c 0.14 0.42 0.11 95% queue length 0.49 2.09 0.36 Control Delay 8.1 26.7 9.5 LOS A D A Approach Delay 19.1 C	C(m) (vph)	1361						283	8	387
95% queue length 0.49 2.09 0.36 Control Delay 8.1 26.7 9.5 LOS A D A Approach Delay 19.1 C Approach LOS C C	v/c	0.14						0.42	(0.11
Control Delay8.126.79.5LOSADAApproach Delay19.1Approach LOSC	95% queue length	0.49						2.09	. (0.36
LOS A D A Approach Delay 19.1 Approach LOS C	Control Delay	8.1						26.7	(9.5
Approach Delay 19.1 Approach LOS C	LOS	А						D	-	A
Approach LOS C	Approach Delay							1	9.1	
	Approach LOS							-	c	•
		·			· .					

-

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY

Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed: Analysis Time Pe Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Cus Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street North/South Stre Intersection Ori	The S 4/22/ riod: AM Du 1 tomary : Route et: Route entation: E	Shaw Gro /2009 aring Co = 163 = 395 S	oup onstruct Ramps	ion	Study peri	.od (hrs)	: 1.0	0
	, 	·						
Major Streatt A	Vehic	te Volu	imes and	i Adj	ustments			
Major Street, M	ovement	1 1	2	2	1 A	restbound	6	
11	ovenent.	L	Z. T	R	4 L	T	R	
Volume		183	296			104	96	
Peak-Hour Factor	PHF	105 n 95	2.90 A 95			104	00	
Hourly Flow Rate	HFR	192	311			109	0.90	
Percent Heavy Ve	hicles	4						
Median Type/Stor	age	Undivi	ded		/			
RT Channelized?								
Lanes		0	1			1 ()	
Configuration		LJ				TI	3	
Upstream Signal?			No			No		
Minor Street: A	pproach	Noi	thbound	<u> </u>	S	outhbound	1	
М	ovement	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	-	L	Т	R	L	\mathbf{T}	R	
Volume					124			
Peak Hour Factor	PHF				134		90	
Hourly Flow Rate	, HFR				141		94	
Percent Heavy Ve	, hicles				4		4	
Percent Grade (%)		0		-	0		
Flared Approach:	Exists?/S	torage			/			1
Lanes		-			1	1	6	•
Configuration						L R		
						·····		
	Delay, Qu	leue Len	igth, an	d Le	vel of Ser	vice		
Approach	EB	WB	Nort	hbou	nd	South	bound	
Movement	1	4	7	8	9 [10 1	.1	12
Lane Conrig	LT	i			1	Ь		R
v (vph)	192					141		94
C(m) (vph)	1361					283		887
V/C	0.14					0.50		0.11
95% queue length	0.49					2.86		0.36
Control Delay	8.1	-				30.2		9.5
TOR	A					D		A
Approach Delay						2	1.9	
Approach LUS							C	
	·			 .,	····	· <u>·</u> ······		

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY

Analyst:								
Agency/Co.:	Shaw Gro	up						
Date Performed:	5/22/200	9						
Analysis Time Period:	AM Build	2011						
Intersection:	1							
Jurisdiction:	-							
Units: U. S. Customary	7							
Analysis Year:	r							
Project ID.								
Fast/Wast Street.	Pto 163							
North (South Street.	RCe 103	5 CP Pom	n n					
Intersection Orientati	NOULE 55	5 55 Kai	ιp	Study	neriod	(hre).	1 00	
intersection offentat.	LOII. EW			bruuy	perrou	(111.5).	1.00	-
	Vehicle	Volumes	and Ad	iustmer	nte			
Major Street: Approa	_veniere	Easthou	und na	Jusemer	West	bound		
Major Screet. Appioa	\rightarrow 1	2	ייים גענע	I.	A	5 5	6	
Hovemen	т.	<u>ح</u> بت	R.	1	т. Т.	ጋ ጥ	R	
	LL	Ť	11		Б	1	IX.	
Volume	18	3 296		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		104	89	
Peak-Hour Factor, PHF	0.	95 0.9	,).5			0.95	0.95	
Hourly Flow Rate, HFR	19	2 311	Ū			109	93	
Percent Heavy Vehicles	s 4		·					
Median Type/Storage	- Un	divided		,	/			
BT Channelized?	~							<i>i</i> .
Lanes		0 1				1 0		
Configuration		LT -				TR		
Upstream Signal?		No				No		
Minor Street: Approad	ch	Northbo	und		Sout	hbound		
Movemer	nt 7	8	9	1	10	11	12	
	\mathbf{L}	\mathbf{T}	R	ļ	L	T	R	
Volume					116		90	
Peak Hour Factor, PHF					0.95		0.95	
Hourly Flow Rate, HFR					122		94	
Percent Heavy Vehicles	5				5	_	4	
Percent Grade (%)		0				0		
Flared Approach: Exis	sts?/Stor	age		/				/
Lanes					1	1		
Configuration					Г	R		
Dela	av. Queue	Length.	and Le	evel of	- Servic	6		
Approach	R WR	Dengen,	lorthbo	ind	Dervie	South	hound	
Movement 1	4	1 7	8	9	1 10	11		12
Lane Config L	r q	1 7	0	5		÷	 ו	2
10000 0000 19 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	-	ı			1		•	
v (vph) 19	92				12	2	(94
C(m) (vph) 13	358				28	0	ş	384
v/c 0.	14				0.	4 4	(0.11
95% gueve length 0					2.	25	(0.36
JJo queue renden D.	. 4 9					ý.		
Control Delav 8.	.49 .1				27	.7	ļ	9.6
Control Delay 8. LOS A	.49 .1 A				27 D	.7		9.6 A
Control Delay 8. LOS Approach Delay	. 4 9 . 1 A				27 D	.7 19).8	9.6 A
Control Delay 8. LOS <i>P</i> Approach Delay Approach LOS	. 4 9 . 1 A	· .			27 D	.7 19).8	9.6 A

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY_____

Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed: Analysis Time Per Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Cust Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street: North/South Stree	The S 4/6/2 iod: PM Ex 1 omary 2009 Route	haw Gro 009 ist 163	up						
Intersection Orie	ntation: E	W	nampo	St	udy	period	(hrs):	1.00	
 .		_				_			
Maian Chraats Do	Vehic	le Volu	mes and	Adjus	stmei	nts	bound		
Major Street: Ap	proach	1 EaS	2	3	4	wes	5	6	
10	vemenc	T.	ረ ጥ	R		ч Т.	ጋ ጥ	R	
			*		1	2	-	-	
Volume		65	204				281	63	
Peak-Hour Factor,	PHF	0.95	0.95				0.95	0.95	
Hourly Flow Rate,	HFR	68	214				295	66	
Percent Heavy Veh	icles	4							
Median Type/Stora RT Channelized?	ge	Undivi	ded		L	/			
Lanes		0	1				1 0		
Configuration		LT					TR		
Upstream Signal?			NO				NO		
Minor Street: Ap	proach	Nor	thbound	· · · ·		Sou	thbound		
Monor Serece: Mp	vement	7	8	9	- 1	10	11	12	
		L	Т	R	i	\mathbf{L}	т	R	
Volume						71		119	
Peak Hour Factor,	PHF					0.95		0.95	
Hourly Flow Rate,	HFR		-			74		125	
Percent Heavy Veh	icles					5		5	
Percent Grade (%)			0		,		0		,
Flared Approach:	Exists?/S	torage			/	-	-		/
Lanes						1	1		
Configuration						Ц	R		
		<u> </u>							
	_Delay, Qu	eue Len	gth, and	d Leve	el o:	f Servi	ce		
Approach	EB	WB	Nort	hbound	1		South	oound	
Movement	1	4	7	8	9	10) 11	L 1	12
Lane Config	LT	· I				L		I	ર
v (vph)	68				**	74	1		25
C(m) (vph)	1187					38	39	-	706
v/c	0.06					0	.19	(0.18
95% queue length	0.18					0	.70	(0.64
Control Delay	8.2					10	5.4	-	1.2
LOS	A					(2		В
Approach Delay							13	3.1	
Approach LOS							Ē	3	
				<u>.</u>					

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY_____

..

Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed: Analysis Time Period: Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Customar Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street: North/South Street: Intersection Orientat	Keith Mal. The Shaw (4/6/2009 PM No Bui 1 y Route 163 Route 395 ion: EW	loy Group ld 2011 S Ramps	st	udy	period	(hrs):	1.00	
	Vebicle V	olumes and	Adius	tmer	nts			
Major Street: Approa	_venicie v	Eastbound	nujus	chici	West	tbound		
Major Street. Approa	nt 1	2	3	1	4	5	6	
	L L	T	R	i	L	Т	R	
								<u></u>
Volume	66	208				284	64	
Peak-Hour Factor, PHF	0.9	5 0.95				0.95	0.95	
Hourly Flow Rate, HFR	69	218				298	67	
Percent Heavy Vehicle	s 4							
Median Type/Storage	Und	ivided		,	/			
RT Channelized?								
Lanes		0 1				1 0		
Configuration		LT				TR		
Upstream Signal?		No				NO		•
Minor Street: Approa	ch	Northbound			Sou	thhound		
Minor Street. Approa	n + 7	8 8	a	ł	10	11	12	
Moveme	пс 7 т.	т Т	R	1	т.	 ጥ	R	
	ц.	*		t.		-		
Volume		,,, <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , ,</u>			72		121	
Peak Hour Factor, PHF					0.95		0.95	
Hourly Flow Rate, HFR	-				75		127	
Percent Heavy Vehicle	S				5		5	
Percent Grade (%)		0				0		
Flared Approach: Exi	sts?/Stora	ae	•	1				1
Lanes	•	2			1	1		
Configuration					\mathbf{L}	R		
	_			-				
Del	ay, Queue	Length, an	d Leve	et o:	t Servi	ce		
Approach E	B WB	Nort	hbound	1	•	South	bound	4.0
Movement 1	4	1 7	8	9	1	0 11	L	12
Lane Config L	T	1			ىل [R
	<u>0</u>				7	5		127
v (vpii) 0 C(m) (mph) 1	- 183				2	~ R 4		703
	103				ວ. ດ	20		0.18
	10				0	72		0 66
Sontrol Deler	• 1 7 0				1	.,2 6 6		11 2
concroi Detay 8	• ∠ ⊼				т	~		лл <u>р</u>
LUD Deserved Delet	А					- 11	2 2	<u>с</u>
Approach IOC						T C	2 . J	
Abbroach nos								

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY

Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed: Analysis Time Pe Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Cus Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street North/South Stre Intersection Ori	The 4/6/ riod: PM D 1 tomary : Rout et: Rout entation:	Shaw 2009 uring e 163 e 395 EW	Gro g Co 3 5 S	oup onstru Ramps	ction	Study	y peri	iod (hr	s):	1.00	1
	Vehi	cle V	Volu	umes an	nd Adj	ustme	ents				
Major Street: A	pproach		Eas	tboun	d		V	Vestbou	ind		<u></u>
м	ovement	1		2	3	. 1	4	5		6	
		т,		- Tr	R	i	T.	Ţ		R	
						•	-	-			
Volume		66		208				284		105	
Pook-Hour Fostor	DHE	00	05	200				0 0	5	U 0E	
Hear-Hour Factor		0.1 CO	90	0.95				0.9	5	110	
Houriy Flow Rate	, HER	69		218				298		110	
Percent Heavy ve	nicles	4					,				
Median Type/Stor	age	Unc	divi	.ded			/				
RT Channelized?											
Lanes			0	1				1	0		
Configuration			\mathbf{LI}						TR		
Upstream Signal?				No				No			
L 2											
Minor Street: A	pproach		Nor	thbou	nd			Southbo	und		
M	ovement	7		8	G.	1	10	11		12	
	ovemente	r.		Ψ	D	1	т.	 π		D	
		ц		1	K	1	11	1		K	
Volume	······································						82			121	·····
Poak Hour Easton	DUE						02			0 05 121	
Peak Hour Factor	, rnr						0.90)		107	
Houriy Flow Race	, HFK						00			121	
Percent Heavy ve	nicies			-			5	-		5	
Percent Grade (%)			0				0			
Flared Approach:	Exists?/	Stora	age				, ,				/
Lanes							1	-	1		
Configuration								L	R		
· .	Delay, Q	ueue	Len	gth, a	and Le	vel c	of Ser	vice			
Approach	EB	WB		Nor	rthbou	nd		So	uthbo	ound	· · · · · ·
Movement	1	4	1	7	8	9	I	10	11		12
Lane Config	T.T	-	i		-	-		т.			R
Lane conrag	171		•				1	ы			
v (vph)	69							86		·	127
C(m) (symb)	1140							272			121 CO4
	1140							0 00			004
V/C	0.06							0.23			0.19
95% queue length	0.19							0.90			U.68
Control Delay	8.4							17.6			11.5
LOS	А							С			В
Approach Delav									13	. 9	
Approach LOS									В		
F.F	· . ·								2		

нся	32000: Unsi	gnal	izec	d Inte	rsecti	ons F	Releas	e 4.1d		
	TWO-	WAY	STOI	P CONT	ROL SU	MMARY	<u>.</u>			
analvst:										
agency/Co.:	The S	Shaw (Groi	αι						
ate Performed:	4/6/2	2009		. T						
nalvsis Time Per	riod: PM Bi	ild.	2011	1						
intersection.	1			-						
Jurisdiction:	-									
Inits. II S Cusi	tomary									
nalvsis Year:	comary									
Project TD.										
last/West Street	. Route	e 163								
Jorth/South Stree	et: Route	395	S I	Ramps						
Intersection Orio	entation: I	EW		· · · · · · · · · ·	5	Study	perio	d (hrs):	1.00)
······								-		٤
	Vehio	cle V	olu	mes an	d Adju	istmei	nts	athound		····
ajor Street: A	pproach	-	Eas	cpouna			A We	E	6	
M	ovement	1		2	3	i i	4	5 m	o n	
		Г		T	R	J	Ч	T	R	
		66		208		· · · ·		284	67	
Posk-Hour Factor	. РНГ	0.9	5	0.95				0.95	0.95	
tourly Flow Pate	, LHL HFR	69	Ŭ	218				298	70	
Percent Heavy Ve	hicles	4							·	
edian Type/Stor.	are	Und	livi	ded			/			
T Channelized?	490		÷ .							
anes			0	1				1 0	1	
Configuration			\mathbf{LT}					TP	t	
Jpstream Signal?	•			No				No		
	- 1.			<u>+ </u>			S (uthhound		
Ainor Street: A	pproach	7	NOL	8 8	iu g	1	10	11	12	
M	ovement	, т.		т T	R	i I	т. Т.	T T	R	
		5		-		•				
/olume	•						75		121	
Peak Hour Factor	, PHF						0.95		0.95	
Hourly Flow Rate	, HFR						78		127	
Percent Heavy Ve	hicles					-	6		5	
Percent Grade (%)			0				0		
Flared Approach:	Exists?/	Stora	ıge			/	-			/
Lanes							1	1	•	
Configuration]	L R		
	Delay, Q	ueue	Len	gth, a	and Lev	vel o	f Serv	vice	bound	
Approach	EB	wв		NOI	uoans: o	na v		10 1	1	12
Movement	1.	4	1	1	o	2	1	то т Т.	, .	r ₽
Lane Config	тт		1				I	ш		
/ (vph)	69							78		127
C(m) (vph)	1180							382		702
7/c	0.06							0.20		0.18
95% queue length	0.19							0.77		0.66
	8.2							16.8		11.3
Control Delav	-							С		В
LONTROL DELAY	A									
LOS Approach Delay	A							1	13.4	
LOS Approach Delay Approach LOS	A							1	L3.4 B	

. ...

Analyst: Agency: Date: Period: Project E/W St:	: The Shaw 4/8/2009 AM Exist ID: Route Route 163	Group e 395 N Ramp 3	os/Route	Int Are Jur Yea 2 163 N/S	er.: 2 a Type isd: ir : 2 St: R	a: All 2009 Route	other 395 N	areas Ramps		
		SIC	INALIZEI) INTERSE	CTION	SUMMA	RY			
	l Eas	stbound	Westh	ound	l Nor	thbou	nd l	Sout	hbound	1
	1 T.	T R	і т. т	' R) T.	. பால்லே மு	R I	т.	TT R	1
		1 1			1 11	7	- K - I	ш		1
No Tan		1 0		1 0	-1		¦·	1	0 1	-
NO. Lane		I U	0		1 0	U	U I	- 1		ſ
Lecontio	g l	LT		TR			1	ц 	R	
Volume	J165	220	15	6 76	1		1	96	37	1
Lane Wid	dth	12.0	12	2.0	1		1	12.0	12.0	1
RTOR VO	1		l	0	1		1		0	
Duration	n 0.25	Area 7	lype: Al	1 other	areas					
-			Signa	1 Operat	ions					
Phage Co	ombination	1 2				5	6	7	8	
		1 L Z	5	ן ד תוא ו	Toft	J	U	/	0	
TP Tere	Ŀ	A			Terc					
Thru	u	A		I	Thru					
Rigt	ht				Right					
Peds	S			1	Peds					
WB Left	t			SB	Left	Α				
Thru	u	A			Thru		· ·			
Righ	ht	А		1	Right	A				
Pede	S			i i	Peds	•				
NB Righ	ht			I EB	Right					
SB Righ	ht			WB	Right					
Groen		33 Q		1 412	Right	6 1				
Green		20.9				2.0				
IETTOM		3.0				3.0				
AII Red		1.0				1.0	-			
						Cyc.	le Len	gth: 4	8.0 se	CS
		Intersed	ction Pe	erformanc	e Summ	ary				
Appr/	Lane	Adj Sat	Rati	.05	Lane	Group	App:	roach		
Lane	Group	Flow Rate								
Grp	Capacity	(s)	v/c	q/C	Delay	LOS	Dela	y LOS		
-		÷ ;		-	. 1		-	•		
Easthour	nd									··
145 02 041										
τm	004	1400	0 42	0 71	~ ~	7	~ ~	7		
Tt.T.	994	1408	0.45	0.71	3.3	А	5.3	A		
_										
T.T								-		
westbour	nd							-		
westbour	nd							-		
westbour TR	nd 1245	1763	0.21	0.71	2.5	А	2.5	A		
westbour TR	nd 1245	1763	0.21	0.71	2.5	A	2.5	A		
Westbour TR Northbou	nd 1245 1nd	1763	0.21	0.71	2.5	A	2.5	A		
Westbour TR Northbou	nd 1245 and	1763	0.21	0.71	2.5	A	2.5	A		
Westbour TR Northbou	nd 1245 and	1763	0.21	0.71	2.5	А	2.5	A		
Westbour TR Northbou	nd 1245 and	1763	0.21	0.71	2.5	А	2.5	A		
TR Northbou	nd 1245 and	1763	0.21	0.71	2.5	А	2.5	А		
Westbour TR Northbou Southbou	nd 1245 and and	1763	0.21	0.71	2.5	A	2.5	A		
Westbour TR Northbou Southbou L	nd 1245 and and 218	1763 1719	0.21	0.71	2.5 21.2	A C	2.5	A		
Westbour TR Northbou Southbou L	nd 1245 and and 218	1763 1719	0.21	0.71	2.5 21.2	A C	2.5	A		
Westbour TR Northbou Southbou L R	nd 1245 and and 218 195	1763 1719 1538	0.21 0.49 0.21	0.71 0.13 0.13	2.5 21.2 19.3	A C B	2.5	A		
Westbour TR Northbou Southbou L R	nd 1245 and 218 195 Intersec	1763 1719 1538	0.21 0.49 0.21 = 6.1	0.71 0.13 0.13 (sec/ve	2.5 21.2 19.3 h) T	A C B nterse	2.5 20.7 ection	A C LOS =	A	
Westbour TR Northbou Southbou L R	nd 1245 and 218 195 Intersec	1763 1719 1538 tion Delay	0.21 0.49 0.21 = 6.1	0.71 0.13 0.13 (sec/ve	2.5 21.2 19.3 h) I	A C B nterse	2.5 20.7 action	A C LOS =	A	

.

Analyst: Keith Malloy Inter.: 2 Agency: The Shaw Group Area Type: All other areas Date: 4/8/2009 Jurisd: Period: AM No Build 2011 Year : Project ID: Route 395 N Ramps/Route 163 E/W St: Route 163 N/S St: Route 395 N Ramps SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY Eastbound Westbound | Northbound Southbound 1 L Т L т т т R | L R | L R L L R 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 No. Lanes 0 0 1 1 LGConfig \mathbf{LT} ΤR | L R 1 168 224 Volume 159 78 198 38 Läne Width | 12.0 12.0 112.0 12.0 | RTOR Vol 0 L L 0 ł Duration 0.25 Area Type: All other areas Signal Operations 2 5 Phase Combination 1 3 4 1 6 7 8 EB Left Α | NB Left Thru А Thru Right Right Peds Peds WB Left SB Left Α Thru Thru A Right Α Right A Peds Peds NB Right | EB Right SB Right | WB Right Green 33.9 6.1 Yellow 3.0 3.0 All Red 1.0 1.0 Cycle Length: 48.0 secs Intersection Performance Summary Appr/ Adj Sat Ratios Lane Group Lane Approach Lane Group Flow Rate Grp Capacity (s) v/c g/C Delay LOS Delay LOS Eastbound \mathbf{LT} 989 1401 0.44 0.71 3.3 Α 3.3 Α Westbound 1763 0.21 0.71 TR 1245 2.5 А 2.5 А Northbound Southbound 1719 0.50 0.13 L 218 21.3 C 20.8 С 0.22 0.13 R 195 1538 19.4 В Intersection Delay = 6.2 (sec/veh) Intersection LOS = A

Analyst: Agency: 2 Date: Period: 2 Project 2 E/W St: 1	The Shaw 4/8/2009 AM During ID: Route Route 163	Group Constructi 395 N Ramp	on s/Route	Int Are Jur Yea 163 N/S	er.: 2 a Type isd: r : St: R	: All	other 395 N R	areas amps	3	
		STG	NALTZED	INTERSE	CTTON	SUMMAI	RY			
	l Eas	thound 1	Westh	ound	Nor	thbou	nd l	Sout	hbound	1
	1 1	T R I	T. T	r R	L	Т	RI	L	T R	Ì
	1 -				1 -	-	1		-	, .
No Lane		1 0	0.	1 0	1 0	0	<u> </u>	1	0 1	'
LCConfig		T.TP 1	Ū	T C TR		Ŭ	× 1	т. —	° -	· 1
Volume	1168	245	15	9 78	1		1	18	38	· •
· Jano Wid	FP-1	12 0 1	10		1		-11	20	1.9	0-1
	1	12.0	12		1		1 -	2.0	12. 0	1
KIOK VOI	3	t		0	1		1		Ŭ	1
Duration	0.25	Area I	ype: Al	l other	areas					
			Signa	1 Operat	ions					
Phase Co	mbination	1 2	3	4		5	6	7	8	
EB Left		A		NB	Left					
Thru		A		1	Thru					
Righ	t			ļ	Right					
Peds				ł	Peds					
WB Left				I SB	Left	A				
Thru		A		1	Thru					
Righ	t	A		I	Right	A				
Peds				l	Peds					
NB Righ	t			EB	Ríght					
SB Righ	t			WB	Right					
Green		33.9				6.1				
Yellow		3.0				3.0				
All Red		1.0				1.0				
				_		Cyc.	le Leng	th: 4	18.0	secs
		Intersec	tion Pe	erformanc	e Summ	ary				· · - · - · - · - · - · - · - · -
Appr/	Lane	Adj Sat	Rati	.05	Lane	Group	Appr	oach		
Lane	Group	Flow Rate	·				·			
Grp (Capacity	(s)	v/c	g/C	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS		
Eastboun	d					· · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
LT	992	1404	0.46	0.71	3.4	А	3.4	A		
Westboun	d									
ТR	1245	1763	0.21	0.71	2.5	А	2.5	А		
Northbou	nd									
				•						
Southbou	nd									
Ti Ti	216	1703	0.61	0.13	24.6	С				
		2.00				-	23.4	С		
R	194	1524	0.22	0.13	19.4	В		-		
**	Intersec	tion Delay	= 7.0	(sec/ve	 h) т	nters	ection	LOS =	= A	
		caon boauy		(220) 70				*		
						-				

. .

-

......

..

.

. . .

Analyst: Agency: Date: Period: Project E/W St:	The Shaw 4/8/200 AM Build ID: Rou Route 1	w Group 9 d 2011 te 395 N Ram) 63	os/Route	Int Are Jur Yea : 163 N/S	er.: 2 a Type isd: r : St: R	: All	other 395 N 1	areas Ramps	5		
		STO	GNALTZED	INTERSE	CTION	SUMMAI	RY				
		asthound	l Westh	ound	l Nor	thbom	nd I	Sout	hbou	nd	1
	1 1					т т	ind j	т.	т Т	R	1
		IK	, , 11 1			T		ц	•		1
	!		!	1 0	!		!-			1	1
No. Lane	es	0 1 0	t o	1 0	1 0	U	0 1	1	0	T	1
LGConfig	a I	\mathbf{LT}	l	TR	1		1	Ъ		R	1
Volume	168	227	16	52 81	1		11	101		38	1
Lane Wid	ith	12.0	12	.0	1		11	12.0		12.0	1
RTOR Vol	LI		1	0	Ì		ł			0	1
	- •				•						
Duration	0.2	5 7202	Tuno: Al	1 other	areas						
Duración	0.2	J Alea	Type: M	l Ocner	iona						
			SIGUS	u operat	1011S						
Phase Co	mbinati	on 1 2	3	4		5	ю	1	8		
EB Left	5	A		NB	Left						
. Thru	1	А			Thru						
Righ	nt			1	Right						
Pede	3			T	Peds						
WR Left	-			I SB	Left	А					
Thru	7	. ъ			Thru						
Diat	* • **	n		1	Pight	Δ					
Rigi		A		1	Dode	1.7					
Peas					reus						
NB Rigr	1t			EB	RIGHT						
SB Righ	nt			WB	Right						
Green		33.9				6.1					
Yellow		3.0				3.0					
All Red		1.0				1.0 .					
						Cvc	le Len	ath: 4	18.0	se	cs
		Interse	ction Pe	rformanc	e Summ	arv	-				
7	Tano				Iano	Group	Ann	roach			
Appr/	Lane	Auj sat	, Rati	105	name	Group	прр.	LUach			
Lane	Group	Flow Rate		10			D - 1		· ·		
Grp	Capacit	y (s)	v/c	g/C	Deray	LOS	Dera	A TO2			
Eastbour	nd	•									
\mathbf{LT}	988	1399	0.44	0.71	3.3	А	3.3	Α			
Westhour	bd										
NCSCDOUI	101										
(T) D	1014	1700	0 22	0 71	2 5	λ	2 5	л			
TR	1244	1/62	0.22	0.71	2.5	А	2.5	A			
Northbou	ind										
Southbo	ind	•									
T.	21.8	1719	0.51	0.13	21.7	C					
Ц	2.10	1 I I J	0.01	0,10	~~• /	-	21 0	C			
D	105	1 5 2 0	0 22	0 1 2	10 4	p	<u> </u>	U U			
к	192	T228	0.22	0.13	19.4	D	.	100	_ ~		
	Inters	ection Delay	= 6.2	(sec/ve	en) I	nters	ection	PO2 =	- A		
-							· ·				

Analyst: Inter.: 2 Agency: The Shaw Group Area Type: All other areas 4/6/2009 Jurisd: Date: Period: PM Exist Year : 2009 Project ID: Route 395 N Ramps/Route 163 E/W St: Route 163 N/S St: Route 395 N Ramps SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY | Westbound | Southbound Eastbound 1 Northbound Ł | L | L ΙL \mathbf{T} R т Т R Т R R 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 No. Lanes Ŧ 0 LGConfig \mathbf{LT} ΤR I L R 1 1114 240 100 120 Volume |119 154 12.0 12.0 Lane Width | 12.0 12.0 ł RTOR Vol I 0 1 0 1 1 0.25 Area Type: All other areas Duration Signal Operations 5 7 2 6 8 Phase Combination 1 3 4 EB Left I NB А Left Thru Thru А Right Right Peds Peds WB Left SB Left Α Thru А Thru Right A Right A Peds Peds NB Right \mathbf{EB} Right WB Right SB Right 8.9 33.1 Green 3.0 Yellow 3.0 All Red 1.0 1.0 Cycle Length: 50.0 secs Intersection Performance Summary Adj Sat Appr/ Ratios Lane Group Approach Lane Lane Group Flow Rate g/C Delay LOS v/c Delay LOS Grp Capacity (s) Eastbound 877 1325 0.36 0.66 4.0 4.0 \mathbf{LT} А А Westbound TR 1196 1806 0.33 0.66 3.8 Α 3.8 Α Northbound Southbound 0.42 $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ 312 1752 0.18 19.2 В 19.5 В 0.49 0.18 19.9 R 279 1568 В Intersection Delay = 8.2 (sec/veh) Intersection LOS = A

......

•

· · ·

Analyst: Agency: The Date: 4/6 Period: PM Project ID: E/W St: Rou	Shaw Gr /2009 No Build Route 3 te 163	coup 1 2011 195 N Ramp:	Inter.: 2 Area Type: All other areas Jurisd: Year : ps/Route 163 N/S St: Route 395 N Ramps								
		6 7.01	NDT T 7 P		ROWTON	C IIMAN 7 1	οv				
	L Rooth	S1G	NALIZE: Mogel	D INTERS		thhow	nd l	Sout	hhound	4 1	
	l Eastr		T		I T.	ក្	R I	T.	m I		
	1		ц	· ·	1 2	Ŧ		1		·• 1 +	
No. Innoa	¦	1 0	0	1 0		0		1	0	'	
NO. Lanes			U	т U лр	1 0	Ū		т.	0.	2 I	
Nelume	1	ыт I	2	102	1		11	16	1:	22	
Volume Taxo Width	121 12		ž,	2 0	1			20	1:	2.0.1.	
	1 12		Т.	2.0	1		1		n n	1	
RICK VOI	1	I		Ū	1		1		·	1	
Duration	0.25	Area T	vpe· A	11 other	areas						
DULUCION	0.20	mea i	Sian.	al Opera	tions						
Phase Combi	nation 1	2	3	4		5	6	7	8	_,	
ER Left	nucron 1	<u> </u>	0		Left	•	•	-	_		
Thru	7	7		1	Thru						
Right	-	•			Right						
Peds				-	Peds						
WB Left				i sb	Left	Α					
Thru		A		1	Thru						
Right	Ĩ	Ą		Í	Right	А					
Peds				I	Peds						
NB Right				EB	Right						
SB Right				1 WB	Right						
Green	33	3.1				8.9					
Yellow	3.	.0				3.0					
All Red	1.	.0				1.0					
						Сус	le Leng	th: 5	50.0	secs	
		Intersec	tion P	erforman	ce Summ	ary				·····	
Appr/ Lan	e	Adj Sat	Rat	ios	Lane	Group	Appr	roach			
Lane Gro	up I	Flow Rate									
Grp Cap	acity	(s)	v/c	g/C	Delay	LOS	Delay	r LOS			
Eastbound											
* **		1000	0.20	0.66	4 0	n	4.0	71			
P.L. 81	4	1320	0.36	0.66	4.0	А	4.0	А			
177 4- h											
westbound											
ת היו חו	70	1 7 7 1	0 24	0 66	2 0	75	30	n			
TK II	12	1//1	0.54	0.00	3.9	л	5.5	А			
Northbound											
Notembound											
Southbound											
т. 31	8	1787	0.42	0.18	19.1	в					
_ 51	-						19.5	в			
R 28	5	1599	0.49	0.18	19.8	В					
In	tersect:	ion Delay	= 8.2	(sec/v	eh) I	nters	ection	LOS =	= A		
		1									
	·		-		·						

,

Analyst: Inter.: 2 Agency: The Shaw Group Area Type: All other areas Date: 4/6/2009 Jurisd: Period: PM During Construction Year : Project ID: Route 395 N Ramps/Route 163 E/W St: Route 163 N/S St: Route 395 N Ramps SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound L T R L Т R L т L R Т R No. Lanes 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 ŧ. 0 1 LGConfig \mathbf{LT} 1 \mathbf{TR} ł L R Volume 121 167 285 142 ł 126 122 Lane Width | 12.0 12.0 12.0 12.0 | RTOR Vol Ł 0 1 0 1 Duration 0.25 Area Type: All other areas Signal Operations Phase Combination 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 EB Left Α | NB Left Thru А Thru Right Right Peds Peds WB Left SB Left А Thru А Thru Right A Right A Peds Peds NB Right EΒ Right SB Right | WB Right Green 33.1 8.9 Yellow 3.0 3.0 All Red 1.0 1.0 Cycle Length: 50.0 secs Intersection Performance Summary Appr/ Lane Adj Sat Ratios Lane Group Approach Lane Group Flow Rate Grp Capacity v/c g/C (s) Delay LOS Delay LOS Eastbound \mathbf{LT} 843 1273 0.39 0.66 4.2 Α 4.2 Α Westbound ΤR 0.42 1166 1762 0.66 4.2 A 4.2 А Northbound Southbound L 318 1787 0.46 0.18 19.4 В 19.6 B R 285 1599 0.49 0.18 19.8 В Intersection Delay = 8.2 (sec/veh) Intersection LOS = A

.

Analyst: Agency: Date: Period: Project E/W St:	Keith Ma The Shaw (4/6/2009 PM Build J ID: Route Route 163	lloy Group 2011 395 N Ramp	Inter.: 2 Area Type: All other areas Jurisd: Year : N/S St: Route 395 N Ramps								
		SIC	GNALIZED	INTERSE	CTION	SUMMAR	Y				
	Eas	tbound	Westh	ound	Nor	thboun	d I	South	oound	1	
	i L	TR	ь	R	L	Т	R 1	L T	R	I	
	i –				Ì		1			1	
No. Lane	es i 0	1 0	0	1 0	0	0	0	1 (0 1	I	
LGConfid	a	\mathbf{LT}	1	TR	1			L	R	l	
Volume	1121	160	24	7 105	1		11	19 .	122	1	
Lane Wig	dth i	12.0	12	.0	1	• •	11	2.0	12.	0 1	
RTOR VO	1		i	0	1		1		0	ł	
	- ,		•				-				
Duration	n 0.25	Area '	Type: Al	l other	areas						
	•		Signa	al Operat	ions						
Phase Co	ombination	1 2	3	4		5	6	7	8		
EB Left	t	А		NB	Left						
Thru	- L	А		Ì	Thru						
Rig	ht			Í	Right						
Ped	S			1	Peds						
WB Lef	t			SB	Left	А					
Thru	u	А		Ì	Thru				* .		
Rial	ht	A		i	Right	А					
Ped	S			İ	Peds						
NB Rig	ht			EB	Right						
SB Rig	ht			WB	Right						
Green		33.1			-	8.9					
Yellow		3.0				3.0					
All Red		1.0				1.0					
						Cycl	e Leng	th: 50	.0	secs	
		Interse	ction Pe	erformanc	e Summ	ary					
Appr/	Lane	Adj Sat	Rati	ios	Lane	Group	Appr	oach			
Lane	Group	Flow Rate									
Grp	Capacity	(s)	v/c	g/C	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS			
-				_							
Eastbou	nd										
ፒም	873	1319	0.37	0.66	4.0	А	4.0	А			
пт	075	1010	0.57	0.00	1.0			••			
Westhou	nd										
Westbou	iiu										
TR	1172	1770	0.35	0.66	3.9	A	3.9	А			
Northho	und										
NOTCHDO											
Southbo	und	4805	A 44	0 10	10 0	-					
L	318	1787	0.43	0.18	19.2	в	10 5	n			
					10 0		19.5	В			
R	285	1599	0.49	0.18	19.8	В		T 0.0	7		
	Intersec	tion Delay	= 8.3	(sec/ve	en) I	nterse	ction	ros =	A		

Analyst: Inter.: 3 Agency: The Shaw Group Area Type: All other areas Date: 4/7/2009 Jurisd: Period: AM Exist Year : 2009 Project ID: Route 163/Route 32 Intersection E/W St: Route 163 N/S St: Route 32 SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound 1 ļΓ | L L т R т R т R L т R 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 0 1 No. Lanes 0 1 1 1 LGConfig L TR LTR \mathbf{LT} 1 R LTR 14 Volume 194 14 116 6 74 280 3 17 359 120 13 12.0 Lane Width |12.0 12.0 12.0 12.0 12.0 · | 1 RTOR Vol 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 Area Type: All other areas Duration 1.00 Signal Operations 2 6 Phase Combination 1 3 5 7 8 4 1 EB Left I NB А Left Α Thru Thru Α А Right А Right A Peds Peds WB Left SB Left А Ά Thru А Thru Α Right · А Right A Peds Peds NB Right \mathbf{EB} Right SB Right WB Right F Green 23.7 28.3 Yellow 3.0 3.0 All Red 1.0 1.0 Cycle Length: 60.0 secs Intersection Performance Summary Appr/ Adj Sat Ratios Lane Group Approach Lane Lane Flow Rate Group Delay LOS v/c q/C Delay LOS Grp Capacity (s) Eastbound 1394 0.38 0.40 ь 551 13.4 В TR 643 1629 0.22 0.40 12.2 В 12.9 В Westbound LTR 682 1727 0.04 0.40 11.2 В 11.2 в Northbound \mathbf{LT} 745 1579 0.52 0.47 11.7 11.7 в В 754 1599 0.00 0.47 8.4 R А Southbound LTR 853 1809 0.62 0.47 13.2 В 13.2 В Intersection Delay = 12.6 (sec/veh) Intersection LOS = B

.

Analyst: Agency: T	'he Shaw	Group		Inter.: 3 Area Type: All other areas								
Date: 4	/7/2009	F		Jur	isd:							
Period: A	M No Bui	ild 2011		Yea	r :							
Project I	D: Route	e 163/Route	32 Inter	csection								
E/W St: P	loute 163	3		N/S	St: Re	oute 32	2					
					•		_					
		SIC	SNALIZED	INTERSE	CTION	SUMMARY	۲ <u></u>			<u> </u>		
	Eas	stbound	Westbo	ound	Nort	thbound	l k	Sou	thboi	ind		
		T R	ь т	R	1 1	T F	K	ىل	т	к	1	
No. Toward	. I	1 0			¦	1 1	¦	0	1	0	¦	
NO. Lanes		L U	נ U ו ד ו	L U 1711D		ב ב יייד	ויי	0	ቷ ጊጥፑ	2	1	
Volume	1198	14 118	י ו א 14	6	174	286 3		7	366	122	1	
Lane Widt	h 112.0	12.0	12	. 0		12.012	z.o i		12.0		· ·	
RTOR Vol	1	0		0	1	0				0	i	
	•		•		•		•					
Duration	1.00	Area	fype: All	l other	areas			/				
Dhago Com	hinstio	<u> </u>	SIGNAL	A I	rous	5	6	7		3	<u> </u>	
FR Loft	IDTHACTO:		5	INR	Left	A	Ŭ	,	-	,		
Thru		A		1	Thru	A						
Right	-	A		ì	Right	A						
Peds	-			i	Peds							
WB Left		А		SB	Left	А						
Thru		Α		1	Thru	A						
Right	:	А		1	Right	А						
Peds				1	Peds							
NB Right	2				Right							
SB Right	-	00 T		I WB	Right	20 2						
Green	•	23.7				20.5						
IEIIOW		1 0				1.0						
MAL NOG		1.0				Cycle	e Ler	ngth:	60.0	5	secs	
		Interse	ction Per	rformanc	e Summ	ary		2				
Appr/ I	ane	Adj Sat	Ratio	os	Lane	Group	App	broach				
Lane G	Group	Flow Rate									•	
Grp C	Capacity	(s)	v/c	g/C	Delay	LOS	Dela	y LOS				
Eastbound	1											
L	551	1394	0.39	0.40	13.4	· B						
TR	643	1629	0.22	0.40	12.2	В	13.0) В				
Westbound	1											
ፒምጽ	682	1726	0.04	0.40	11.2	в	11.2	? В				
DIK .	002	1720	0.01	0.10		2						
Northbour	nd											
LT	744	1578	0.53	0.47	11.8	в	11.8	в В				
R	754	1599	0.00	0.47	8.4	А						
Southbour	nd											
LTR	853	1808	0.63	0.47	13.5	в	13.5	б В				
	Interse	ction Delay	= 12.8	(sec/ve	h) T	ntersed	ction	LOS	= B			
					, _				-			

.

Analyst: Inter.: 3 . Agency: The Shaw Group Area Type: All other areas Date: 4/7/2009 Jurisd: Period: AM During Construction Year : Project ID: Route 163/Route 32 Intersection E/W St: Route 163 N/S St: Route 32 SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY

	Ea	Eastbound			Westbound			1	Noi	rthbo	und	.	Soi	ıthbo	und	1
	L	т	R	L	,	Т	R	L		Т	R	I		т	R	ł
	1			1				ł				_ ł				_
No. Lanes	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	
LGConfig		TR				\mathbf{LI}	R	1		LT	R	I I		\mathbf{LT}	R	
Volume	198	55	118	3		14	6	74		286	3	17		366	122	I
Lane Width	12.0	12.0	•••	ŀ		12.0) – –	·		12.0	12.0	1 ·		12.0		1 .
RTOR Vol	1		0	1			0	1			0	I			0	1

Dura	ation 1.00)	Area	Type:	All of	her	areas				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
				Si	gnal Op	berat	ions				
Pha	se Combinatio	n 1	2	3	4	ļ		5	6 7	8	
EB	Left	A				NB	Left	А			
	Thru	А					Thru	А			
	Right	А					Right	А			
	Peds						Peds				
WB	Left	А			-	SB	Left	А			
	Thru	Α.			.		Thru	A			
	Right	А			•		Right	А			
	Peds						Peds				
NB	Right				1	EB	Right				
SB	Right					WB	Right				
Gree	en	23.7					•	28.3			
Yel	low	3.0						3.0			
A11	Red	1.0						1.0			
								Cvcle	Length:	60.0	secs

		Interpretion Denformence Ourseau									
Appr/ Lane	Lane Group	Intersec Adj Sat Flow Rate	Rat:	erforman ios	ce Summa Lane G	roup	Appro	ach			
Grp Capacity		(s)	v/c	g/C	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS			
Eastbour	nd			,,,,,,			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
L	545	1380	0.39	0.40	13.5	В					
TR	661	1673	0.28	0.40	12.6	В	13.1	В			
Westbour	nd										
LTR	<u>674</u>	1706	0.04	0.40	11.2	В	11.2	В			

Northbou	ınd									
LT	744	1578	0.53	0.47	11.8	в	11.8	в		
R	754	1599	0.00	0.47	8.4	А				
Southbou	ınd									
LTR	853	1808	0.63	0.47	13.5	В	13.5	В		
. '	Intersect	ion Delay	= 12.8	(sec/v	eh) Ir	nters	ection	LOS	=	в

Inter.: 3 Analyst: Agency: The Shaw Group Area Type: All other areas Date: 4/7/2009 Jurisd: Period: AM Build 2011 Year : Project ID: Route 163/Route 32 Intersection E/W St: Route 163 N/S St: Route 32 SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY

••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	Eas	Eastbound				Westbound			No:	rthbo	und	1	Soi	ithboi	ind	1
	L	т	R	L		т	R	I	,	т	R	1 3	L.	T .	R	ł
	۱			!				_!_				_!_				_1
No. Lanes	1	1	0	ł	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	l
LGConfig	L	TR		I		\mathbf{LT}	R	I		\mathbf{LT}	R	1		LTI	R	ł
Volume	1198	20	118	13		20	6	74		286	3	17		366	122	ł
Lane Width	112.0	12.0				12.0		ľ		12.0	12.0	Т	••	12.0		<u> </u>
RTOR Vol	I		0	ł			0	I			0	1			0	I

Dur	ation	1.00		Area	Type:	A11	otl	her	areas					
					Si	.gnal	Op	erat	ions					
Pha	se Combi	nation	1	2	3	-	4			5	6	7	8	
ĒΒ	Left		Α				1	NB	Left	А				
	Thru		А				1		Thru	А				
	Right		А				- 1		Right	А				
	Peds			•			1		Peds				-	
WB	Left		А				1	SB	Left	А				
	Thru		А	* .			ł		Thru	А				1997 - 19
	Right		А				1		Right	А	-	-		
	Peds						1		Peds					
NB	Right						1	EB	Right					
SB	Right						l l	WB	Right					
Gre	en		23.7						•	28.3				
Yel	low		3.0							3.0				
A11	Red		1.0							1.0				

						Cycl	e Lengt	th: 60.0	secs
		Intersec	tion Pe	erforman	ce Summa	ary			
Appr/	Lane	Adj Sat	Rat:	los	Lane G	Froup	Appro	bach	
Lane	Group	Flow Rate							
Grp	Capacity	(s)	v/c	g/C	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	
Eastbou	nd								
\mathbf{L}	547	1385	0.39	0.40	13.5	В			
TR	648	1640	0.23	0.40	12.3	В	13.0	В	
Westbou	nd								
LTR	690	1747	0.05	0.40	11.2	В	11.2	В	
Northbo	und								

0.47 11.8

8.4

1808 0.63 0.47 13.5 В 13.5 853 Intersection Delay = 12.8 (sec/veh) Intersection LOS = B

0.53

0.00

1578

1599

 \mathbf{LT}

LTR

Southbound

R

744

754

в

А

11.8

В

в

0.47

~

	Inter	• •	3		
e Shaw Group	Area '	Тур	e: Al:	l other	areas
/2009	Juris	d:			
Exist	Year	: :	2009		
Route 163/Route 32 Intersect	ion.				
ite 163	N/S S	t: 1	Route	32	
	e Shaw Group 7/2009 Exist Route 163/Route 32 Intersect ate 163	Inter Shaw Group Area 7/2009 Juris Exist Year Route 163/Route 32 Intersection ate 163 N/S S	Inter.: 3 Shaw Group Area Type 7/2009 Jurisd: Exist Year : 2 Route 163/Route 32 Intersection tte 163 N/S St: 1	Inter.: 3 Area Type: Al. 7/2009 Exist Route 163/Route 32 Intersection tte 163 N/S St: Route	Inter.: 3 Area Type: All other Jurisd: Exist Year : 2009 Route 163/Route 32 Intersection tte 163 N/S St: Route 32

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |L.T.R.|L.T.R.|L.T.R. | 0 1 1 | 0 1 0 | LT R | No. Lanes 1 1 0 0 1 0 LGConfig L TR LTR LT R Volume 170 25 110 14 22 7 169 438 5 15 Lane Width 12.0 12.0 12.0 12.0 12.0 12.0 12.0 LTR 380 161 12.0

RTOF	K VOI	. 1	-	U	Î	0	I	U	1		U	1
Dura	tion	1.00		Area	Type: Al	1 other	areas					
Dhac		mbinatio	0 1	2	31911a				6	7	8	
rnac rp	Toft		7	2	. 5		ĩ.eft	A	Ū	•	Ū	
БÐ	Terr	-	Л			1	Thru	Δ				
	Diah	• • •	7			1	Right	A				
	Pode	1 L	л			• •	Pede					
WD	Toft		Δ				Left	۵				
WD	Tere	· 1	λ			1 55	Thru	A				
	Diah	.+-	7			. •	Right	A				
	Dode	, ,	A			i I	Peds					
NB	Piak	, .+					Right					
GB GB	Diak	1.C. h.t.					Right					
Gree	n n		18 9			1 112	112 9110	41.1			· ·	
Voll			3 0					3.0				
1611	Pod		1 0					1.0				
WT T	neu		1.0					Cvcl	e Lengi	th: 68	. 0	secs
			Τn	torso	ction Pe	rformanc	e Summa	arv	ie heng			2000
Anni	~/	Lano	ит	Cerse Sat	Rati		Lane (Troup	Appro	hach		
Tand	- /	Group	Flow	, Bato	, nacı	.0.5	Hanc ,	stoup		Juon		
Grn	3	Canacity	1011	e)	w/c	a/C	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS		
01 þ		capacity	```	5,	170	970	2024]		1			
East	bour	nd								··· ··· ···	<i>i</i>	
т.		379	136	4	0.51	0.28	21.8	С				
π'R		454	163	4	0.34	0.28	20.0+	c	21.0	С		
111		151	100	-	0.01	0.20		•		•		
West	hour	hd										
	ui											
ፒ.ጥጽ		434	156	2	0 09	0.28	18.3	в	18.3	в		
штк		404	100	. 2	0.05	0.20	2010	-				
Nort	- hbor	ind										•
NOL		ing										
ፒ.ጥ		795	1 3 1	6	0.87	0.60	22.5	С	22.3	С		
D		966	150	9	0 01	0 60	5.3	Ā		-		
Sout	- hhou	nd	100		0.01	0100	0.0					
Sout												
T.TP		1086	170	7	0.57	0.60	8.9	А	8.9	A		•
nıv		1000	<i>د. ۱</i>		0.07	0.00	J • J	**		••		
		Interse	ction	Delay	- 17.1	(sec/ve	eh) In	nterse	ection 1	Los = 1	В	

- ----

.

.

Analyst: Agency: Date: Period: Project	Keith Ma The Shaw 4/7/2009 PM No Bui ID: Route Pouto 163	Illoy Group Id 2011 163/Route	32 Inte	Int Are Jur Yea rsection	er.: 3 a Type isd: r :	: All	other	area	S		
ы/w эс.	Nouce 10.	,		175	0C. N	oute .					
	<u> </u>	SI	GNALIZED	INTERSE	CTION	SUMMAI	XY	0	1. 1. 1		
	j Eas	stbound	ן Westb	ound	Nor	thbour T	nd j	Sou T.	TUDOL T	ina P	1
	1 11	I K	, 11 - 1 	K	1	*		11	T		1
No. Lane	s 1 1	1 0	0	1 0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
LGConfig		TR		LTR		LT	RI	_	LTH	2	1
Volume	1173	25 112	4 22	7	1172	446 5 12 0 1	ן כ	5	386 15 D	164	- r
RTOR Vol		0	1 12	.0	1	12.0 1)		12.0	0	r I
	•				, 					_	. <u> </u>
Duration	1.00	Area	Type: Al	l other	areas						
Phase Co	mbination	1 2	Signa 3	4 i	10NS	5	6	7		3	
EB Left		A 2	Ū	NB	Left	A	•	•			
Thru	L	А		l	Thru	A					
Righ	it	A		l	Right	A					
Peds	;	20		ן מיס ו	Peds	7					
wb beru Thru	-	A			Thru	A					• .
Righ	it	A `		i	Right	А					
Peds	:			ł	Peds						
NB Righ	it .			EB	Right						
SB Righ	it.	18 9		WB	RIGHT	41 1					
Yellow		3.0				3.0					
All Red		1.0				1.0					
			· · ·	-	~	Cyci	Le Len	igth:	68.0	,	secs
7	Tana		ction Pe	rformanc	e Summ	ary Group	700	roach			
Appr/ Lane	Group	Flow Rate	Raui	05	пайе	Group	Abb	·	•		
Grp	Capacity	(s)	v/c	g/C	Delay	LOS	Dela	y LOS			
				·····							
Eastbour	10 379	1364	0.52	0.28	22.0	С					
TR	454	1634	0.34	0.28	20.0+	.Č	21.1	. с			
Westbour	ıd										
LTR	434	1561	0.09	0.28	18.3	В	18.3	B			
Northbou	ınd										
LT	789	1306	0.89	0.60	25.7	С	25.6	5 C			
R	966	1599	0.01	0.60	5.3	А					
Southbou	Ind										
LTR	1086	1797	0.58	0.60	9.0	А	9.0	A			
	Intersed	ction Delay	= 18.5	(sec/ve	h)∙ I	nterse	ection	LOS	= B		
		·			. ~						

. _____
HCS2000: Signalized Intersections Release 4.1d

Analyst	:			Int	er.: 3	;					
Agency:	The Shaw	Group		Are	а Туре	: All	L othe:	r area	ŧs		
Date:	4/7/2009			Jur	isd:						
Period:	PM During	g Contructi	on	Yea	r : 2	009					
Project	ID: Route	e 163/Route	32 Inte	ersection	Ŀ						
E/W St:	Route 163	3		N/S	St: R	oute	32				
		SI	GNALIZEI) INTERSE	CTTON	SUMMA	ARY				
	Eas	stbound	l West	ound	l Nor	thho	und	1 801	thhow	nd .	1
	L	TR		r R	L	Т	R	т. 1 т.	ग ग	R	i
	I		_ ·			-			-	••	1
No. Lan	es 1	1 0	0	1 0	0	1	1	1 0	1	0	ì
LGConfi	g L	TR	1	LTR	1	\mathbf{LT}	R	1	LTR		Ì
Volume	170	45 110	4 10	03 7	172	446	5] 5	386	L64	1
-Lane Wi	dth 12.0	-12.0 -	12	2.0	1	12.0	12.0	1 -	12.0		I
RTOR VO.	1	0	1	0	1		0	ł	()	1
Duratio	n 1 00	7.200		1] othor							·
Duratio	1.00	Area	iype: Al Siqna	al Operat	ions						
Phase C	ombinatior	n 1 2	3	4 1		5	6	7	8		
EB Lef	t	A		I NB	Left	А					
Thr	u	A		I	Thru	Α					
Rig	ht	A		1	Right	A					
Ped	S			1	Peds						
WB Lef	t	А		SB	Left	А					
Thr	u	A		·	Thru	А					
Rig	ht	A	•	l	Right	A					
Ped.	S				Peds						
NB RIG	ՈՇ հ+			I EB	Right						
SB KIG	li L	10 0		I WB	Right	41 1					
Yellow		3 0				3 0	-				
All Red		1.0				1 0					
		210				Cvc	le Ler	nath:	68.0	se	cs
		Interse	ction Pe	erformanc	e Summ	ary					
Appr/	Lane	Adj Sat	Rati	os	Lane	Group	o App	proach	<u>.</u>		
Lane	Group	Flow Rate	·							•	
Grp	Capacity	(s)	v/c	g/C	Delay	LOS	Dela	ay LOS			
Eastbour	nd						······································		<u>.</u>		· p
L	347	1247	0.56	0.28	23.0	С					
TR	458	1648	0.38	0.28	20.4	С	21.7	7 C			
Westbour	nd										
LTR	447	1610	0.29	0.28	19.6	В	19.6	5 В			
Northbou	ınd										
LT	789	1306	0.89	0.60	25 7	C	25 6	; c			
R	966	1599	0.01	0.60	5.3	Ă	20.0				
Southbou	und										
LTR	1086	1797	0.58	0.60	9.0	A	9.0	A			
	Intersec	tion Delay	= 18.7	(sec/ve	h) I	nters	ection	LOS	= B		

..

HCS2000: Signalized Intersections Release 4.1d

Analyst:						Int	er.: 3						
Agency:	The Shaw	Group				Are	а Туре	: All	. other	r area	as		
Date:	4/7/2009					Jur	isd:						
Period:	PM Build	2011				Yea	r :						
Project 1	ID: Route	163/1	Route	32 In	ters	ection							
E/W St:	Route 163	i				N/S	St: R	oute	32				
			070	יא ז א ד ד יז	PD T	ស៣២០០០	CUTON	e fimm7	DV				
		thound		лацта Мос	thou	nd	L Nor	thho	und	Sol	ithho	und	
	Las	ም ም	а I В I	T.	ար	R	I T.	спос т	R	і БОС I Т.	т	R	
		7		ш	-		1	-	-		-		i
No. Lane:	s 1	1	0	0	1	0	i 0	1	1	0	1	0	i
LGConfig	L	TR			\mathbf{LT}	R	1	\mathbf{LT}	R	۱.	LT	R	1
Volume	173	31 3	112	4	28	7	172	446	5	5	386	164	L L
Lane Wid	th 12.0	12.0	1		12.0		1	12.0	12.0	1	12.0		Î.
RTOR Vol	l.	(0			0	I		0	1		0	ļ
D	1 00				<u> </u>	athon							
Duration	1.00	1	Area 1	ype:	ALL	otner	areas						
Phase Co	mbination	1	2	3 210	111.a.r. 4	operat	.10115	5	6	7		8	
EB Left	morna cron	. <u>-</u>	2	5	1		Left	Ă	•	•		•	
Thru		A				}	Thru	A					
Righ	t	A				Ì	Right	А					
Peds						1	Peds						
WB Left		A				SB	Left	A					•
Thru		·A	••			1	Thru	A					
Righ	t	A				1	Right	A					
Peas ND Dich	÷-					ן עדע	Peas Dight						
NB Righ	L +					םם בעון	Right						•
Green	L	18.9				1 110	night	41.1	L				
Yellow		3.0						3.0	-				
All Red		1.0						1.0					
								Сус	cle Ler	ngth:	68.0		secs
		In	tersed	ction	Perf	ormano	e Summ	ary					
Appr/	Lane	Adj	Sat	Ra	itios		Lane	Grou	p Apr	proact	n		
Lane	Group	F.TOM	Rate			10	Delau	TAR					
Grp	Capacity	(3)	v/c	g		ретау	202	Der	ау 10.	5		
Eastboun	d						· <u>···</u> ·····						
L	377	135	6	0.52	2 0	.28	22.1	С					
TR	457	164	4	0.35	5 0	.28	20.1	С	21.2	2 C			
Westboun	d												
			_		_	• •							
LTR	437	157	4	0.10	0 0	.28	18.4	В	18.4	4 В			
	··1												
Northbou	na												
ፒም	789	130	6	0.80		60	25 7	С	25.0	6 C			
R	966	159	9	0.01	0	. 60	5.3	A	20.				
Southbou	nd							-					
LTR	1086	179	7	0.58	3 C	.6Ò	9.0	А	9.0	A			
					_	. <u>-</u>			-				
	Intersec	ction	Delay	= 18.	5 (sec/ve	eh) I	nter	section	n LOS	= B		

HCS2000: Unsignalized Intersections Release 4.1d Keith Malloy The Shaw Group 100 Technology Center Drive Stoughton, MA 02072 Phone: 617-589-5134 Fax: 617-589-2160 E-Mail: keith.malloy@shawgrp.com ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS Analyst: Keith Malloy Agency/Co.: The Shaw Group Date Performed: 4/8/2009 Analysis Time Period: AM Exist Intersection: 4 Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Customary 2009 Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street: Depot Road Pink Row/Lathrop Rd North/South Street: Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics | Southbound | Westbound | Northbound | Eastbound RLL T R т Т R] L Т R ŀ L 17 18 13 19 8 7 115 12 4 7 0 Volume 0 % Thrus Left Lane Northbound Southbound Eastbound Westbound L1L2L1L2 г1 L2 $\mathbf{L1}$ L2 Configuration LTR LTR LTR LTR PHF 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 33 Flow Rate 24 33 14 % Heavy Veh 10 33 19 0 1 1 No. Lanes 1 1 · 1 1 1 Opposing-Lanes 1 1 1 Conflicting-lanes 1 1 Geometry group 1 1 1 1 Duration, T 1.00 hrs. Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet Westbound Southbound Eastbound Northbound L2 L2 L1Г5 L1ь2 L1г1 Flow Rates: Total in Lane 33 24 33 14 7 0 9 16 Left-Turn Right-Turn 14 7 4 0 Prop. Left-Turns 0.0 0.4 0.5 0.5 Prop. Right-Turns 0.4 0.3 0.1 0.0 Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.1 0.3 0.2 0.0 Geometry Group 1 1 1 .1 Adjustments Exhibit 17-33: 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 hLT-adj

hRT-adj	-0).6	-0).6	-(0.6	-(0.6	
hHV-adj]	.7	1	7		1./	0 1	1./	
hadj, computed	-0.1		0.5		0.3		0.1		
Wor	ksheet	4 - Dep	arture H	leadway	and Ser	vice Tim	ie		
	Easth	oound	Westh	ound	North	oound	South	bound	
	L1	L2	$\mathbf{L1}$	L2	L1	L2	L1	L2	
Flow rate	33		24		33		14		
hd, initial value	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	
x, initial	0.03		0.02		0.03		0.01		
hd, final value	3.95		4.50		4.39		4.16		
x, final value	0.04		0.03		0.04		0.02		
Move-up time, m	1	2.0	2	2.0	:	2.0	:	2.0	
Service Time	1.9		2.5		2.4		2.2		
Wor	ksheet	5 - Car	west	nd Level	of Ser	vice	South	bound	
	L1	L2	L1	L2	L1	L2	L1	L2	
Flow Pato	33		24		33		14		
Prov Race	1 9		2 5		2.4		2.2		
Utilization v	0.04		0.03		0.04		0.02		
Dop boodway hd	2 92		4 50		4.39	-	4.16		
Capacity	283		274		283		264		
Delay	7 10		7 64		7.57		7.23		
LOS	A	•	A		A		A		
Approach	**								
Delay		7.10	-	7.64		7.57		7.23	
LOS	2	A.	1	<i>•</i>		A		A	
Intersection Delay	7.39		Inte	ersectio	on LOS A				

•

....

HCS2000: Unsignalized Intersections Release 4.1d Keith Malloy The Shaw Group 100 Technology Center Drive Stoughton, MA 02072 Fax: 617-589-2160 Phone: 617-589-5134 E-Mail: keith.malloy@shawgrp.com ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS Analyst: Keith Malloy The Shaw Group Agency/Co.: 4/8/2009 Date Performed: Analysis Time Period: AM No Build 2011 Intersection: 4 Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Customary Analysis Year: Project ID: Depot Road East/West Street: Pink Row/Lathrop Rd North/South Street: ___Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics__ Southbound Eastbound ł Westbound | Northbound F 1 R | L | L т L т R L т T R R 7 115 12 4 17 7 0 18 13 19 0 8 Volume % Thrus Left Lane Northbound Southbound Westbound Eastbound L2 L2 L1 $\mathbf{L1}$ г5 г1 L1г5 LTR LTR LTR Configuration LTR 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 PHF 14 24 33 Flow Rate 33 19 0 10 33 % Heavy Veh 1 1 1 No. Lanes 1 1 1 1 1 Opposing-Lanes 1 1 1 1 Conflicting-lanes 1 1 1 1 Geometry group Duration, T 1.00 hrs. Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet Westbound Northbound Southbound Eastbound L1L2L1ь2 Г1 Г5 L1г5 Flow Rates: 24 33 14 33 Total in Lane 7 9 16 Left-Turn 0 7 0 Right-Turn

0.5

0.0

0.0

1

0.2

1.

0.2

14 4 0.5 Prop. Left-Turns 0.0 0.4 0.1 0.3 Prop. Right-Turns 0.4 0.3 0.2 Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.1 Geometry Group 1 1 Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:

0.2

0.2

hLT-adj

hRT-adj	- (D.6	(1).6	().6	-().6 .7
hadi, computed	-0.1	L • /	0.5		0.3		0.1	
				1	and Com	tigo Mim	~	
WO1	ksneet	4 – Dep	arture f	leadway	and serv	Arce in	e	
	Eastl	bound	Westł	oound	Northl	oound	South	oound
	L1	L2	L1	L2	L1	L2	L1	L2
Flow rate	33		24		33		14	
hd, initial value	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20
x, initial	0.03		0.02		0.03		0.01	
hd, final value	3.95		4.50		4.39		4.16	
x. final value	0.04		0.03		0.04		0.02	•
Move-up time, m		2.0	2	2.0	:	2.0	:	2.0
Service Time	1.9		2.5		2.4		2.2	
W01	ksheet	5 - Cap	acity an	id rever	or ser	vice		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Fact	bound	West}	ound	North	ound	South	bound
	Eastl L1	bound L2	West L1	bound L2	North L1	bound L2	South Ll	bound L2
	Eastl L1	bound L2	Westl L1	bound L2	North) L1	bound L2	South L1	bound L2
Flow Rate	East! L1 33	bound L2	Westl L1 24	bound L2	North L1 33	oound L2	South Ll 14	bound L2
Flow Rate Service Time	East L1 33 1.9	bound L2	West L1 24 2.5	bound L2	North L1 33 2.4	bound L2	South L1 14 2.2	bound L2
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x	East L1 33 1.9 0.04	bound L2	West L1 24 2.5 0.03	L2	North L1 33 2.4 0.04	bound L2	South L1 14 2.2 0.02	bound L2
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd	East L1 33 1.9 0.04 3.95	bound L2	West L1 24 2.5 0.03 4.50	L2	North L1 33 2.4 0.04 4.39	bound L2	South L1 14 2.2 0.02 4.16	bound L2
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity	East L1 33 1.9 0.04 3.95 283	bound L2	West L1 24 2.5 0.03 4.50 274	L2	North L1 33 2.4 0.04 4.39 283	bound L2	South L1 14 2.2 0.02 4.16 264	bound L2
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay	East L1 33 1.9 0.04 3.95 283 7.10	bound L2	West L1 24 2.5 0.03 4.50 274 7.64	L2	North L1 33 2.4 0.04 4.39 283 7.57	bound L2	South L1 14 2.2 0.02 4.16 264 7.23	bound L2
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS	East L1 33 1.9 0.04 3.95 283 7.10 A	bound L2	West L1 24 2.5 0.03 4.50 274 7.64 A	L2	North L1 33 2.4 0.04 4.39 283 7.57 A	bound L2	South L1 14 2.2 0.02 4.16 264 7.23 A	bound L2
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS Approach:	East L1 33 1.9 0.04 3.95 283 7.10 A	bound L2	West L1 24 2.5 0.03 4.50 274 7.64 A	L2	North L1 33 2.4 0.04 4.39 283 7.57 A	bound L2	South L1 14 2.2 0.02 4.16 264 7.23 A	bound L2
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS Approach: Delay	East L1 33 1.9 0.04 3.95 283 7.10 A	bound L2 7.10	West L1 24 2.5 0.03 4.50 274 7.64 A	Dound L2	North L1 33 2.4 0.04 4.39 283 7.57 A	bound L2	South L1 14 2.2 0.02 4.16 264 7.23 A	bound L2 7.23
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS Approach: Delay LOS	East L1 33 1.9 0.04 3.95 283 7.10 A	bound L2 7.10 A	West L1 24 2.5 0.03 4.50 274 7.64 A	Dound L2 7.64	North L1 33 2.4 0.04 4.39 283 7.57 A	Dound L2 7.57 A	South L1 14 2.2 0.02 4.16 264 7.23 A	bound L2 7.23 A

.

HCS2000: Unsignalized Intersections Release 4.1d Keith Malloy The Shaw Group 100 Technology Center Drive Stoughton, MA 02072 Fax: 617-589-2160 Phone: 617-589-5134 E-Mail: keith.malloy@shawqrp.com ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS Analyst: Keith Malloy The Shaw Group Agency/Co.: 4/8/2009 Date Performed: Analysis Time Period: AM During Construction Intersection: 4 Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Customary Analysis Year: Project ID: Depot Road East/West Street: Pink Row/Lathrop Rd North/South Street: Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics | Eastbound | Westbound 1 Northbound | Southbound | L т Т т R | L т R L R | L R 7 12 17 7 0 54 8 115 4 10 18 19 Volume % Thrus Left Lane Northbound Southbound Eastbound Westbound г1 L2 L2 $\mathbf{L1}$ L2 L1г5 $\mathbf{L1}$ LTR LTR LTR LTR Configuration 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 PHF 14 33 24 Flow Rate 77 19 % Heavy Veh 6 33 0 No. Lanes 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 Opposing-Lanes 1 1 1 1 Conflicting-lanes 1 1 1 1 Geometry group 1 Duration, T 1.00 hrs. Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet Northbound Southbound Eastbound Westbound L1 L2 L1L2 Т.1 г5 L1L2 Flow Rates: 77 24 33 14 Total in Lane 7 16 9 Left-Turn 0 7 0 58 4 Right-Turn 0.5 0.5 Prop. Left-Turns 0.0 0.4 0.0 0.3 0.1 Prop. Right-Turns 0.8 0.0 0.2 Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.1 0.3 Geometry Group 1 1 .1 1 Adjustments Exhibit 17-33: hLT-adj 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2

hRT-adj hHV-adi	-	0.6	-().6 .7	~().6	C 1).6
hadj, computed	-0.3		0.5		0.3		0.1	
Wor	ksheet	4 - Depa	arture P	leadway	and Serv	vice Tim	e	
	Rondee	i bepe	.reare i	icuanaj	unu bor			
	East	bound	Westh	oound	North	oound	Southb	ound
	L1	L2	L1	L2	L1	L2	L1	ь2
Flow rate	77		24		33		14	
hd, initial value	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20
x, initial	0.07		0.02		0.03		0.01	
hd, final value	3.69		4.54		4.47		4.25	
x, final value	0.08		0.03		0.04		0.02	
Move-up time, m		2.0	2	2.0	2	2.0	2	2.0
Service Time	1.7		2.5		2.5		2.2	
Wor	ksheet	5 - Capa	icity an	nd Level	of Serv	rice		
•		• • • •			17 4 le 1		0	
	East	souna .	west	Jound	NOFER	Jound	South	T 2
	ــ دا	1-Z	1.1	71	ТŢ	<u>ь</u> 2	ТТ	24
Flow Rate	77		24		33		14	
Service Time	1.7		2.5		2.5		2.2	
Utilization, x	0.08		0.03		0.04		0.02	
Dep. headway, hd	3.69		4.54		4.47		4.25	
Capacity	327		274		283		264	
Delay	7.00		7.68		7.66		7.32	
LOS	А	•	A		A		A	
Approach:								
Delay		7.00	-	7.68	-	1.66	7	.32
Delay LOS		7.00 A	1	7.68 A	-	7.66 A	T F	.32

.

HCS2000: Unsignalized Intersections Release 4.1d

Keith Malloy The Shaw Group 100 Technology Cen	ter Drive	•		
Stoughton, MA 0207	2	·		
Phone: 617-589-51 E-Mail: keith.mal	34 loy@shawgrp	.com	Fax: 617-589	-2160
	ALL-WAY ST	OP CONTROL (AWS	SC) ANALYSIS	
			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Analyst:	Keith M The Sha	alloy w Group		
Date Performed:	4/8/200	9		
Analysis Time Peri	od: AM Buil	d 2011	······································	
Intersection:	4			
Jurisdiction:				
Units: U. S. Custo	mary			
Project ID:				
East/West Street:	Depot F	load		
North/South Street	: Pink Ro	w/Lathrop Rd		
Worksheet	2 - Volume	Adjustments	and Site Characte	ristics
l Raet	bound I	Westbound	Northbound	Southbound
	T R	L T R	L T R	L T R I
·	I	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_1	l
Volume 0 1	8 19 19	87	21 12 4	7 7 0
% Thrus Left Lane				-
	Eastbound	Westbou	nd Northbound	l Southbound
	L1 L2	2 L1	L2 L1 L2	L1 L2
			7	TOD
Configuration	LTR	LTR 0 92	LTR 0 92	0.92
Flow Bate	39	24	39	14
% Heavy Veh	16	33	24	0
No. Lanes	1	1	1	1
Opposing-Lanes	1	1	1	1
Conflicting-lanes	1	1	1	L 1
Geometry group	L hra	T	T	T
Duration, T 1.00	mis.			
Workshe	et 3 - Satu	ration Headwa	y Adjustment Wor}	csheet
	Eastbound	d Westbou	nd Northbound	1 Southbound 1 1.2
	ذىك ــــــل	2 11	24 בין אין אין	
Flow Rates.				
Total in Lane	39	24	39	14
Left-Turn	0	9	22	7
Right-Turn	20	7	4	0
Prop. Left-Turns	0.0	0.4	0.6	0.5
Prop. Right-Turns	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.0
Prop. Heavy Venics	1	0.5	1	1
Adjustmente Evhibi	t 17-33	т.	-	-
hLT-adj	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
· ··· J				

	-	,		
hRT-adi	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6
hHV-adi	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7
hadj, computed	-0.0	0.5	0.5	0.1 ·
Wor	ksheet 4 - I	Departure Headway	and Service Tim	le
	Eastbound	Westbound	Northbound	Southbound
	L1 · L2	L1 L2	L1 L2	L1 L2
flow rate	39	24	39	14
nd, initial value	3.20 3.20	3.20 3.20	3.20 3.20	3.20 3.20
<pre>. initial</pre>	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.01
hd. final value	4.02	4.52	4.52	4.18
x. final value	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.02
Move-up time, m	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Service Time	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.2
WOL	Eastbound	Westbound	Northbound	Southbound
				24 10
Flow Rate	39	24	39	14
Service Time	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.2
Jtilization, x	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.02
Dep. headway, hd	4.02	4.52	4.52	4.18
Capacity	289	274	289	264
Delay	7.20	7.67	7.75	7.25
LOS	A	A	A	А
Approach:				
Delay	7.20	7.67	7.75	7.25
LOS	A	A	А	A
Intersection Delay	7.49	Intersectio	on LOS A	

HCS2000: Unsignalized Intersections Release 4.1d

Keith Malloy The Shaw Group 100 Technology Center Drive Stoughton, MA 02072

Phone: 617-589-5134 E-Mail: keith.malloy@shawgrp.com Fax: 617-589-2160

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS

Analyst:	Keith Malloy
Agency/Co.:	The Shaw Group
Date Performed:	4/7/2009
Analysis Time Period:	PM exist
Intersection:	4
Jurisdiction:	
Units: U. S. Customary	1
Analysis Year:	2009
Project ID:	
East/West Street:	Depot Road
North/South Street:	Pink Row/Lathrop Rd
Worksheet 2 -	- Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics

	Ea	astbo	ind	We	estbo	und	j No	orthbo	ound	So	outhbo	ound	1
	L	т	R	L	т	R] L	\mathbf{T}	R	L	Т	R	1
	1			1						1			. 1
Volume	10	16	9	116	16	14	18	14	17	10	15	0	I
% Thrus	Left Lar	ne											

	Eastb	ound	Westl	oound	North	bound	South	bound
	L1	L2	L1	L2	L1	L2	L1	L2
Configuration	LTR		LTR	•	LTR		LTR	
PHF	0.70		0.70		0.70		0.70	
Flow Rate	34		64		69		35	
% Heavy Veh	20		11	-	4		0	
No. Lanes	1		1	L	:	1	1	L
Opposing-Lanes	1		1	L		1	1	_
Conflicting-lanes	1		1	L		1	1	L
Geometry group	1		1	L		1	· 1	
Duration T 1 00	hrs							

Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet

	Eastb	ound	Westh	ound	North	oound	South	bound
	L1	L2	L1	г5	L1	L2	L1	г5
Flow Rates:								
Total in Lane	34		64		69		35	
Left-Turn	0		22		25		14	
Right-Turn	12		20		24		0	
Prop. Left-Turns	0.0		0.3		0.4		0.4	
Prop. Right-Turns	0.4		0.3		0.3		0.0	
Prop. Heavy Vehicle	e0.2		0.1		0.0		0.0	
Geometry Group	1	÷	1		1	L		1
Adjustments Exhibit	: 17-33	:						
hLT-adj	0	.2	C	.2	C).2		0.2

hRT-adj hHV-adj	· -	-0.6 1.7	- C 1	.6 7	-0 1).6 7	-0 1).6 7
hadj, computed	0.1		0.1		-0.1		0.1	
Wor	ksheet	t 4 - Depa	arture H	leadway	and Serv	vice Tim	e	
	East	tbound	Westh	ound	North	oound	South	oound
	L1	L2	L1	L2	L1	г5	ь1	ь2
Flow rate	34		64		69		35	
hd, initial value	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20
x, initial	0.03		0.06		0.06		0.03	
hd, final value	4.32		4.23		4.09		4.27	
x. final value	0.04		0.08		0.08		0.04	
Move-up time, m		2.0	2	2.0	4	2.0	2	2.0
Service Time	2.3		2.2		2.1		2.3	
	Eas	tbound	West	oound	North	bound	South	bound
	L1	L2	L1	Г5	L1	L2	L1	12
· Flow Bate	34		64		69		35	
Service Time	2.3		2.2		2.1		2.3	
Utilization, x	0.04		0.08		0.08		0.04	
Dep, headway, hd	4.32		4.23		4.09		4.27	
Capacity	284		314		319		285	
Delay	7.51		7.58		7.44		7.46	
LOS	А		A		A -		A	
Approach:								
Delay		7.51		7.58		7.44	·	7.46
LOS		A	1	A		A	Ì	A
Intersection Delay			T +					

. ·

.

. . . .

HCS2000: Unsignalized Intersections Release 4.1d

Keith Malloy The Shaw Group 100 Technology Center Drive Stoughton, MA 02072 617-589-2160 Phone: 617-589-5134 Fax: E-Mail: keith.malloy@shawgrp.com ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS Analyst: Keith Malloy The Shaw Group Agency/Co.: 4/7/2009 Date Performed: Analysis Time Period: PM No Build 2011 Intersection: 4 Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Customary Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street: Depot Road Pink Row/Lathrop Rd North/South Street: Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics Westbound | Northbound | Southbound | Eastbound I. L T Т Т R] L т R I L R | L R 16 14 17 15 Volume 10 9 116 16 14 118 110 0 % Thrus Left Lane Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound г1 ь2 L1 L2ь1 L2L1ь2 Configuration LTR LTR LTR LTR 0.70 0.70 0.70 0.70 PHF 69 35 Flow Rate 34 64 % Heavy Veh 20 11 0 4 No. Lanes 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 Opposing-Lanes 1 1 Conflicting-lanes 1 1 1 1 1 Geometry group 1 Duration, T 1.00 hrs. Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound L1L2 L1г5 L1г5 $\mathbf{L1}$ L2 Flow Rates: 69 35 Total in Lane 34 64 22 25 14 Left-Turn 0 12 20 24 0 Right-Turn 0.3 0.4 0.4 Prop. Left-Turns 0.0

0.0 Prop. Right-Turns 0.4 0.3 0.3 Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.2 0.1 0.0 0.0 Geometry Group 1 . 1 1 1 Adjustments Exhibit 17-33: hLT-adj 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2

Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS Approach:	34 2.3 0.04 4.32 284 7.51 A	•	64 2.2 0.08 4.23 314 7.58 A		69 2.1 0.08 4.09 319 7.44 A		35 2.3 0.04 4.27 285 7.46 A	
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS	34 2.3 0.04 4.32 284 7.51 A		64 2.2 0.08 4.23 314 7.58 A		69 2.1 0.08 4.09 319 7.44 A		35 2.3 0.04 4.27 285 7.46 A	
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity	34 2.3 0.04 4.32 284 7.51		64 2.2 0.08 4.23 314 7 58		69 2.1 0.08 4.09 319 7 44		35 2.3 0.04 4.27 285 7.46	
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd	34 2.3 0.04 4.32		64 2.2 0.08 4.23 314		69 2.1 0.08 4.09 319		35 2.3 0.04 4.27 285	
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x	34 2.3 0.04		64 2.2 0.08		69 2.1 0.08		35 2.3 0.04 4.27	
Flow Rate Service Time	34		64 2.2		69 2.1		35 2.3	
Flow Rate	34		64		69		35	
•	L1	L2	L1	г5	L1	L2	L1	L2
	Easth	ound	West	oound	North	oound	South	oound
Service Time	2.3 ksheet	5 — -Cap	2.2 acity an	nd Level	2.1 of Serv	/ice	2.3	<u> </u>
Move-up time, m	2	.0		2.0	2	2.0	4	2.0
x, final value	0.04		0.08		0.08		0.04	
hd, final value	4.32		4.23		4.09		4.27	
x, initial	0.03		0.06		0.06		0.03	
hd, initial value	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20
Flow rate	34		64		69		35	
	Eastb	ound L2	Westł Ll	ound L2	Northi L1	bound L2	South L1	bound L2
Wor	ksheet	4 - Dep	arture H	leadway	and Serv	vice Tim	e	
	0.1		0.1		0.1		0.1	
nadj, computed	0.1		1./		_0 1		1.7	
hHV-adj hadj, computed	T		_					

HCS2000: Unsignalized Intersections Release 4.1d

Keith Malloy The Shaw Group 100 Technology Center Drive Stoughton, MA 02072 Phone: 617-589-5134 Fax: 617-589-2160 E-Mail: keith.malloy@shawgrp.com ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS Analyst: Keith Malloy Agency/Co.: The Shaw Group Date Performed: 4/7/2009 Analysis Time Period: PM During Construction Intersection: 4 Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Customary Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street: Depot Road North/South Street: Pink Row/Lathrop Rd Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics Eastbound L Westbound L Northbound 1 Southbound ΙL т R L т R · т L R L Т R Volume · 10 16 29 · 16 199 116 14 14 $\overline{17}$ 110 15 0 % Thrus Left Lane Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound L1ь2 Г1 L2 L1L2 L1Г5 Configuration LTR LTR LTR LTR PHF 0.70 0.70 0.70 0.70 Flow Rate 63 64 185 35 13 % Heavy Veh 11 3 0 No. Lanes 1 1 1 1 Opposing-Lanes 1 1 1 1 Conflicting-lanes 1 1 1 1 Geometry group 1 1 1 1 Duration, T 1.00 hrs. Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound L1г5 L1L2L1L2 L1L2Flow Rates: Total in Lane 63 64 185 35 Left-Turn 0 22 141 14 Right-Turn 41 20 24 0 Prop. Left-Turns 0.0 0.3 8.0. 0.4 Prop. Right-Turns 0.7 0.3 0.1 0.0 Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.1 · 0.1 0.0 0.0 Geometry Group 1 1 1 1 Adjustments Exhibit 17-33: hLT-adj 0.2 0.2 0.2

0.2

hRT~adj hHV-adj hadj, computed	-(] -0.2).6 L.7	-(] 0.1).6 .7	-(1 0.1).6 L.7	-1 0.1	0.6 1.7	
Wor	ksheet	4 - Dep	arture H	leadway	and Serv	vice Tim	e		
	Easth	ound	Westh	ound	North	oound	Southbound		
·	$\mathbf{L}1$	L2	L1	ь2	L1	L2	L1	L2	
Flow rate	63		64		185		35		
hd, initial value	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	3.20	
x, initial	0.06		0.06		0.16		0.03		
hd, final value	4.32		4.55		4.36		4.48		
x, final value	0.08		0.08		0.22		0.04		
Move-up time, m	2	2.0	2	.0	2	2.0	2	2.0	
Service Time	2.3		2.6		2.4		2.5		
wor	ksheet Eastb Ll	5 - Cap oound L2	acity an Westh L1	ound L2	of Serv Northk Ll	ound L2	South L1	bound L2	
wor	ksheet Easth Ll 63	5 - Cap ound L2	acity an Westk Ll 64	d Level ound L2	of Serv Northk Ll 185	ound L2	Southk L1	Dound L2	
Flow Rate Service Time	ksheet Easth Ll 63 2.3	5 – Cap oound L2	acity ar Westk L1 64 2.6	d Level oound L2	of Serv Northk Ll 185 2.4	vice oound L2	South L1 35 2.5	Dound L2	
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x	ksheet Easth Ll 63 2.3 0.08	5 – Cap oound L2	Acity an Westk L1 64 2.6 0.08	d Level oound L2	of Serv Northk L1 185 2.4 0.22	ound L2	South L1 35 2.5 0.04	Dound L2	
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd	ksheet Eastk L1 63 2.3 0.08 4.32	5 – Cap oound L2	acity ar Westk L1 64 2.6 0.08 4.55	ound L2	of Serv Northk L1 185 2.4 0.22 4.36	ound L2	South L1 35 2.5 0.04 4.48	bound L2	
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity	ksheet Eastk L1 63 2.3 0.08 4.32 313	5 – Cap bound L2	acity an Westk L1 64 2.6 0.08 4.55 314	d Level oound L2	of Serv Northk L1 185 2.4 0.22 4.36 435	ound L2	South L1 35 2.5 0.04 4.48 285	bound L2	
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay	ksheet Eastk L1 63 2.3 0.08 4.32 313 7.67	5 – Cap bound L2	acity an Westk L1 64 2.6 0.08 4.55 314 7.95	d Level oound L2	of Serv Northk L1 185 2.4 0.22 4.36 435 8.62	vice bound L2	South L1 35 2.5 0.04 4.48 285 7.69	bound L2	
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS	ksheet Eastk L1 63 2.3 0.08 4.32 313 7.67 A	5 – Cap bound L2	Acity an Westk L1 64 2.6 0.08 4.55 314 7.95 A	ound L2	of Serv Northk Ll 185 2.4 0.22 4.36 435 8.62 A	vice bound L2	South L1 35 2.5 0.04 4.48 285 7.69 A	bound L2	
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS Approach:	ksheet Eastk L1 63 2.3 0.08 4.32 313 7.67 A	5 – Cap bound L2	Acity an Westk L1 64 2.6 0.08 4.55 314 7.95 A	ound L2	of Serv Northk L1 185 2.4 0.22 4.36 435 8.62 A	vice oound L2	Southk L1 35 2.5 0.04 4.48 285 7.69 A	bound L2	
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS Approach: Delay	ksheet Eastk L1 63 2.3 0.08 4.32 313 7.67 A 7	5 - Cap bound L2	acity an Westk L1 64 2.6 0.08 4.55 314 7.95 A	.95	of Serv Northk Ll 185 2.4 0.22 4.36 435 8.62 A	vice bound L2	Southk L1 35 2.5 0.04 4.48 285 7.69 A	Dound L2	
Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS Approach: Delay LOS	ksheet Eastk L1 63 2.3 0.08 4.32 313 7.67 A 7 A	5 - Cap bound L2	acity an Westk L1 64 2.6 0.08 4.55 314 7.95 A 7	.95	of Serv Northk L1 185 2.4 0.22 4.36 435 8.62 A	ound L2	South L1 35 2.5 0.04 4.48 285 7.69 A	Dound L2 7.69	

•

.

•

HCS2000: Unsignalized Intersections Release 4.1d

Keith Malloy The Shaw Group 100 Technology Center Drive Stoughton, MA 02072 Phone: 617-589-5134 617-589-2160 Fax: E-Mail: keith.malloy@shawgrp.com ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS Analyst: Keith Malloy Agency/Co.: The Shaw Group 4/7/2009 Date Performed: Analysis Time Period: PM Build 2011 Intersection: 4 Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Customary Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street: Depot Road North/South Street: Pink Row/Lathrop Rd Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics Eastbound Westbound E Ł Northbound Southbound 1 ł ΙL т | L R | L т R] L т Ŕ т R Volume IŌ. 16 15 116 16 14 124 14 17 110 15 0 % Thrus Left Lane Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound L1г5 L1 Г5 L1г5 $\mathbf{L1}$ L2 Configuration LTRLTR LTR LTR 0.70 0.70 0.70 0.70 PHF Flow Rate 43 64 78 35 % Heavy Veh 52 11 15 0 No. Lanes 1 1 1 1 1 1 Opposing-Lanes 1 1 Conflicting-lanes 1 1 1 1 1 1 Geometry group 1 1 Duration, T 1.00 hrs. Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet Eastbound Westbound Northbound Southbound г1 г5 L1г5 L1L2L1г5 Flow Rates: 43 64 78 Total in Lane 35 22 Left-Turn 0 34 14 Right-Turn 21 20 24 0 0,0 0.3 Prop. Left-Turns 0.4 0.4 Prop. Right-Turns 0.5 0.3 0.3 0.0 Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.5 0.1 0.1 0.0 Geometry Group 1 1 1 1 Adjustments Exhibit 17-33: hLT-adj 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2

hRT-adj	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6
hadj, computed	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.1
Wor	ksheet 4 -	Departure Headway	and Service Tim	ne
	Eastbound	Westbound	Northbound	Southbound
	L1 L2	L1 L2	L1 L2	L1 L2
Flow rate	43	64	78	35
hd, initial value	3.20 3.2	3.20 3.20	3.20 3.20	3.20 3.20
x, initial	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.03
hd, final value	4.82	4.28	4.35	4.32
x, final value	0.06	0.08	0.09	0.04
Move-up time, m	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Service Time	2.8 :ksheet 5 -	2.3 Capacity and Level	2.4 L of Service	2.3
Service Time Wor	2.8 ksheet 5 - Eastbound	2.3 Capacity and Level Westbound	2.4 L of Service Northbound	2.3 Southbound
Service Time Wor	2.8 ksheet 5 - Eastbound L1 L2	2.3 Capacity and Level Westbound L1 L2	2.4 l of Service Northbound L1 L2	2.3 Southbound L1 L2
Service Time Wor Flow Rate	2.8 ksheet 5 - Eastbound L1 L2 43	2.3 Capacity and Level Westbound L1 L2 64	2.4 l of Service Northbound L1 L2 78	2.3 Southbound L1 L2 35
Service Time Wor Flow Rate Service Time	2.8 ksheet 5 - Eastbound L1 L2 43 2.8	2.3 Capacity and Level Westbound L1 L2 64 2.3	2.4 of Service Northbound L1 L2 78 2.4	2.3 Southbound L1 L2 35 2.3
Service Time Wor Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x	2.8 ksheet 5 - Eastbound L1 L2 43 2.8 0.06	2.3 Capacity and Level Westbound L1 L2 64 2.3 0.08	2.4 Northbound L1 L2 78 2.4 0.09	2.3 Southbound L1 L2 35 2.3 0.04
Service Time Wor Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd	2.8 ksheet 5 - Eastbound L1 L2 43 2.8 0.06 4.82	2.3 Capacity and Level Westbound L1 L2 64 2.3 0.08 4.28	2.4 Northbound L1 L2 78 2.4 0.09 4.35	2.3 Southbound L1 L2 35 2.3 0.04 4.32
Service Time Wor Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity	2.8 ksheet 5 - Eastbound L1 L2 43 2.8 0.06 4.82 293	2.3 Capacity and Level Westbound L1 L2 64 2.3 0.08 4.28 314	2.4 Northbound L1 L2 78 2.4 0.09 4.35 328	2.3 Southbound L1 L2 35 2.3 0.04 4.32 285
Service Time Wor Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay	2.8 Eksheet 5 - Eastbound L1 L2 43 2.8 0.06 4.82 293 8.12	2.3 Capacity and Level Westbound L1 L2 64 2.3 0.08 4.28 314 7.63	2.4 Northbound L1 L2 78 2.4 0.09 4.35 328 7.80	2.3 Southbound L1 L2 35 2.3 0.04 4.32 285 7.51
Service Time Wor Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS	2.8 Eastbound L1 L2 43 2.8 0.06 4.82 293 8.12 A	2.3 Capacity and Level Westbound L1 L2 64 2.3 0.08 4.28 314 7.63 A	2.4 Northbound L1 L2 78 2.4 0.09 4.35 328 7.80 A	2.3 Southbound L1 L2 35 2.3 0.04 4.32 285 7.51 A
Service Time Wor Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS Approach:	2.8 ksheet 5 - Eastbound L1 L2 43 2.8 0.06 4.82 293 8.12 A	2.3 Capacity and Level Westbound L1 L2 64 2.3 0.08 4.28 314 7.63 A	2.4 Northbound L1 L2 78 2.4 0.09 4.35 328 7.80 A	2.3 Southbound L1 L2 35 2.3 0.04 4.32 285 7.51 A
Service Time Wor Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS Approach: Delay	2.8 ksheet 5 - Eastbound L1 L2 43 2.8 0.06 4.82 293 8.12 A 8.12	2.3 Capacity and Level Westbound L1 L2 64 2.3 0.08 4.28 314 7.63 A 7.63	2.4 Northbound L1 L2 78 2.4 0.09 4.35 328 7.80 A 7.80	2.3 Southbound L1 L2 35 2.3 0.04 4.32 285 7.51 A 7.51
Service Time Wor Flow Rate Service Time Utilization, x Dep. headway, hd Capacity Delay LOS Approach: Delay LOS	2.8 ksheet 5 - Eastbound L1 L2 43 2.8 0.06 4.82 293 8.12 A 8.12 A	2.3 Capacity and Level Westbound L1 L2 64 2.3 0.08 4.28 314 7.63 A 7.63 A	2.4 Northbound L1 L2 78 2.4 0.09 4.35 328 7.80 A 7.80 A	2.3 Southbound L1 L2 35 2.3 0.04 4.32 285 7.51 A 7.51 A

.

.

HCS2	2000: Uns	signali:	ed Inte	rsectio	ons Relea	se 4.1d		
	TW(D-WAY ST	TOP CONT	ROL SUN	IMARY	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Analvst:								
Agency/Co.:	The	Shaw G	coup					
Date Performed:	4/22	2/2009	.oup					
Analysis Time Peri	MA bo	Eviet						
Intersection.	5	SALOC						
Jurisdiction:	5							
Unite, H S Custo	m > ***							
Appludie Veen		`						
Project TD:	2003	,						
Froject ID:	Qi+	Entror						
East/West Street:		s Elleral	ice					
North/South Street		пор ка		01		- 1 (1	. 1 00	
Intersection orien	itation:	NS			udy peri	.oa (nrs): 1.00	
	Veh	icle Vol	lumes an	d Adjus	stments			
Major Street: App	roach	NC	orthboun	.d	S	outhbou	nd	
Mov	rement	1	2	3	4	5	6	
		L	т	R	L	т	R	
·								<u>.</u>
Volume			19	1	4	13		
Peak-Hour Factor,	PHF		0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84		
Hourly Flow Rate,	HFR		22	1	4	15		
Percent Heavy Vehi	cles			<u> </u>	0			
Median Type/Storag	le	Undiv	rided		/			
RT Channelized?								
Lanes			1	0	C	1		
Configuration			т	R		\mathbf{LT}		
Upstream Signal?			No			No		
Minor Street: App	roach	Ŵe	estbound		E	astboun	d	
Mov	rement	7	8	9	10	11	12	
		\mathbf{L}	Т	R	I L	Т	R	
Volume								
Volume	DUE	1		1				
Peak Hour Factor,	PHE	0.84		0.84				
Hourty Flow Rate,	HER	1 O		1				-
Percent Heavy Veni	cres	U	0	U		0		
rercent Grade (%)	The day is a C		U		,	U		,
riared Approach:	EXISTS?/	storage	2	-	/			1
Lanes		1	_	1				
Configuration		1	ı R		-			
	Del				1 . 5 0			
Approach	ив петау, С	dan pe dan pe	uycn, a. שסס	на Leve thourd	i or ser	vice	thound	
Movement	1	а А і	7	g	Q 1	ња5 10	11	10
Lang Config	т	יד דידי ו ידידי	/ T	U	ן כ	τU	77	12
name contra		ן דע	ц					
v (vph)		4	1		1			·····
C(m) (vph)		1605	968		1061			
v/c		0.00	0.00		0.00			
95% queue length		0.01	0.00		0.00			
Control Delay		7.2	8.7		8.4			
LOS		Δ	д.		а. А			
Approach Delay		**		86	**			
Approach LOS				Δ				
PPTORON DOD				п				

. . . .

ł.

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY

Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed: Analysis Time Peri Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Custo Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street: North/South Street Intersection Orien	The 4/22 od: AM N 5 mary Site : Lath tation:	Shaw Gro 2/2009 No Build E Entrand Trop Rd NS	oup 2011 ce		udy	period	(hrs)	: 1.0	0
	Vehi	cle Volu	mes and	Adius	tmer	ts			
Major Street: App	roach	No:	rthbound		onior	Sou	thboun	d	
Mov	rement	1	2	3	ł	4	5	6	
		L	Т	R	I	L	т	R	
			1.0				10		·
Volume			19	T O O		4	13		
Peak-Hour Factor,	PHF.		0.84	0.84		0.84	0.84		
Hourly Flow Rate,	HFR		22	T		4	15		
Percent Heavy Vehi	cles	** 11				,0			
Median Type/Storag	e	Undiv	lded						
RT Channelized?					• •				
Lanes			1 0			0	Ţ	•	
Configuration			TR			L'I			
Upstream Signal?			NO				NO .		
Minor Street: App	roach	We	sthound			East	thound		
Mov	rement	7	8	9	1	10	11	12	
	<u>emene</u>	, L	T	R	i	L	T	R	
					•	_			
Volume		1		1					
Peak Hour Factor,	PHF	0.84		0.84					
Hourly Flow Rate,	HFR	1		1					
Percent Heavy Vehi	cles	0		0					
Percent Grade (%)			0			-	0		
Flared Approach:	Exists?/	'Storage			/				/
Lanes		1	1						
Configuration		L	R						
			antha an	d Torro	1	Conri	~~		
	peray, C	ueue Lei	ngth, an	a reve	1 01	Servio	e		······································
Approach	1	5B 4 1	west	onnod	0	1 10	EdSL n	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	10
	T	4) TO (, T	0	צ	1 1		Ĺ⊥	12
Lane Conrig		ן זע	Ц		ĸ	ł			
$\frac{1}{v}$ (vph)		4	1		1				
C(m) (vph)		1605	968		106	1			
V/C		0.00	0.00		0.0	0			
95% queue length		0,01	0.00		0.0	0			
Control Delav		7.2	8.7		8.4	-			
LOS		Д	а., А		с., Д				
Approach Delay			••	~ ~	4.7				
				8.6					
Approach LOS				8.6 A					

HCS2000: Unsignalized Intersections Release 4.1d

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY

Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed Analysis Time Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Construction	The 4/2 Period: AM 5 Customary	Shaw Gi 2/2009 During (roup Constr	uction				
Analysis Year:								
Project ID: Fast/Woot Stro	at. cit	o Entror						
North/South St	reet. Lat	hron Rd	ice					
Intersection C	rientation:	NS		S	tudv per	iod (hrs): 1.	00
				·· · · ··· ·	· · · - ⁴ · • · ·	•••••	· · · · · · · · ·	
	Veh	icle Vol	umes	and Adju	stments_			
Major Street:	Approach	NC	orthbo	und		Southbou	nd	
	Movement	1	2	3	4	5	6	
		L	т	· R	L	Т	R	
Volume			19	1	45	13		<u></u>
Peak-Hour Fact	or. PHF		0.8	4 0.84	0.8	4 0.84		
Hourly Flow Ra	te, HFR		22	1	53	15		
Percent Heavy	Vehicles				2			
Median Type/St	orage	Undiv	rided		/			
RT Channelized	l?				· .			
Lanes			1	0	1	01		
Configuration				TR		LT		
Upstream Signa	1?		No			No		
Minor Street:	Approach	We	stbou	nd]	Eastboun	d	
	Movement	-	8	9		11	12	
		ц	T	R .	L	л.	R	
Volume		1	·····	1				
Peak Hour Fact	or. PHF	0.84		0.84				
Hourly Flow Ba	te. HFR	1		1				
Percent Heavy	Vehicles	Ō		Ō				
Percent Grade	(%)	Ū	0	Ū.		0		
Flared Approac	h: Exists?	/Storage			/	-		/
Lanes		1	-	1		`		·
Configuration		I	3	R				
			·····			······································		
	Delay,	Queue Le	ength,	and Lev	el of Sei	cvice		
Approach	NB	SB	W	estbound		East	tbound	
Movement	1	4	7	8	9 1	-10	11	12
Lane Config		LT	\mathbf{L}		R			
v (vph)		53	1	···	1		<u></u>	
(dav) (m) C(m)		1592	826		1061			
v/c		0.03	0.00		0.00			
95% gueue lend	th	0.10	0.00		0.00			
Control Delav		7.3	9.4		8.4			
					-			
LOS		А	А		А			
LOS Approach Delav	,	A	A	8.9	A			

.

.....

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY

Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed: Analysis Time Period Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Customa Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street: North/South Street: Intersection Orienta	The Sha 4/22/20 : AM Buil 5 ry Site En Lathrop tion: NS	w Grou 09 d 2011 trance Rd	đ	Stu	ıdy	period	(hrs):	1.00)
			,						
	Vehicle	Volum	les and	Adjust	cme	nts			
Major Street: Appro	ach	Nort	hbound	2		Sou	chbound	c	
Movem	ent 1			3	ł	4) T	C m	о П	
	L		т	к	3	L	Т	R	
Volume	·····		19	0		10	13	<u> </u>	
Ponk-Unix Englor DH	Б.		1 9 1	0 9/		0 84	0.84		
Peak-Hour Factor, Ph			0.04	0.04		11	15		
Houriy riow Rate, nr	R		22	0		11	10		
Percent Heavy Venici	es					60 /			
Median Type/Storage	0	naivia	ea						
RT Channelized?									• .
Lanes			1 0			0	1		
Configuration			TR			\mathbf{LT}			
Upstream Signal?			No				No		
			<u> </u>						
Minor Street: Appro	ach	West	bound			Eas	tbound	1.0	
Movem	ent 7		8	9	1	10	11	12	
	L		Т	R	1	Г	T	R	
									·····
Volume		~ .		6					
Peak Hour Factor, PH	F U	.84		0.84					
Hourly Flow Rate, HF	R O			7					
Percent Heavy Vehicl	es O			100			_		
Percent Grade (%)			0				0		
Flared Approach: Ex	ists?/Sto	rage			/				/
Lanes		1	1						
Configuration		L	R						
								·····	
			_		_				
De	lay, Queu	e Leng	th, and	i Level	lo	f Servi	ce		
Approach	NB SB		Westh	ound			Eastbo	ound	
Movement	1 4	· 7	. 6	}	9	1	0 1:	1	12
Lane Config	\mathbf{LI}		I		R	1			
v (vph)	11	0	1		7				
C(m) (vph)	12	87 9	45		83	1			
v/c	0.	01 0	.00		0.	01			
95% queue length	0.	03 0	.00		0.0	03			
Control Delay	7.	8 8	. 8		9.	4			
LOS	A		A		А				
Approach Delay			C	9.4					
Approach LOS			-	A					

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY_____

Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed: Analysis Time Peri Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Custo Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street: North/South Street Intersection Orien	The S 4/22/ od: PM Ex 5 mary 2009 Site : Lathr tation: N	Shaw Gro 2009 tist Entranc top Rd IS	e	Sti	udy	period	(hrs):	1.0	0

Major Stroot, App	venic	te voit	thes and	Aajus	cine	Sou	thhound		
Major Screet: App	oment	1	2	3	т	4 500	5	6	
MOV	ement	т.	ረ ጥ	D D	1	ч Т.	с т	R	
		Ц	I			10	-		
Volume			21	1		8	24		
Peak-Hour Factor.	рнг		0.70	$\tilde{0.70}$		0.70	0.70		
Hourly Flow Bate	HFR		30	1		11	34		
Borcont Heavy Vehi	clee			<u> </u>		0			
Modian Two/Storad	0162	Undivi	heh			,			
DT Channelized?		UIIUL VI	.ueu			, 			
Ki Channetizeu:			1 0			0	1		•
Lanes			т U мъ			ָ ד.ידי	*		
			No			111	No		
opscream signar:			NO				NO		
Minor Street: Ann	roach	Wee	thound		<u> </u>	Eas	thound	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Manor Derecet. Mpp	rement	7	8	9	ł	10	11	12	
	chiene	T.	с т	R	i	T.	T T	R	
			~		•	-	_		
Volume		8		16					
Peak Hour Factor.	PHF	0.70		0.70					
Hourly Flow Rate,	HFR	11		22					
Percent Heavy Vehi	cles	0		0					
Percent Grade (%)		-	0				0		
Flared Approach:	Eviete?/9	Storage	Ū		1		•		1
Tared Approach.	<u>HA1000.70</u>	1	1						,
Configuration		· T.	R						
configuración		Ц	R				•.		
	Delay, Or	ieue Ler	ath, and	d Leve	1 0	f Servi	ce		
Approach		SB SB	West	bound			Easth	ound	
Movoment	1 .	4	7	R	9	1 1	0 1	1	12
Lano Config	1	T. TP 1	т.	•	R				
Lane contry		D* 1				•			
v (vph)		11	11		22				· ·
C(m) (with)		1595	914		10	50			
		0 01	0.01		õ.	02			
958 guoue longth		0 02	0 04		õ.	06			
Control Dolow		7 3	9 0		8	5			
CONCLOT DETAX		7.J 7	л. С Л		ט. א				
The second para		n	л	Q 7	А				
Approach Delay				0./ N					
Abbingen PD2	•								

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY_____

Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed: Analysis Time Per Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Cust Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street: North/South Street Intersection Orie	iod: comary	Keith The S 4/22/ PM No 5 / Site Lathr	Mal. haw 2009 Bui. Bui. cop Ra	loy Gro ld anc d	up 2011 e		St	udy	pei	ciod	(hrs): 1.(00	
				· · ·					· · · · · · ·					••••
Maion Chuasta Dr		Vehic	le V	o⊥u Nor	mes thbo	and	Adjus	tme	nts	Sout	hhow	nd		<u> </u>
Major Street: Ap	proac	.n.	1	NOL	20011	unu	3	1	4	DOU	5	6		
MC	ovemer	lL	т т		<u>د</u>		л р	-1	т.		ר ידי	a a		
			Ц		т		ĸ	1	ц		T	IX.		
Volume					21		1		8		24			
Peak-Hour Factor.	рнг				0.7	0	0.70		0.3	70	0.70			
Hourly Flow Pato	HEB				30	U	1		11		34			·
Dergont Honwy Vol		3						•	0					
Modian Turna (Stor		5	Und	itti	ded				1.					
Median Type/Stora	iye		ona	т v т	ueu				'					
RT Channellzeu?					1	0				0	1			
Lanes					Т	ט מידי				.т.	1			
Configuration					No	IL				111	No			
Upstream Signal?					NO						NO			
Minor Street: An	proa	ch		Wes	tbou	nd				East	tboun	d		
Manuel Deceder 11	vemei	nt.	7		8		9	I	10		11	12		
			ī.		т		R	i	\mathbf{L}		т	R	. '	
			-											
Volume			8	,			16							
Peak Hour Factor	PHF		0.7	0			0.70							
Hourly Flow Rate	HFR		11				22							-
Percent Heavy Vel	nicle	s	0				0							
Percent Grade (%))	-	-		0						0			
Flared Approach:	Exi:	sts?/S	stora	ae		•		/					1	
Lanes				1		1								
Configuration				L		R								
	Dela	ay, Qu	ieue	Ler	gth,	an	d Leve	el c	of Se	ervi	ce	+ h - 1 - 1		
Approach	N	в	SB		W	est	bound	~			_≞as	LUOUNG	10	
Movement	1		4	ł.	7		8	9		1 1	0	11	12	
Lane Config			\mathbf{LT}	1	L			R		1				
			11		11			22	,					
v (vpn)			11		11			10	50					
(m) (vpn)			1222		714 0 01			<u>т</u> о	0.0					·
V/C			0.01		0.01	•		0.	02					
95% queue length			0.02		v.04	l		Ų.	06					
Control Delay			7.3		9.0			8.	5					
LOS			A		Α		_	P	L					
Approach Delay							8.7							
Approach LOS							A .							
													-	•

HCS2000:	Unsignalized	Intersections	Release	4.1d
----------	--------------	---------------	---------	------

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY

.

Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed: Analysis Time Period Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Customa Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street: North/South Street: Intersection Orienta	The S 4/22/ 1: PM Du 5 ary Site Lathr ation: N	Shaw Gr 2009 Gring C Entran Cop Rd IS	oup onstruct ce	ion St	udy	period	l (hrs):	1.0	0
	Table			n -1-1-1-1-1	.				
Major Street: Appro	venic	TE AOT.	umes and ntbbound	Adjus	tmer		thhound	<u>.</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Major Street. Appro	ach	1 [°]	2 chibound	2		1 201	s s	6	
Moven	lenc	т.	2. ጥ	ר פ		ч т	J 17	о р	
		11	T	ĸ	1	Ц	T	К	
Volume			21	1		28	24		
Peak-Hour Factor, PH	IF		0.70	0.70		0.70	0.70		
Hourly Flow Bate, HE	יי. אי		30	1		40	34		
Percent Heavy Vehicl	es					0			
Median Type/Storage		Undiv	ided			, ĭ			
RT. Channelized?		Und I	1404						
Lanes			1 0			0	1		
Configuration			- TR			т.т			
Upstream Signal?			No				No		
of a care and a final .									
Minor Street: Appro	ach	We	stbound			Eas	tbound		
Moven	ent	7	8	9	ł	10	11	12	
		г	т	R	i	L	т	R	
Volume		8		97					
Peak Hour Factor, PH	IF	0.70		0.70					
Hourly Flow Rate, HE	'R	11		138					
Percent Heavy Vehicl	.es	0		2		· .			
Percent Grade (%)			0				0		
Flared Approach: Ex	ists?/S	torage			1				1
Lanes		ī	1						
Configuration		\mathbf{L}	R						
De	lay, Qu	eue Lei	ngth, an	d Leve	l of	Servi	ce		
Approach	NB	SB	West	bound			Eastb	ound	
Movement	1	4	7	8	9	1	0 1	1,	12
Lane Config		LT	L		R	Ι			
v (vph)		40	11		138	}			
C(m) (vph)		1595	832		104	4			
v/c		0.03	0.01		0.1	.3			
95% queue length		0.08	0.04		0.4	16			
Control Delay		7.3	9.4		9.0)			
LOS		А	A		A				
Approach Delav				9.0					
Approach LOS				А					

.

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY_____

Analyst: Agency/Co.: Date Performed: Analysis Time Perio Intersection: Jurisdiction: Units: U. S. Custom Analysis Year: Project ID: East/West Street: North/South Street: Intersection Orient	The S 4/22/ od: PM Bu 5 nary Site Lathu tation: N	Shaw Gro 2009 nild 20 Entranc cop Rd IS	oup 11 ce	St	udy	peri	od (hrs)	: 1.0	0
	Vohic		mag and	۸diua	tmor	. t. c			
Major Street: Appr	vento	Te AOTO	rthbound	Aujus	ruei		outhbour		
Move	ement	1	2	3	1	4	5	6	
11000	Shiene	L	T	R	ļ	L ·	т Т	Ř	
		•••	-		•	_ `	-		
Volume			21	1		14	2.4		
Peak-Hour Factor, H	PHF		0.70	0.70		0.70	0.70		•
Hourly Flow Rate, H	IFR		30	1		20	34		
Percent Heavy Vehic	cles					43			
Median Type/Storage	3	Undiv:	ided			/			
RT Channelized?		· · · · ·							•
Lanes			1 0			0	1		
Configuration			TR				LT _		
Upstream Signal?			No				No		
opporedate bighti.									
Minor Street: Appr	roach	Wes	stbound			E	astbound		
Move	ement	7	8	9	1	10	11	12	
		L	T	R	i	L	т	R	
					•				
Volume		8		22					
Peak Hour Factor, H	PHF	0.70	-	0.70					
Hourly Flow Rate, H	IFR	11		31					
Percent Heavy Vehic	cles	0		30					
Percent Grade (%)			0				0		
Flared Approach: H	Exists?/S	Storage			1				1
Lanes	• • •	í	1						
Configuration		L	R						
······································									
Γ	Delay, Ou	aeue Lei	ngth, and	d Leve	l of	Ser	vice		
Approach	NB	SB	West	bound			Eastl	oound	
Movement	1	4 1	7	8	9	1	10 1	11	12
Lane Config		LT I	L		R	i			
,		•				•			
v (vph)		20	11		31			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·
C(m) (vph)		1353	886		970)			
v/c		0.01	0.01		0.0)3			
95% queue length		0.05	0.04		0.1	0			
Control Delay		7.7	9.1		8.8	3			
LOS		A	 A		Δ				
Approach Delay		••		8.9	••				
Approach LOS			· · ·	Δ					

APPENDIX C Photographs

Site Name: Site Location: Route 163 Uncasville, CT Photographer Peter Rancourt Date 4/8/09 Direction SB Comments Side street is Hidden Acres Road Good Pavement Condition Photographer Peter Rancourt Date 4/8/09 Direction SB Comments 1-395 S Exit sto Ramp Good Pavement Condition

Site Location: Route 163 and I-395 NB Ramps

Site Name: Uncasville, CT

Photographer Peter Rancourt

Date 4/8/09

Direction NB

Comments Good pavement condition

Photographer Peter Rancourt

Date 4/8/09

Direction NB Ramps

Comments Good pavement condition





Site Name: Uncasville, CT

Photographer Peter Rancourt

Date 4/8/09

Direction SB

Comments Pink Row and Lathrop Rd Intersection



Photographer Peter Rancourt

Date 4/8/09

Direction SB

Comments On Lathrop Rd, Depot Rd on the right





 Site Name:
 Uncasville,

 Uncasville,
 T

 Photographer
 Peter

 Rancourt
 Date

 4/8/09
 Direction

 Direction
 NB

 Comments
 Site Entrance



Site Name: Uncasville, CT

Photographer Peter Rancourt

Date 4/8/09

Direction SB

Comments

Site Location: Route 32


Site Location: Powerhouse Rd Site Name: Uncasville, CT Photographer Peter Rancourt Date 4/8/09 Direction EB Comments Photographer Peter Rancourt Date 4/8/09 Direction EB Comments

APPENDIX D CDOT Accident Experience Report



STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

2800 BERLIN TURNPIKE, P.O. BOX 317546 NEWINGTON, CONNECTICUT 06131-7546 Phone:



April 22, 2009

RESPONSE TO DATA REQUEST

TO: Mr. Jim Barrock, P.E. Lead Civil Engineer Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure Group 100 Technology Center Drive Stoughton MA 02072

Re: Response to your request of April 21, 2009.

Enclosed is the Accident Data that you requested.

COMMENTS:

Direct questions to: Craig Mandell

Telephone number: (860) 594-2097

Provide Sebastian P. Puglisi Trans. Supervising Planner Systems Information Bureau of Policy & Planning F

Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. 100 Technology Center Drive Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. Stoughton, MA 02072 617-589-2761 Fax: 617-589-2160 **Fax** Πo: Mr. Angelo Asaro, Facsimile No. 860-594-2056 Transportation Asst Planning Director Location: ConnDOT Division of Systems Information # of Sheets: 1 of 2 PO Box 317546 Newington CT 06131 From: James Barrack, P.E. Telephone No. (617) 589-2761 Date: April 21, 2009 RE: Request for Accident Experience Report. Mr. Asaro: We are requesting an "Accident Experience Report" for the latest 3-year time period, for the following six (6) intersections located in Montville, CT. 1. I-395 Exit 79 SB off ramp at Rte 163 (unsig) 2. J-395 Exit 79 NB off ramp at Rte 163 (signal) 3. Rte 163 at Rte 32 at Depot Rd (signal) 4. Lathrop Rd at Depot Rd at Pink Row (unsig, non-State owned) 5. Lathrop Rd at NRG Plant Entrance (unsig, non-State owned) 6. Power House Rd at Rte 32 (unsig) A map is attached on page 2. Also, can you provide me with the average accident rates for signalized and unsignalized intersections (Statewide rates are fine). This will be supporting data for a "Traffic Impact Study" for the NRG Power plant proposed conversion to wood chip fuel source. The trip generation is 6 new inbound/ 6 new outbound vehicle trips per peak Thank you. The information can be faxed, emailed, or mailed directly to me Jim Barrack, P.E. Lead Civil Engineer Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure Group 100 Technology Center Drive Stoughton, MA 02072 617-589-2761 617-589-2160 fax lames.barrack@shawqrp.com



TRANSMISSION VERIFICATION REPORT

TIME : 04/21/2009 14:00

DATE,TIME FAX NO./NAME DURATION PAGE(S) RESULT MODE

04/21 13:57 918605942056 00:02:11 02 OK STANDARD ECM

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Division of Systems Information

Standard Accident Experience Abbreviations

Table Title - Special Features (RDWY. FACT.)

Abbreviation

PENTRTD M B CNST ACT, DEV AT PVT DRIVE AT COMM DRVE OPN MED DVDR AT RR XING

Definition

Median Barrier Penetration Construction Activity or Device At a Private Drive At a Commercial Drive At an Opening in Median Divider At a Railroad Crossing

Table Title - Light Condition (LIGHT COND)

Abbreviation

Definition

DAYLT DARK/WO DARK/W

Daylight Darkness, No Highway Illumination Darkness, With Highway Illumination

Table Title - Road Surface Condition (SURF COND)

Abbreviation

SAND UNKN Definition Loose Sand Unknown

Table Title - Weather Condition (WEATH)

Abbreviation UNKN

Definition Unknown

Table Title - Type of Collision (COLLISION TYPE)

Abbreviation

ANGLE FIXED OBJ MOVING OBJ SIDESWP-SM SIDESWP-OP TURN-SAME HD-ON TRN TURN-INTS NON-COLL

Definition

Angle (involving no turns)Fixed ObjectMoving ObjectSideswipe (same direction)Sideswipe (opposite direction)Turning Movement (same direction)Turning Movement (opposite direction)Turning Movement (intersecting paths)Miscellaneous - Non-Collision

Table Title - Pedestrian Maneuver

Abbreviation

EMERG PERS (NOT REL TO MTR VEH ACC)

Definition

Emergency Personnel (not related to a motor vehicle accident)

Abbreviation	
A	
В	
С	

Definition

Fatal Injury

Incapacitating Injury (i.e., severe lacerations, broken or distorted limbs, skull or chest injuries, abdominal injuries, unconsciousness at or when taken from the accident scene, unable to leave the accident scene without assistance) Nonincapacitating Evident Injury (i.e., lump on head, abrasions, bruises, minor lacerations) Possible Injury (i.e., momentary unconsciousness, claim of injuries not evident, limping, complaint of pain, nausea, hysteria)

Table Title - Roadway Type (RAMP TYPE)

Abbreviation ON OFF SERV CON CDRD HOV TRWT

Table Title - Contributing Factors

Abbreviation

DRVR ENTERED DIVD HWY IN WRONG DIRECTION DRVR UNABLE TO COPE W/COND, DRVR LOST CONT VEH TURNING DISPLAYING WRONG DIR SIGNAL

Table Title - Vehicle Direction

Abbreviation

NB SB EB WB UK

Table Title - Object Location

Abbreviation

OFF RD AHEAD SHLDR RIGHT SHLDR LEFT OFF RD RIGHT OFF RD LEFT Definition On-Ramp Off-Ramp Service Area or Rest Area Connector Collector-Distributor Roadway High-Occupancy Vehicle Lane Truck Weighing Station

Definition

Driver entered a divided highway in wrong direction Driver unable to cope with conditions, driver lost control Vehicle turning displaying wrong directional signal

Definition

Northbound Southbound Eastbound Westbound Unknown

Definition

Off road and shoulder ahead On shoulder - near side (right) On shoulder - far side (left) Off road & shoulder - near side (right) Off road & shoulder - far side (left)

2

Table Title - Vehicle Type

Abbreviation COMM BUS SCHL BUS TRUCK ST TRUCK DT MTRCYCLE EMRGNCY TR TRAIL CNSTRTN SNOWMOBL NON CONT TANDEM VAN AUTO PAS TRK-COMB CAR-COMB VEHICLE PDSTRIAN

Table Title - Vehicle Maneuver

Abbreviation

VEH CHANGING FROM ENT. RAMP TO LEFT LANE VEH MANEUV TO EXIT FR PRKNG SP(NOT ANGLE)

Table Title - Object Involved

Abbreviation CONST BARR CATCH BASN CLVRT HEDR FRGN OBJ ILLUM POLE UTLTY POLE BRDGE RAIL HGHWY SIGN OH SGN SPT U.P.CEILING VEH OFF RD **R.R.APURTN** IMPCT DEVC CHANNELIZTN FIRE HYD JERSEY BARR. TR-CNTRL DEV

Definition

Commercial Bus School Bus Truck (single unit-single tires) Truck (single unit-dual tires) Motorcycle **Emergency Vehicle** Tractor-trailer (1 trailer) Construction or farm equipment Snowmobile, Go-Kart, ATV's, etc. Non-contact vehicle Tractor-trailer (2 trailers) Passenger Van Passenger Car Truck-trailer combination (not tractor) Car-trailer combination Unknown vehicle Pedestrian

Definition

Vehicle changing from entrance ramp to left lane Vehicle maneuvering to exit from parking space (other than angle parking)

Definition

Construction Barricade or Barrels Catch basin or manhole cover Culvert Endwall (header) Foreign object on pavement **Illumination Pole** Utility Pole Bridge parapet wall or rail (on bridge) Highway Sign Overhead sign support Underpass Ceiling Vehicle (off road and shoulder) Railroad appurtenance or tracks Impact Attenuator Channelization Fire Hydrant New Jersey Barrier Traffic Control Device

2004-2006

TABLE III

GROUP NAMES

1. Identification

2. Total Number of Sections

- 4. Number of Accidents (Sections)
- 5. Rate Sections Accidents Per Million Vehicle Miles
- 6. Rate Sections Accidents Per Mile

7. Required Minimum - Accidents Per Mile

8. Total Number of Spots

and the second at the water of the second at

10. Number of Accidents (Spots)

11. Rate - Spots - Accidents Per Million Vehicles Entering

12. Rate - Spots - Accidents Per Spot

13. Required Minimum - Accident Per Spot

COMPARITIVE ACCIDENT STATISTICS BY ROADWAY GROUP AND INTERSECTION TYPES DESCRIPTION OF ROW HEADING ABBREVIATIONS FOR TABLE III - PAGE 1

RNOR	= R NORMAL STREETS	
UNOR	= U NORMAL STREETS	W/O INTERSECTION
RNORS	= R NORMAL STREETS	W/O INTERSECTION
UNORS	= U NORMAL STREETS	AT CT HWY
RNORT	= R NORMAL STREETS	AT CT HWY
UNORT	= U NORMAL STREETS	AT TOWN RD
RNORTS	= R NORMAL STREETS	AT TOWN RD
UNORTS	= U NORMAL STREFTS	AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
R4UN	= R 4 LANE UNDIVIDED	AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
U4UN	= U 4 LANE UNDIVIDED	W/O INTERSECTION
R4UNS	\approx R 4 LANE UNDIVIDED	W/O INTERSECTION
U4UNS	= U 4 LANE UNDIVIDED	AT CT HWY
R4UNT	= R 4 LANE UNDIVIDED	AT CT HWY
U4UNT	= U 4 LANE UNDIVIDED	AT TOWN RD
R4UNTS	= R 4 LANE UNDIVIDED	AT TOWN RD
U4UNTS	= U 4 LANE UNDIVIDED	AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
R4DU	= R 4 LANE DIVIDED UNIT	AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
U4DU	= U 4 LANE DIVIDED UNITATED	W/O INTERSECTION
R4DUS	= R 4 LANE DIVIDED UNITATED	W/O INTERSECTION
U4DUS	= U 4 LANE DIVIDED UNITATED	AT CT HWY
R4DUT	= R 4 LANE DIVIDED UNITATED	AT CT HWY
U4DUT	= U 4 LANE DIVIDED UNITATED	AT TOWN RD
R4DUTS	= R 4 LANE DIVIDED UNITATED	AT TOWN RD
U4DUTS	= U 4 LANE DIVIDED UNITATED	AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
RFRT	≈ R FRONTAGE OP SERVICE	AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
UFRT	= U FRONTAGE OR SERVICE	W/O INTERSECTION
RFRTS	= R FRONTAGE OR SERVICE	W/O INTERSECTION
UFRTS	= U FRONTAGE OR SERVICE	AT CT HWY
RFRTT	= R FRONTAGE OR SERVICE	AT CT HWY
UFRTT	= U FRONTAGE OR SERVICE	AT TOWN RD
RFRTTS	= R FRONTAGE OR SERVICE	AT TOWN RD
UFRTTS	= U FRONTAGE OR SERVICE	AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
RCIR	= R TRAFFIC CIRCLE	AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
UCIR	= U TRAFFIC CIRCLE	W/O INTERSECTION
RCIRS	= R TRAFFIC CIRCLE	W/O INTERSECTION
UCIRS	= U TRAFFIC CIRCLE	AT CT HWY
RCIRT	= R TRAFFIC CIRCLE	AT CY HWY
UCIRT	= U TRAFFIC CIRCLE	AT TOWN RD
RCIRTS	= R TRAFFIC CIRCLE	AT TOWN RD
UCIRTS	= U TRAFFIC CIRCLE	AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
REXPB	= R EXPRESSWAY	AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
UEXPB	= U EXPRESSWAY	BETWEEN INTERCHANGES
REXPI	= R EXPRESSWAY	BETWEEN INTERCHANGES
UEXPI	= U EXPRESSWAY	AT INTERCHANGE
RRMP	= R RAMPS	AT INTERCHANGE
URMP	= U RAMPS	BETWEEN INTERSECTIONS
RRMPS	= R RAMPS	BETWEEN INTERSECTIONS
IIPMDC		AT CT HWY

COMPARITIVE ACCIDENT STATISTICS BY ROADWAY GROUP AND INTERSECTION TYPES DESCRIPTION OF ROW HEADING ABBREVIATIONS FOR TABLE III - PAGE 2

RRMPT	= R RAMPS	
URMPT	= U RAMPS	AT TOWN RD
RRMPTS	= R RAMPS	AT TOWN RD
URMPTS		AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
RVAR		AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
IIIIAD	A VARIOUS RDS	W/O INTERSECTION
DUDG	= U VARIOUS RDS	W/O INTERSECTION
RVARS	= R VARIOUS RDS	AT CT HWY
UVARS	= U VARIOUS RDS	<u>አ</u> ጥ ርጥ ਸੂਲਾ
RVART	= R VARIOUS RDS	
UVART	= U VARIOUS RDS	AT TOWN RD
RVARTS	= R VARIOUS RDS	AT TOWN RD
UVARTS	= II VARIOUS PDS	AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
RTUR		AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL
קוזיייוז	IN TORNING ROADWAY	W/O INTERSECTION
DMUDG	= 0 TURNING ROADWAY	W/O INTERSECTION
RIURS	= R TURNING ROADWAY	AT CT HWY
UTURS .	U TURNING ROADWAY	AT CT HWY
RTURT	- R TURNING ROADWAY	
UTURT	= U TURNING ROADWAY	AT TOWN RD
RTURTS	= R TURNING ROADWAY	AT TOWN RD
UTURTS	= U TURNING ROADWAY	AT TOWN RD WITH SIGNAL

R RURAL U URBAN

REPORT
SURVEILLANCE
ACCIDENT
TRAFFIC
- 2006

2004

	ě
	ļ
	ł
	E
	i.
	F
	Ę
	Ŀ
	ě
	F
	É
	E
8	A
	ρ
8	B
8	Ĥ
8	č
*	
8	ĝ
8	ò
8	Ľ,
8	ň
8	מ
	3
	2
ŝ.	1
	Ś
Š	ġ
Ë E	-
86	1
۶F]
ï٤	}
٩	
85	ļ
F	
2	
NAI VAI	
ž	
ีย	

TABLE 3

ŝ

PACE

HEESE

	REQ MIN ACC/ ACC/	SPOT SPOT	0000 886 166	1.0 2.3 5.2	000 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	1.7 14.5 1.3 4.9	5.0 .0 16.9 .0 2.6 .0	2.88 11.6 6.9 0.0 0.0 0 0.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5.2 18.0 18.0	90000		0 0 0 0
n	IR ACC/	WTS MV 3 .102	1		239 239 231 231 231 231 231 231 231 231 231 231	- 1044 - 771 - 080 - 235	559 559 -213	.130 .414 .515	.241 .000 .570	80000	000. 000 000	.815
1411 NOTION	S P O T S NUMBI	ACCIDE 49:	1093 136 1007	246 1570: 28:	5593	4392 4 2011	8260 41	1380 73 2681 48	1401 0 2974 0		, o o a m	55
	N	NUMBER	5044 586 1374 5274	2393 6834 54 1086	4 196	903 903 913 903	489 16 18	232	269 0 165 0		0 0 0 m	4
	CC/ REQ MI ACC/	0. 0. 23.0				0.00 0.00	10.9 14.5					19.4 .0
	IONS Acc/ A Mon	1.429 2.263	000 900 000	000.000	4.031 4.031	000. 000. 000	000 1.020 1.679	000-0000	000.000	000	.000 000 000 000	R CTC.0
	S. E. C. T. NUMBER ACCIDENTS	8279 27710	600	0000	1570 1570	000	0 24 1907	0000	0000		စ္စစ္	J F
	OTAL Meer	2353 4252	0 001	000r	626 0 C	0000	0 8 192		0000	0000	oaom)
	T. NT	Жал	5 55 F 6	RIS RIS V	NS NS NS	NT NT STN STN		BEE	TS TS L	<u>ខ</u> ល្ខដក	SLIS	
	ä	OND OND			040 R40 U40	R4U R4U				REP. N.		

\$1055 > 15 107 of scall 1< 2/2

:	RED MIN ACC/	5201 .0 .0	¤≎.o.o.o	0000ge	secidae	1600ddac			
ю N	and and	S MV SPOT .000 .0 .000 .0	0000 0000 0000 000 000 000 000 000 000	128 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	000 0000 0000 0000 0000 0000 1000 1000	.654 7.7 .138 .77 .341 5.3 .341 5.3 .000 .0 .000 .0	0.0.0 0.0.0 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0		
PAG D INTERSECTION TYPES	SPOTS TAL NUMBEL		0000 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	• • • • • • •	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			
		0.000 0.000	0.0.0.0 H H			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
ANCE REPORT TAB E ACCIDENT STATISTIC	E.C.T.I.O.N.S HER ACC/ AC ENTS WW]	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0000 1000 12 12 12 1496 1496 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13		0 .000 29 1.726 12 31 3.485 42 75 3.087 84		0000 0000 0000 0000 0000 0000 0000		
TIC ACCIDENT SURVETLI COMPARATIV	S. AL NUM ER ACCID	ວວວວວ	34 81 35 130 130 130 130 130 130 130 130 130 130	000000	-06 ⁸ -00 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 2		0 2325	*	
2004 - 2006 TRAFT	ENT	RCIRS UGIRS KCIRT UCIRT RCIRIS	UCIRTS REXTB UEXTB UEXTB UEXT UEXT UEXT	URVES BRADS URVES Traver Traver	URMELS URMETS UNAR UNARS UNARS UNARS	UVART VARTS VARTS UVARTS UVARTS RIUR UTUR TURS	RIUKS RUKT UTURT RUKTS UTURTS		

i

STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION BUREAU OF POLICY AND PLANNING DIVISION OF SYSTEMS INFORMATION

ACCIDENT DATA CONTENT

Data in the enclosed report reflects that which was contained in the Department of Transportation's accident file on the date that this report was generated and represents accidents occurring during the period July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2008.

REPORTING LEVEL

Investigating police authorities have been required to file an accident report within five days of the completion of such investigation for any accident that resulted in death, injury or a prescribed dollar amount of damage to the property of any one individual. The prescribed dollar amounts and their effective periods are as follows: \$1,000, from October 1, 1988 to present; \$600, from October 1, 1984 to September 30, 1988; and \$400, from January 1, 1974 to September 30, 1984.

Effective with accidents occurring on October 1, 1990 and thereafter, (in accordance with Public Act 90-143) the requirement of involved operators to complete an Operator Accident Report was rescinded by the State Legislature. Also, investigating police authorities are required to file accident reports with the Department of Transportation instead of the Department of Motor Vehicles as formerly required.

Effective with accidents occurring on January 1, 1995 and thereafter, investigating police authorities are required to report accidents with a revised accident report form which differs significantly from the form used to report accidents prior to 1995. Data recorded from this form is then converted to the pre-1995 format for the production of various reports. Since some information is lost in the conversion process, the data in the enclosed report may not necessarily reflect the data recorded from the police accident report form.

DIFFERENCES IN CODING CRITERIA CONCERNING LOCAL ROAD PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY ACCIDENTS

Property damage only accidents which occurred on locally maintained roadways before August 1, 1990, from January 1, 1992 to March 31, 1992 and from January 1, 2007 to the present were coded for inclusion in the Department of Transportation's accident file. Property damage only accidents which occurred on locally maintained roadways from August 1, 1990 to December 31, 1991 and from April 1, 1992 to December 31, 2006 were <u>not</u> coded for inclusion in the accident file. Data users should be aware of the differences in the accident coding criteria among the various time periods.

LIMITATIONS

The Department of Transportation devotes considerable resources to the analysis of each accident received and to the codification of the location of each accident. Each accident entered into the Department's computerized system is reviewed for accuracy and completeness. Quality control routines are included in the system that validate the data and generate reports containing exceptional data for review. The user of the data contained in the enclosed report should be aware of certain limitations.

All accidents which actually occurred within the area covered by the report:

- May not have been received by the Department of Transportation;
- May not have contained sufficient information to have been located in the physical area covered by this report; or
 - May not have been appropriately located by the Department of Transportation during codification, data entry, file maintenance or data retrieval activities.

Accidents contained within the enclosed report may not have actually occurred within the physical area covered by the report, but have been placed there due to, either, insufficient or misleading information contained in the accident report or to misallocation of the accident during codification, data entry, file maintenance or data retrieval activities.

Contributing Factors

The contributing factors indicated on the accident experience and/or accident summary have been determined by the Department of Transportation's Accident Records Section and are used by the Department in its ongoing engineering evaluation of Connecticut's roads and highways. Each contributing factor has been determined subjectively and is not meant to assign legal responsibility.

	DIATE OF CONNECT	LICUT A	CCIDEN	r summary			
ROUTE NUMBER 00320	FROM 005.56 MI	LES TO	005.61	, WILES			
HINOW	2005	2006	2007	2008	TOTAL	PERCENT	
MAR MAY		-	ન ન	Н	1 C	6.666] ‡]
		01 -		.4	4 M	20.000	
AUG	H				-H (X	6.666 13.333	
NOV -	н	•	r-t		101	13.333	
DEC	~	171			20	13.333	•
TOTAL	া বা	9	m	7	12 5	13.333 100.000	
COLLISION TYPE	2005	2006	2007	2008	TOTAL	PERCENT	
HD-ON TRN SIDESWD.SW		-1 (н	2 3 4 4 4 7 4 8 7 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	1 0	13.333	1 - -
REAR FUID	r	m (I	. ا	ት	26.666	
TTIRN-SAME	η,	57	N .		8	53.333	
	rei .				ŗ.	6.666	
WEATHER	2005	2006	2007	2008	TOTAL	PERCENT	
CLEAR RATN	Μ,	Ŀ	m	 		86.666	1 -
				r1	5	13.333	
ROAD COND	2005	2006	3007	2008	TOTAL	PERCENT	
DRY WET	η Η	v	m		5 m 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		7 • •
LIGHT COND	2005	2006	2007	2008	TOTAL	PERCENT	
DAYLT DARK/W	мн	ι 1 Δη ι-1 1 1	201		17 17 17 17 17 17 17	80.000 20.000	1
•			•				

	INS SUN MON THE FR SAU TOTAL EACENT 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6.666 1 0 0 0 0 1 6.666 1 6.666 1 0 0 0 1 6.666 1 6.666 1 0 0 0 1 6.666 1 6.666 1 0 0 0 1 6.666 1 6.666 1 0 0 0 1 1 6.666 6.666 0 0 0 1 1 6.666 6.666 6.666 1 0 0 1 1 6.666 <th>NUMBER 0032</th> <th>LALE O</th> <th>DO NO</th> <th>5.56 M</th> <th>TLES T</th> <th>ACCIDEN O 005 6</th> <th>T SUMMARY</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	NUMBER 0032	LALE O	DO NO	5.56 M	TLES T	ACCIDEN O 005 6	T SUMMARY			
1 0	11 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 6.666 0 0 0 0 1 6.666 0 0 0 1 6.666 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 6.666 0 0 0 0 1 1 6.666 0 0 0 0 1 1 6.666 0 0 0 0 1 1 6.666 0 0 0 1 1 6.666 6.666 0 0 0 1 1 6.666 6.666 0 0 0 1 1 6.666 6.666 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1	NINS	NOM	TUE		THUR	FRI SA	C MILLES	TOTAL	PERCENT	·
0 0 <td>0 0<td></td><td>00</td><td>00</td><td>1 1 1 1 0 0</td><td>00</td><td>00</td><td>7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td><td>2 8 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td><td>6.666 6.566</td><td></td></td>	0 0 <td></td> <td>00</td> <td>00</td> <td>1 1 1 1 0 0</td> <td>00</td> <td>00</td> <td>7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td> <td>2 8 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td> <td>6.666 6.566</td> <td></td>		00	00	1 1 1 1 0 0	00	00	7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 8 1 1 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	6.666 6.566	
B 2005 2005 2006 2000 10	B 2005 2005 2005 2007 2008 10	000	0 1 0	000	0011	000	000		۳ ۱۰۰ ۳ ۲۰۰	0000 0000 0000 0000	
0 1 6.666 2 3 0 5 2 1 1 6.666 1 1 6.666 2 2 0 5 2 15 100.000 1 2 2 1 6.666 1 6.666 6 9 6 4 25 80.645 1 1 2 3 9.677 2 5 6.451 3 9.677 2 5 6.451 3 9.677 2 5 6.451 2 6.451 2 5 6.451 2 6.666 2 5 5 6.451 2 5 5 5 5 2 5 5 5 5 2 5 5 5 5 2 5 5 5 5 2 5 5 5 5 3 5 5 5 3 5 5 5 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 6 5 5 5 7	B 2005 2006 2007 2008 TOTAL PERCENT C 9 6 4 25 80.645 1 1 1 6.666 6 9 6 4 255 1 1 3.225 1 2 3 9.677 2 2005 2007 2008 TOTAL 1 2 3 9.677 2 1 1 3.225 2 1 3 9.677 2 5.451 2 5.451 2 2 5.451 2 2 1 1 2 2 1 1 6.666 2 1 1 6.666	0000	0040	0000	000-	0000	0100) et m et	20.006 6.666 6.666	
E 2005 2006 2007 2008 TOTAL PERCENT 6 9 6 4 25 80.645 1 1 3 3.225 2 3 9.677 2 5.451 2 5.451 2 5.451 B 2005 2007 2 1 1 6.666 2 1 1 6.666 2 5 1 1 2 5 1 1 2 5 6.666	E 2005 2005 2005 2006 2007 2008 TOTAL PERCENT 6 9 6 4 25 80.645 1 1 3.225 3 9.677 2 5 6.451 2 6.451 2 2005 2007 2008 TOTAL PERCENT B 2 1 1 6.666 2 1 1 6.666 2 5 1 10 66.666	000	9 H O M	0000	100m	0000	0 H O C			6.666 6.666 100.000	
G 2005 2006 2007 2008 TOTAL PERCENT 2 1 3:225 3 9:677 2 6:451 2 3 9:677 2 6:451 2 6:451 2 6:666 B 1 1 1 3:225 2 6:451 2 6:666 B 1 1 3:225 2 6:451 2 6:666 6 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	G B B B B C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1		2005	2006	2007	2008	TOTAL	PERCENT	
IG 2005 2006 2007 2008 TOTAL PERCENT 2 1 1 6.666 2 5 2 1 10 66.666	IG 2005 2006 2007 2008 TOTAL PERCENT E 2 1 1 1 6.666 2 5 2 1 10 66.666				07 HA O	50 14 70	v	4	7 M H	80.645 3.225 9.677 6.451	
/E 2 1 1 1 6.666 2 5 2 1 10 66.666	2 1 1 6.666 2 5 2 1 1 6.666 2 1 10 66.666 66.666 66.666	ДG		4 1 1 1 1	2005	2006	2007	2008	TOTAL	PERCENT	
		E			N N	ດ ເ າ	ы и			66.666	

STATE OF CONNECTICUT ACCIDENT SUMMARY

ROUTE NUMBER 00320 FROM 005.56 MILES TO 005.60 MILES

ACCIDENT CONTRIBUTING FACTOR	2005	2006	2007 2	800	TOTAL	PERCENT	
NO ACTION, UNKNOWN OR CONFLICTING STORIES DRIVER FAILED TO GRANT RIGHT OF WAY VEHICLE HAD MECHANICAL FAILURE DRIVING TOO FAST FOR CONDITIONS DRIVER FOLLOWING TOO CLOSE IMPROPER PASSING MANEUVER VEH TURNING DISPLAYING WRONG DIR SIGNAL	ग्ला ्रस्ते स्त	rt + 0 0	44	स्न स्न	പ പ ഗ ഗ ഗ ഗ പ	6.666 6.666 13.3333 20.000 2000 6.666)

· · ·

ST	ATE OF COI	NNECT	ICUT A	CCIDEN	T SUMMARY]			•	
ROUTE NUMBER 00320	FROM 005.	56 MII	LES TO	005.6	O MILES			·			
OFFENDING VEHICLE DIRECTION		2005	2006	2007	2008		TOTAL	PERCEN	EN		
HINON		⊢ m	រ ហេកា រ រ	5 	; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ;	3 3 1 5 8 8	100	53.3		 	1
DIRECTIONS OF ALL VEHI		2005	2006	2007	2008		TOTAL	PERCEN	200 TV		
NORTH SOUTH		ოფ	<u>ი</u> ო	ოო	20	, 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		1 	1 3 1 3 3 7 8 3 8 3 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8
INJURIES		3005	2006	2007	2008		TOTAL	PERCEN			
TOTAL B-INJURIES TOTAL				, , , ,)]] } 4] }] }]]]]]]]]]]]]		 	0.001		P J J J	
ACCIDENTS BY SEVERITY	0	005	2006	2007	2008		TOTAL				
B-INJ PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY TOTAL	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	। ; ; ; ;	0 O O	HOM	00		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			t 2 7 1 3 8 8	1 8 9 1 1 1 2 2 2 8
OBJECT INVOLVED	Ñ	005	2006	2007	2008		OBC OBC OI TOTAL AI	JECT LO	CATION CATION N SHLDR SHLDR OFFRD OFFRD IN DWV RIGHT LEFT DIGING TOTAL	GORE	OVER UNKNWN
TOTAL	t 7 8 9 6 6 6	T F 1 1	5 1 7 6 7	1 1 1 2		3 2 8 8 8 8 8 8	1 1 5 1		7779W 1397 TIDTY 4477		RDWY

ni 40

-

	Н Б †	* 0						
	RAMP TC TYPE IN							
	JURIES A B C							
	NU INU		þ					
	COLLISI TYPE ******	00	XED OB.					
	0 MEATH ******	00	LEAR FI					
LENCE	SURF COND		DRY CI					
T EXPEN 999.99	LIGHT COND		ARK/W					
ACCIDEN	R HOUR ******	~	2159 D			-		
ATION /	N DA H TE YI *****	000	12 07 LANE	 				
ANSPORT LOC	мо Т Т Т Т Т Т Т Т Т		40N FEB PROPER	·				
OF TR	CASE # .******		05972 h					
ARTMENT 08	FACT. * * * * * * *	42	OGE 1 3 RIGHT					
JUT DEP 990 06 30	RDWY.	00	I A BRII TURNING					
NNECTIC R 005 05 TO	TION ******		ON VEH RIGHT					
D NUMBE M 07 01	C. LOCA	ск вр	F WAY					
ROAJ COD FROI	I OF AC(******	AT DC	IGHT OF					
PERI	RIPTION ******	6600	GRANT R					
TULLE 22 09	IA DESC) ******	A	CCK RD LED TO (RE HYD					
OF MONT RED 04	GE ALPH *****	THROP R	0 AT DC ER FAIL RK-COMB RUCK FI		·			
TOWN PREPA	MILEA ****	ON ON LA	000.1 DRIV. NB TI STI				. •	

	COLLISION INJURIES RAMP TOT VIH TYPE K A B C TYPE INJ	какакакакакакакакакакакакакакакакакака	R FIXED OBJ - 1 1 - 1	r rear end 1 1 1		
RIENCE	SURF COND WEA	DRY CLE	DRY CLE?	UNKN RAIN		
UT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT EXPEN- 5 06 30 08	RDWY. FACT. CASE # DAY TH TE YR HOUR COND ************************************	NE 123956 FRI MAY 19 06 1531 DAYLT CLE GOING STRAIGHT	F RAMP 136786 TUE JUL 11 06 1650 DAYLT CLE GOING STRAIGHT	NE 153612 WED OCT 11 06 1555 DAYLT PED VEHICLE ACE OR VISIBILITY CONDITION		
TOWN OF MONTVILLE ROUTE NUMBER 395 PREPARED 04 22 09 PERIOD FROM 07 01 05 TO 0	MILEAGE ALPHA DESCRIPTION OF ACC. LOCATION R ************************************	006.33 0.4 MI S OF EXIT 79 SB DRVR UNABLE TO COPE W/COND, DRVR LOST CONT SB AUTO PAS STRUCK BEAM RAIL ON MEDIAN	006.33 AT EXIT 79 DRVR UNABLE TO COPE W/COND, DRVR LOST CONT SE AUTO PAS STRUCK TREE GORE AREA	006.33 0.4 MI S OF EXIT 79 DRIVER FOLLOWING TOO CLOSE SB AUTO PAS SKIDDED SLOWING FOR STOPPI SB AUTO PAS SKIDDED SLOWING FOR SURFA	· ·	

、

.

• .

	INJURIES RAMP TOF K A B C TYPE INJ ************************************	OFF.	1 •											
EXPERIENCE 6.73	IGHT. SURF COLLISION COND COND WEATH TYPE *******************************	K/W DRY CLEAR HEAD-ON		·			·							
OF TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT LOCATION 006.73 00	ASE # DAY TH TE YR HOUR (************************************	1766 SAT JUN 10 06 2215 DAR! .IGHT	.IGHT			•	•		•				• • •	
CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT E NUMBER 395 07 01 05 TO 06 30 08	LOCATION RDWY. FACT. C ******************************	DIRECTION VEHICLE GOING STRA	VEHICLE GOING STRA									-		
MONTVILLE 104 22 09 PERIOD FROM	ALPHA DESCRIPTION OF ACC *****************************	N RT 95 SB OFF RAMP 008 TERED DIVD HWY IN WRONG 1 PAS		•						·	•		•	
TOWN OF PREPAREL	MILEAGE ******	006.73 C DRVR EN NB AUTO SB AITO			-						·			

TOWN OF MONTVILLE PREPARED 04 22 09 PERIOD.FROM 07 01 0	NECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT EXP R 32 35 TO 06 30 08	ERIENCE 0
MILEAGE ALPHA DESCRIPTION OF ACC. LOCATI ************************************	MON DA LIGH 10N RDWY. FACT. CASE # DAY TH TE YR HOUR CON ************************************	T SURF COLLISION INJURIES RAMP TOT D COND WEATH TYPE K A B C TYPE INJ ************************************
005.57 50 FT S OF DEPOT RD IMPROPER PASSING MANEUVER	NONE 133578 FRI MAY 09 08 1604 DAYLT	WET RAIN SIDESWP-SM
NB AUTO PAS NB AUTO PAS	VEH PASSING SAME DIRECTION ON RIGHT VEH. CHANGING FROM LEFT TO RIGHT LANE	
005.58 AT RTE 163 DRIVER FAILED TO GRANT RIGHT OF MAY	UNKNOWN 125798 FRI MAR 09 07 1108 DAYLT	DRY CLEAR HD-ON TRN
SB AUTO PAS NB AUTO PAS	VEH TURNING LEFT FROM PROPER LANE VEHICLE GOING STRAIGHT	
005.58 INT RT 163 IMPROPER PASSING MANEHYER	UNKNOWN 131519 WED JUN 14 06 1412 DAYLT	DRY CLEAR SIDESWP-SM
NB AUTO PAS NB TRUCK ST	VEH PASSING SAME DIRECTION ON RIGHT VEHICLE GOING STRAIGHT	
005.58 AT RTE 163 OAKDALE RD VEHICLE HAD MECHANICAL FAILTEE	UNKNOWN 134702 SUN JUL 02 06 0944 DAYLT	DRY CLEAR HD-ON TRN
NB AUTO PAS SB AUTO PAS STOPPED FOR	VEH TURNING LEFT FROM PROPER LANE 1 TRAFFIC SIGNALS	
005.58 100 FT NORTH OF RTE 163 DRIVER FOLLOWING TOO CLOSE	AT COMM DRVE 138166 FRI MAY 04 07 1616 DAYLT	DRY CLEAR REAR END
NE AUTO PAS NE AUTO PAS STOPPED FOR	VEHICLE GOING STRAIGHT 1. VEH. TURNING LEFT FROM PROPER LANE	, , ,
005.58 AT RTE 163 DRIVER FOLLOWING TOO CLOSE	UNKNOWN 144912 FRI JUN 20 08 1435 DAYLT	DRY CLEAR REAR END
SE AUTO PAS SE AUTO PAS SE AUTO PAS STOPPED FOR	VEHICLE GOING STRAIGHT TRAFFIC SIGNALS	
005.58 INT RT 163 DRIVING TOO FAST FOR CONDITIONS	UNKNOWN 145904 WED JUN 28 06 1923 DAYLT	DRY CLEAR SIDESWP-SM
NE AUTO PAS SKIDDED SLOWING FOR NE AUTO PAS STOPPED FOR	STOPPED VEHICLE TURN LEFT	
005.58 INT RT 163 VEH TURNING DISPLAYING WEONG DIE STONNE	UNKNOWN 146087 SUN AUG 14 05 1006 DAYLT	DRY CLEAR TURN-SAME
SB AUTO PAS SB AUTO PAS	VEH TURNING RIGHT FROM PROPER LANE VEHICLE GOING STRAIGHT	
	•	

÷ .

	NJURIES RAMP TOT K A B C TYPE INJ ******************									
<u></u> ц	F COLLISION I D WEATH TYPE *********************	CLEAR SIDESWP-SM	CLEAR REAR END	CLEAR REAR END	CLEAR REAR END	CLEAR REAR END	CLEAR REAR END	RAIN REAR END		
ER I ENC	SUR CON	DRY	DRY	DRY	DRY	DRY	рку.	WET		
CCIDENT EXPI)5.56 005.60	LIGHT HOUR CONI	504 DAYLT	240 DARK/W	105 DARK/W	855 DARK/W	202 DAYLT	427 DAYLT	610 DAYLT		·
TION AC	DA TE YR :*****	13 06 1 GHT	4 06 2	9 05 2	8 07 I	1 06 1	1 05 1	2 05 16	•	
SPORTA. LOCA	MON AY TH ******	I NOV C	T NOV C	N DEC 1	V OCT 0	N AUG 2	0 DEC 2	1 OCT 2		
DF TRAN	ASE # D ******	L766 FR IRECTIO	2182 SA	1466 MOI GHT GHT	645 MOI	009 MON	484 WEI	112 SA1		
TMENT (CT. C2 *****	163 SAME DJ	162 3 STRAJ	170 STRAI	181 3 STRAI ALS	149 3 STRAI	173 JLE YLE	159 正臣 王王		
1 DEPAR)WY. FA :*****	IOWN SSING EFT	OWN EFT	OWN E GOIN(OWN E GOINC C SIGNI	C GOINC	D VEHIC BUS VEHIC	D VEHIC		
ECTICUT 32 5 TO 06	ON RI ******	UNKN VEH PA TURN L	UNKN VEHICL TURN L	UNKN USHICL VEHICL	UNKN VEHICL TRAFFI	NONE VEHICL TRAFFI	NONE STOPPE: SCHOPLE:	NONE STOPPEI STOPPEI		
CONNI NUMBER 7 01 0!	LOCATIO	ED FOR	ED FOR	STORIE	ID FOR	ID FOR	IG FOR ED FOR FOR	IG FOR ID FOR		
FROM 0	*****	STOPP	IddOLS	ICTING	URE STOPPI	IđđOLS	IddOLS STOPFI	EGGOTS SNOIS SNOI		
PERIOD	r:*****	JUVER	CLOSE	CONFL	L FAIL	163 CLOSE	163 CLOSE KIDDED	163 CONDIT KIDDED		
E E E E E	ESCRIP' *****	.63 NG MANI	63 NG TOO	63 NOWN OF	63 CHANICZ	OF RTE NG TOO	OF RT NG TOO S	OF RT ST FOR S		
AONTVIL 04 22	\LPHA D ******	T RT 1 C PASSI COMB PAS	CRTE 1 TOLLOWI PAS PAS	IT RT 1 NN, UNK ST	T RT 1 HAD ME PAS PAS	MI N (OLLOWI PAS ST	FT N (OLLOWII PAS PAS	0 FT N TOO FAI PAS PAS		
TOWN OF A PREPARED	MILEAGE 2 *******	005.58 IN IMPROPEF NB TRK-C NB AUTO	005.58 AI DRIVER F NB AUTO NB AUTO	005.58 IN NO ACTIC SB VAN SB TRUCK	005.58 IN VEHICLE SB AUTO SB AUTO SB AUTO	005.59 1 DRIVER F SE AUTO SE TRUCK	005.59 50 DRIVER F NB VAN NB AUTO NB AUTO	005.60 10 DRIVING SB AUTO SB AUTO	•	

TOWN OF MONTVILLE ROUTE NUMBE PREPARED 04 22 09 PERIOD FROM 07 01	NMECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT EXPE SR 163 05 TO 06 30 08	RIENCE
MILEAGE ALPHA DESCRIPTION OF ACC. LOCAT ************************************	MON DA LIGHT FION RDWY. FACT. CASE # DAY TH TE YR HOUR COND ************************************	<pre>CURF COLLISION INJURIES RAMP TOT COND WEATH TYPE K A B C TYPE INJ ************************************</pre>
000.00 AT DEPOT RD DRIVER FAILED TO GRANT RIGHT OF WAY SE AUTO PAS NB AUTO PAS NB AUTO PAS	UNKNOWN 100591 THU JAN 10 08 2110 DARK/W VEH TURNING LEFT FROM PROPER LANE VEHICLE GOING STRAIGHT	DRY CLEAR HD-ON TRN
000.00 AT RTE 32 DRIVER INATTENTIVE NB VEHICLE SB AUTO PAS STOPPED FOI	UNKNOWN 119047 THU FEB 15 07 1641 DAYLT VEHICLE ENGAGED IN HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE OR TRAFFIC SIGNALS	UNKN CLEAR SIDESWP-OP
000.00 INT OF DEPOT RD DRIVER FAILED TO GRANT RIGHT OF WAY NE NON CONT SE TRUCK ST STRUCK BEAM RAIL OFF RD RJ	UNKNOWN 147186 SUN AUG 14 05 1512 DAYLT VEH TURNING LEFT FROM PROPER LANE 1G VEH TURNING LEFT FROM PROPER LANE 11GHT	DRY CLEAR FIXED OBJ
000.00 INT OF RT 32 DRIVER FOLLOWING TOO CLOSE NB AUTO PAS SKIDDED SLOWING FOR NB VAN STOPPED FOF	UNKNOWN 153822 THU JUL 26 07 0730 DAYLT DR STOPPED VEHICLE DR TRAFFIC SIGN	DRY CLEAR REAR END
000.00 AT DEPOT RD DRIVER FAILED TO GRANT RIGHT OF WAY NB AUTO PAS SB AUTO PAS	UNKNOWN 157348 MON OCT 02 06 1628 DAYLT VEH TURNING LEFT FROM PROPER LANE VEHICLE GOING STRAIGHT	DRY CLEAR HD-ON TRN
000.00 AT RT 32 DRIVER FOLLOWING TOO CLOSE SE AUTO PAS SB AUTO PAS SB AUTO PAS	UNKNOWN 201653 WED DEC 26 07 2158 DARK/WO VEHICLE GOING STRAIGHT NR TRAFFIC SIGNALS	WET RAIN REAR END 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -
9		
)		

WN OF MONTVILLE COUTE NUMBER 395 EPARED 04 22 09 PERIOD FROM 07 01 05 TO 06 30 08 LEAGE ALPHA DESCRIPTION OF ACC. LOCATION RDWY, FACT, CASE # DAY WON DA LIGHT SURF COLLISION I	INJURIES RAMP TOT
**************************************	K A B C TYPE INJ ****************
6.33 AT EXIT 79 RVR UNABLE TO COPE W/COND, DRVR LOST CONT B AUTO PAS STRUCK TREE QORE AREA GORE AREA	, , ,
6.33 0.4 MI S OF EXIT 79 RIVER FOLLOWING TOO CLOSE B AUTO PAS SKIDDED SLOWING FOR STOPPED VEHICLE B AUTO PAS SKIDDED SLOWING FOR SURFACE OR VISIBILITY CONDITION	-1 -1 - - - - - - - - -
	· .

	JURIES RAMP TOT	о то	1							
EXPERIENCE	LIGHT. SURF COLLISION IN COND COND WEATH TYPE K ************************************	LK/W DRY CLEAR HEAD-ON					•			
PARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT LOCATION 006.73 00	FACT. CASE # DAY TH TE YR HOUR ************************************	131766 SAT JUN 10 06 2215 DAF DING STRAIGHT			• • •				· ·	
F MONTVILLE CONNECTICUT DEF RONTVILLE ROUTE NUMBER 395 3D 04 22 09 PERIOD FROM 07 01 05 TO 06 30	3 ALPHA DESCRIPTION OF ACC. LOCATION RDWY. ************************************	ON RT 95 SB OFF RAMP 008 NONE SNTERED DIVD HWY IN WRONG DIRECTION CO PAS VEHICLE GO NO PAS VEHICLE GO				· · ·	•			
TOWN OF MONTVILLE PREPARED 04 22 09	MILEAGE ALPHA DES ****************	006.73 ON RT 95 S DRVR ENTERED DIV NB AUTO PAS SB AUTO PAS SB AUTO PAS		·						-

APPENDIX E Manual Traffic Counts

		-	ŀ					Manual	Counts	- Rte 160	l at I-396	5 SB Off.xls									
SHAW E&I			-															-	- -	-	Г
COLINE LOCATION.		- 1001				_	South			-										-	1
COUNT FOUNTION	Uakland Koad(h	(te 163	V/Rtel-	395 SB OFF F	Samp	_	•			-+-								-	-		
					_	-		_			_										T
								OA	CDALE	RD (RTE	: 163)			ĺ		-		_	-		Τ
COUNT DATE:	4/6/2009																	- -	-	_	Τ
													No Signal								T
		-								╟		A			L						T
		+			-														-	-	1
					_							8					+		-	+	Τ-
		-			_						1%	/						$\left \right $	-		Т
		-																	-		T
					-								ш	.%	L					-	7-
	15 MINUTE COUL	NTS	-							-											T
																		-			1
		_	_										RTE I-395 SB	Off RAMP				_			1
					╢																TT
COUNT DATE:	4/6/2009																				
		_	-								-										1
PERIOD						Left										- LOF		1	+	_	1.
FROM	0	Ā	B #T's	<u>%T</u> F	<u>ED</u>		#T's	<u>%T PEL</u>	Ш	¥ L	NIS N	6T PED						Adk Th	_	Deal	<u>z</u> T
7:00 AM	7:15 AM	33	16 4	8%	4	12 31	e	4%	6	24	0					5	2	민	-	립	<u> </u>
7.15 AM	7:30 AM	40	22 3	5%	2	. 45	ф -	5%		30.	2 2 2 2 2 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	0/0		_							
	7:45 AM 8:00 AM	3`83	0 0 6 7 6	5%	1~ 0	5 2 2 2	ო.	2%	35	28	3	8									1
AMC OCA	CLUC AIM	- 4 - 4		4% 70	۲ نی	N 1 N 1	41	4%	36	23	۲.	200				7:00 PM	3:00 PM	823	36 49	%	1
8:15 AM	8:30 AM	54	17 0	1.70 707	- -	0 4 C	,	0% 10/	- 22 	ດ ເ	e i e i	~				7:15 PM 8	3:15 PM	854	37 49	6 Yes	10
8:30 AM	8:45 AM	00	16	11%		200		170	<u>8</u> 8	200	<u>, 1</u>	%				7:30 PM 8	3:30 PM	787 :	31 49	%	
8:45 AM	9:00 AM	27	15 5	12%		36	2) t	0/ 0	38	36	1 7 7	%				7:45 PM 8	3:45 PM	731 :	35 59	~	- 1
		102	84	5%	20	0 179		707	111	00	4 <	%				8:00 PM 3	00 PM	111 1	9 9	0	
								2		3	 	0/						_	-		
PERIOD					+														_	-	·····
ROM	10	A	П #T's	0 1 1 0		Lei	еI Т #	10							PERIO	0 TOT	٩	eak		peat	1.2
4:00 PM	4:15 PM	65	19 R	10%			5 r	201 PEL	비운	# 비	S N	<u>et PED</u>				R	<u>10</u>	ΈH #T	<u>s</u> %	I Hou	
4:15 PM	4:30 PM	62	15.4	5%	> T	5 24	0 0 0	6% 6%	44 40	20 20	ם_ ה ה							-	_		
4:30 PM	4:45 PM	83	10 2	2%	ۍ ۱	а 1-1-1-	4	6%	202	8	2 4 2 4	\$ \$		_					-		
4:43 EM 5:00 PM	5-15 PM	89 89	с 13 2, с	1% 20/	4	u 2 ⊈	↔ ,	2%	15	8	2 2	%				4:00 PM E	MH 003	301	5,		1
5:15 PM	5:30 PM	71 - 7	16 1 1	10/	יי ה 	2 C	n (20	32	5 5 0	- 				4:15 PM 5	:15 PM	303 3	0 4%	6 Yes	1
5:30 PM	5:45 PM	69	16 2	2%	2 4	47	- c	0.0	77	1	ວ ກ	%				4:30 PM 5	30 PM	776 2	6 39	.0	-1
5:45 PM	6:00 PM	55 3	16	%0	- e; 	14	4	0%	2 2	36	4 C	8 8		-		4:45 PM 5	:45 PM	755 2	2 3%	.9	. ,
	5	81 6	53	3%	20	4 65	-	4%	7 2	110	-	× 10				5:00 PM 6	MH 00	751 2	30	.0	·
						3 	+-	27	-	0	2										
					-		-	-			_		_		_	-	-				

•

103 ň 0

Palmerton Road (Rte 163) /1-39; Palmerton Road Road Ramerton Road
Palmerton Road (Rte 163) /1-335 NB OFF Ramp No Palmerton Road (Rte 163) /1-335 NB OFF Ramp No 4772006 1 7:15 AM 2 7:15 AM 2 8:15 AM 2 7:15 AM 2 8:15 AM 2 8:15 AM 2 8:16 AM 2 8:17 AM 2 8:17 AM 2 8:16 AM 2
Palmerton Road (Rts 163) Palmerton

ſ

•

1

• .

															1						Peak	%T Hour				3%	7% Yes	1%	2%	6%				T car	%T Hour				%0	3%	%0	%0	8% yes	
ŀ							-			-							-	-				s.1#				24 2	17 1	18 2	15 1	14 1			-	!	#				14 1	17 1	14	14 14	12	
		_												-							TOT	VEH				1 94	100	86	68	1 90				5	VEH			_	1 137	1 129	1 137	144	145	
																						2				8:00 PN	8:15 PN	8:30 PN	8:45 PN	9:00 PN					입				5:00 PN	5:15 PN	5:30 PN	5:45 PN	6:00 PN	
					OAD		-														ERIOD	~				MH 00	15 PM	30 PM	45 PM	MH 00:		Ť			r				MH 00	15 PM	30 PM	45 PM	MH 00	
		-+			FOT R		-	[╞		╎		_					-		ä	Ë				1	4	1	1	ία) Ι	-				<u>-</u>	╉	-		4	4	4	4	2	
	-				D				-			╞	+						_			DED										-			<u>r</u> L				_		-	_	-+	
-	_		-		%T			Ĩ	υ		-				_							<u>%T</u>	%0	0%0	0%	0%0	0%	33%	%0	%0	-+	0%		+	10/	%0	4%	%0	%0	0%0	0%0	%0	0%	100
					7							Ĺ	-		_							50	0	0	0	. 0	÷ 0	1	0	0		-			S C			0	0	0	0	-0		+
╞	_				4	J			Ļ	-	ľ			la u	8 						-	<u>لا</u> #1	0	0	ö	0	0	-	0	0		5	+		- - -	<u>-</u>	-	0	0	0	0	0.5	0 0	1
						_					-			u	u			ROAD				Y	4	Ŧ	2	0	4	1	3	9	1			2	×1 0	2	4	7	5	и я,	с,	5	Ň	1
	NK ROW													2				THROP					2		0		е	-	2	e		`		ļ	2	- 0		۳ 		m	4	τ, i	₽ 	
										╞	+	+	-	+				P	+			%T PE	%00	11%	38%	75%	33%	50%	20%	67%		33%		10 1 10	11 100/	%/D	%07	18%	27%	9%6	13%	9%	11%	140/
DOLAIS							_			Ì			ļ						-	_	.	- Of	3	†	Э E	5	Ļ	2:	2	2		-	-	+	w c			N	 	÷	~			-
an dou			%T		Y				4	m	 C	<u>% ד</u>	2		+			-				<u>1</u> #]]	2	.4	9	0	• 0	2	3	0	1	+	+			+	4	-	4	\$°2	œ	íų -		
112 - 1911															+		-					피	T	N	2	64	2	2	4	e	G	ø		-		• •		0	5	4] F	9	ы. С	म 	4
	+											-										ຍ	0	ŝ	E		1	0	3	0	4	'n		ľ	3	10	1	2	5	ίΩ ·	en S	4.1	a	Ţ
INIGI	+				DAD	-		_					+-		1			-		_		6T PED	%	°%-	. %		1%	%	%	%		0/2		1		2/0	%	%	%		96	× ;	,e	- 10
-	_				FOT R(_	_	_					-			 						S.	2 29	2 12	3 43	1 25	0	11	1 20	1 20		-	-	5	N +		-		1 13	4 13	0 0	0		
-					비									-	-			-		_		Т Т	0	~ 2	e F	0		2	0	0		t		ļ‡ u		2 6		7	2	(C)	N)	۲. ۱	n	17
	North							_														Ш	ო	9	ę.	CV	C)	2	e	2		2		u U	<u>ul «</u>	-	J L	<u>_</u>	<u></u>	m 1	0	n «	~	11
																COUNTS							4	G	с у	N	Ŷ	ъ С	2	ю	ų.	2		C		F V			3	2	b S	- i	- 	ά
-	-				_	-	-	_			-	-	-	-		INUTE C			<u> </u>			<u>%T PEC</u>	%0	<u> 3% .</u>	3%	3%	1%	%0	%0	%0	/01	8			<u>(01) [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] [] </u>	700	0/0	0/0	3%	2%	0%C	3%	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	10/
		w Road											-			15 M						<u></u>	4 8(1 1	1 20	9 0	т Т	1	1 2	0	-	-	-	0	1	00	3 1		1 2	N 1 N 1	12 1	₩. { •	ი 	06
	-	Pink Ro				_		-								-						0 1	2	ņ	4	2.	4	-	2	e	10	2	+	۲ ۲	1	> ~	2	4	4	in c	N 1	n) +		0
		o Road/F							_				-	+							B	60	3	7	1	3	ا <u>ا</u>	4	6	0	a t		e u	ľ			t -	-	1	ω,	n (ю ç	4	16
-		/Lathrog												-		-						P P	o E	φ D	0 	o ∑İ	0 N	0 Σ	0 M	ν M			-					2	o ≊l:	α « Σ Σ	⊃`¢ ≥l:	⊃ ¢ Σ :	2	C
		ot Road				5009									1				600;				7:15 A	7:30 A	7:45 A	8:00 A	8:15 A	8:30 A	8:45 A	9:00 A				+	4:15 P	4 30 P	1 44 0		100	5.15 P		10.40		
	-	L: Dep		_		4/8/2	-				 				-				4/8/2				N.	M	M	M	M	M	M	W					M	N.	N.	M	ξ.	N	N	N, N	×	
		DCATIO				ATE:									1				VTE:				7:00 4	7:15 A	7:30 4	7:45 A	8:00 A	8:15 A	8:30 A	8:45 /				-	4:00 P	4-15 P		100.4	404 100 100 100	100:0		1 0:30 1	2	
		OUNT LC				OUNT D.													OUNT D/		ERIOD	SOM											ERIOD	NO2										

į

SHAIM E81		Manual Counts - Lathrop_NRG_Site.xis		
			NRG SITE ENTRANCE	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
COUNT LOCATION: Lathrop Road / NRG Site Entrar	Ice			
		LATHROP ROAD	LATHROP ROAD	Γ
				T
15 MINUTE COUNTS				
COUNT DATE: 4/8/2009				
PERIOD SB	NB	EB		
-ROM TO A B #T's	<u>%T PED C D #T's %T</u>	PED E F #T'S %T PFD		Leak
7:00 AM 7:15 AM 1 3 0	0% 4 1 0 0%	0 0 0 0%		
7:15 AM 7:30 AM 0 1 0	0.0 2%	0 0 0%		1
7:30 AM 7:45 AM 2 6 0	0% 5.0.0			
7:45 AM 8:00 AM 1 2 05	0% 2 0 0 93	0 0 0%	7:00 PM 8:00 PM 35 0 0%	Ţ
		* 0 0 0%	7:15 PM 8:15 PM 36 0 0% Y	Yes
8:30 AM 8:45 AM 3 5 0		1 0 0 0%	7:30 PM 8:30 PM 33 0 0%	
8.45 AM 0.00 AM 2 2 2		%0 0 0	7:45 PM 8:45 PM 29 0 0%	
		0 0 0%0	8:00 PM 9:00 PM 29 1 3%	
4 13	0% 19 0 0%	000		
20UNT DATE: 4/7/2009				
EKIOD SB	NB	EB	PERIOD TOT Peak	Deak
4:00 PM 4:15 PM 0 5 0	<u>%1 PED C D #T's %T</u>	PED E F #Ts %T PED	FR TO VEH #TS %T HO	Hour
4:15 PM 4:30 PM 1 6 0		0 0 0%		
4:30 PM 4:45 PM 1 4 0				
4:45 PM 5:00 PM 2 6 0				
5:00 PM 5:15 PM 1 4 0			4:00 PM 5:00 PM 35 0 0%	
5:15 PM 5:30 PM 2 5 0			4:15 PM 5:15 PM 41 0 0%	
5:30 PM 5:45 PM 3 7 014			4:30 PM 5:30 PM 57 0 0%	
5:45 PM 6:00 PM 2 8 0	07% 6 0 0 0°.		4:45 PM 5:45 PM 67 0 0%	
			5:00 PM 6:00 PM 78 0 0% Ye	Yes
8 24	0% 21 1 0%	8 16 0%		T

Dare 1

APPENDIX F ConnDOT Maximum Vehicle Loads

STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 2800 BERLIN TURNPIKE, P. O. BOX 317546 NEWINGTON, CONNECTICUT 06131-7546

Telephone (860) 594-2880 Fax (860) 594-2949

Connecticut Bridge Formula

Connecticut DOT Web Page <u>www.ct.gov/dot</u>

. . .

On-line Permits <u>www.cvisn.ct.gov</u>

					2	
DISTANCE IN FEET BE- TWEEN THE EXTREMES	MAXIMUM LOAD IN POUNDS CARRIED ON ANY GROUP OF 2 OR MORE CONSECUTIVE A					
MORE CONSECUTIVE						
AVI ER						
A	2 AXLES	3 AXLES	4 AXLES	5 AXLES	6 AXLES	7 AXLES
<u> </u>	36,000				· · · ·	
6	38,000					
7	36,000					
· 8	36,000					
- 9	39,000	42,000				
10	40.000	42,000				
11	40,000	40,000				
12		46,000	50 000			
13		45,000	50,000			
14		46 500	50,500			
15		47,000	52 660			
16	· ·	48,000	52,500	59.000		
17 .		48,500	53 500	59,000		
18		49.500	64 000	59,000		
19		50,000	54,500	60,000		
20		51,000	65.500	60,500	88.000	
		51,500	56,000	61,000	66,500	
22		52,500	56,500	61,500	67,000	
.23		53,000	57,500	62,500	68,000	
24		54,000	58,000	63,000	68,500	74,000
- 20 • 70g		54,500	58,500	64,600	69,000	74,500
20		55,500	59,500	65,000	69,500	75,000
28		56,000	60,000	65,000	70,000	75,500
29		57,000	60,500	65,500	71,000	76,500
30		58 500	61,000	66,000	71,500	77,000
31		59,000	62,500	60,000	72,000	77,500
32		80,000	63 500	68.004	72,000	78,000
33			64,000	68,500	74,000	78,000
34			64.500	69,000	74 500	10,000
35			65,500	70.000	75,000	201000
36			66,000	70,500	75.500	
37			68,500	71,000	76.000	
38			67,500	72,000	77.000	
03 An			68,000	72,500	77,600	
40			6B,500	73,000	78,000	
41 49			69,500	73,500	78,500	
43			70,000	74,000	79,000	
44			70,500	75,000	80,000	
45			71,500	75,500		
46			72,000	76,000		
47			72,500	76,500		
48			/3,500	77,500		
49			14,000 74 PAA	/8,000		
50			74,000 78,600	18,500		
51			10,000 78,000	19,000		
52			70,000	20,000		
53			77 500			
54			72 886			
55			78 500			
56			79 600			
57			10,000			

24

78,000 78,500 79,500 80,000

APPENDIX G Minimum Turning Radius (WB-62) Semi-trailer Truck with Aerial Photos
	ier an to	EVB	0	2		
	루르그푸 정문 영정 탄	W	ν η	.,		
	Passe ger C Boa Iraib	B/B	24	6.5		
- -	Passen- ger Cau with Travel Trailer	ΡΊ	24	2.0		
	Motor Home	ЫH	\$	26.0		
	Turn- pike Dou- ble Trailer	WB-114	3	17	nicles.	
	Triple Semi- Trailer	WB-96	50	20.7	ign vel	
	Inter- State Semi- Trailer	WB-67**	45	8	of des	
	Inter- State Semi-	WB-62*	45	9.1	g radii	
	Semi- trailer Full Full Combina- tion	WB-60	45	22.2	- turning	
	Semi- trailer tion Large	WB-50	45	19.2		
	Semi- trailer Inter-	WB-40	6	18.9	× ×	
	Articu- lated Bus	A-BUS	33	14.0	1982 طفات مع Act) او -2 ,	
	Single Unit Bus	BUS	42	24.4	Jopted in andraherc Assistan Tat	
	Single Unit Truck	su	4	27.8	ailler as a ation Ass a rainer as g sportation sportation	
	Pas- Senger Car	4	24	13.8	vith 48' tr Thansport Taice That Taice That	
	Design Vehicle Type	Symbol	Minimum design turring radius (ft)	Minimum inside radius (ft)	 Design vehicle 1 STAA (Surface 1 Design vehicle 1 1982 STAA (Sur 1982 STAA (Surface 1 	

ASHTO—Geometric Design of Highways and Street

THIS TURNING TEMPLATE SHOWS THE TURNING PATHS OF THE AASHTO DESIGN VEHICLES. THE PATHS SHOWN ARE FOR THE LEFT FRONT OVERHANG AND THE OUTSIDE REAR WHEEL. THE LEFT FRONT WHEEL FOLLOWS THE CIRCULAR CURVE, HOWEVER, ITS PATH IS NOT SHOWN.



SCALE IN FEET

*Design vehicle with 48' trailer as adopted in 1982 Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA)

Source: Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation

Figure II-8. Minimum turning path for WB-62 (Interstate Semitrailer)*





I-395 NB at Rte 163 (signal)



Route 163 at Route 32 (signal)

Lathrop Road at NRG Site Entrance





Depot Road at Pink Row at Lathrop Road

