Application
19837-2024 Roadway Spot Mobility
20217 - City of Little Canada - 35E/Country Drive/Little Canada Road Interchange
Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

| Status: | Submitted |
| :--- | :--- |
| Submitted Date: | $12 / 14 / 20234: 28$ PM |

## Primary Contact

Feel free to edit your profile any time your information changes. Create your own personal alerts using My Alerts.

| Name:* | He/him/his |  |  | Dircks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pronouns | First Name | Middle Name | Last Name |
| Title: | Public Works Director |  |  |  |
| Department: |  |  |  |  |
| Email: | bill.dircks@littlecanadamn.org |  |  |  |
| Address: | 515 Little Canada Road |  |  |  |
| * | LITILE CANADA |  | Minnesota | 55117 |
|  | City |  | State/Province | Postal Code/Zip |
| Phone:* | 651-766-4049 |  |  |  |
|  | Phone |  |  | Ext. |

## Fax:

What Grant Programs are you most interested in?
Regional Solicitation - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

## Organization Information

| Name: | LITLLE CANADA, CITY OF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdictional Agency (if different): | City |
| Organization Type: |  |
| Organization Website: | 515 LITTLE CANADA RD |


| $*$ | Little Canada <br> City | Minnesota <br> State/Province |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| County: | Ramsey |  |
| Phone:* | $651-766-4026$ |  |
| Postal Code/Zip |  |  |

## Project Information

## Project Name

Primary County where the Project is Located
Cities or Townships where the Project is Located:
Jurisdictional Agency (If Different than the Applicant):

Little Canada Road and Country Drive Intersection Project
Ramsey
City of Little Canada
Ramsey County

Brief Project Description (Include location, road name/functional class, type of improvement, etc.)

The proposed project in the City of Little Canada will reconfigure the Little Canada Road and Country Drive intersection from a traffic signal to a single-lane roundabout and realign Country Drive and the intersection with Little Canada Road approximately 600 feet west. Country Drive will be realigned to the west and include a dedicated pedestrian facility. Access to Little Canada Road from the existing Country Drive location will be removed, enhancing operations for the $1-$ 35E interchange ramp intersection currently separated by less than 100 feet with coordinated signals. The existing traffic signal serving the intersection, along with the existing access location, will be removed. The Waterworks Trail connection to Little Canada Road will be extended through the existing Country Drive right of way. The new location of the Little Canada Road and Country Drive intersection and conversion to a roundabout will work jointly with the programmed improvement for the Little Canada Road/Lake Shore Avenue/County Road C intersection, which will also be converted to a single-lane roundabout.

Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) is an A Minor Arterial Augmentor at this location just west of l-35E. The intersection and connection to Country Drive is important due to the parallel route serving I-35E and I-694 as it runs immediately adjacent west of where the two interstate corridors merge within the City of Little Canada. The continuous connection of Country Drive from Little Canada Road to Rice Street (CSAH 49) allows local traffic and even some regional traffic to avoid I-35E and I-694 altogether.
(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)
TRANSPORTATIONIMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) DESCRIPTION - will be used in TIP Reconstruct Little Canada Road and Country Drive intersection to roundabout and if the project is selected for funding. See MnDOT's TIP description guidance. realign intersection 600 feet west.

Include both the CSAHMSAS/TH references and their corresponding street names in the TIP Description (see Resources link on Regional Solicitation webpage for examples).
Project Length (Miles)
to the nearest one-tenth of a mile

## Project Funding

Are you applying for competitive funds from another source(s) to implement this Yes project?
If yes, please identify the source(s) HSIP and LRIP
Federal Amount \$3,500,000.00

Match Amount \$5,414,000.00
Minimmof $20 \%$ of project total
Project Total \$8,914,000.00
For transit projects, the total cost for the application is total cost minus fare revenues.
Match Percentage 60.74\%
Minimumof 20\%
Compute the match percentage by dividing the match amount by the project total
Source of Match Funds CSAH and MSAS Funds
A minimumof $20 \%$ of the total project cost must cone fromnon-federal sources; additional match funds over the $20 \%$ minimum can cone fromother federal sources
Preferred Program Year
Select one: 2028
Select 2026 or 2027 for TDM and Unique projects only. For all other applications, select 2028 or 2029.
Additional Program Years:
2026, 2027
Select all years that are feasible if funding in an earlier year becomes available.

## Project Information: Roadway Projects

NOTE: If your project has already been assigned a State Aid Project \# (SAP or SP), please Indicate SAP\# here
SAP\#:
County, City, or Lead Agency
Functional Class of Road
City of Little Canada
A Minor Arterial Augmentor, Major Collector
Road System
CSAH 21, MSAS 101
TH, CSAH, MSAS, $O$. RD., TMP. RD., CITY STREET
Road/Route No.
i.e., 53 for CSAH 53

## Name of Road

Example; 1st ST., MAINAVE
TERMIN:(Termini listed must be within 0.3 miles of any work)
From:
Road System
Road/Route No.
i.e., 53 for CSAH 53

Name of Road
Example; 1st ST., MAINAVE
To:
Road System
DO NOT INCLUDELEGAL DESCRPPTION
Road/Route No.
i.e., 53 for CSAH 53

Name of Road
Example; 1st ST., MAINAVE
In the City/Cities of:
(List all cities within project limits)
OR:
At:
Road System
(TH, CSAH, MSAS, CO. RD., TMP. RD., Aity Street)
Road/Route No.
i.e., 53 for CSAH 53

Name of Road
Example; 1st ST., MAINAVE
In the City/Cities of:
(List all cities within project linits)
PROJECT LENGTH
Miles
(nearest 0.1 miles)
Primary Types of Work (check all the apply)
New Construction
Reconstruction
Resurfacing
Bituminous Pavement
Concrete Pavement
Roundabout
New Bridge
Bridge Replacement
Bridge Rehab
New Signal
Signal Replacement/Revision
Bike Trail
Other (do not include incidental items)

BRIDGE/CULVERT PROJECTS (IF APPUCABLE)
Old Bridge/Culvert No.:
New Bridge/Culvert No.:
Structure is Over/Under
(Bridge or culvert name):
OTHER INFORMATION:
Zip Code where Majority of Work is Being Performed 55117
Approximate Begin Construction Date 05/01/2026
Approximate End Construction Date 10/01/2026
Miles of Trail (nearest 0.1 miles) 0.2
Miles of Sidewalk (nearest 0.1 miles)
0.4

Miles of trail on the Regional Bicycle Transportation Network (nearest 0.1 miles): 0.2
Is this a new trail? Yes

## Requirements - All Projects

## All Projects

1. The project must be consistent with the goals and policies in these adopted regional plans: Thrive MSP 2040 (2014), the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (2018), the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan (2018), and the 2040 Water Resources Policy Plan (2015).

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
2. The project must be consistent with the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. Reference the 2040 Transportation Plan goals, objectives, and strategies that relate to the project.

Briefly list the goals, objectives, strategies, and associated pages:
Goal B. Safety and Security; Objective A. Reduce fatal and serious injury crashes and improve safety and security for all modes of passenger travel and freight transport; Strategies B1, B4, B6

Goal C. Access to Destinations; Objective A. Increase the availability of multimodal travel options, especially in congested highway corridors; Objective B. Increase travel time reliability and predictability for travel on highway and transit systems; Strategies C1, C9, C17

Goal D. Competitive Economy; Objective A. Improve multimodal access to regional job concentrations identified in Thrive MSP 2040; Strategy D1.

Linit 2,800 characters, approximately 400 words
3. The project or the transportation problem/need that the project addresses must be in a local planning or programming document. Reference the name of the appropriate comprehensive plan, regional/statewide plan, capital improvement program, corridor study document [studies on trunk highway must be approved by the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Council], or other official plan or program of the applicant agency [includes Safe Routes to School Plans] that the project is included in and/or a transportation problem/need that the project addresses

List the applicable documents and pages: Unique projects are exempt from this qualifying requirement because of their innovative nature.

City of Little Canada 2024-2033 CIP pages 30-31, Ramsey County 2023-2027 TIP pages 10-15

Limit 2,800 characters, approximately 400 words
4. The project must exclude costs for studies, preliminary engineering, design, or construction engineering. Right-of-way costs are only eligible as part of transit stations/stops, transit terminals, park-and-ride facilities, or pool-and-ride lots. Noise barriers, drainage projects, fences, landscaping, etc., are not eligible for funding as a standalone project, but can be included as part of the larger submitted project, which is otherwise eligible. Unique project costs are limited to those that are federally eligible.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
5. Applicant is a public agency (e.g., county, city, tribal government, transit provider, etc.) or non-profit organization (TDM and Unique Projects applicants only). Applicants that are not State Aid cities or counties in the seven-county metro area with populations over 5,000 must contact the MnDOT Metro State Aid Office prior to submitting their application to determine if a public agency sponsor is required.
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
6. Applicants must not submit an application for the same project elements in more than one funding application category.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
7. The requested funding amount must be more than or equal to the minimum award and less than or equal to the maximum award. The cost of preparing a project for funding authorization can be substantial. For that reason, minimum federal amounts apply. Other federal funds may be combined with the requested funds for projects exceeding the maximum award, but the source(s) must be identified in the application. Funding amounts by application category are listed belowin Table 1. For unique projects, the minimum award is $\$ 500,000$ and the maximum award is the total amount available each funding cycle (approximately $\$ 4,000,000$ for the 2024 funding cycle).

Strategic Capacity (Roadway Expansion): \$1,000,000 to \$10,000,000
Roadway Reconstruction/M odernization: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000
Traffic Management Technologies (Roadway System Management): \$500,000 to $\$ 3,500,000$
Spot M obility and Safety: \$1,000,000 to \$3,500,000
Bridges Rehabilitation/Replacement: \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
8. The project must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
9. In order for a selected project to be included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and approved by USDOT, the public agency sponsor must either have a current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) self-evaluation or transition plan that covers the public right of way/transportation, as required under Title II of the ADA. The plan must be completed by the local agency before the Regional Solicitation application deadline. For future Regional Solicitation funding cycles, this requirement may include that the plan has undergone a recent update, e.g., within five years prior to application.
The applicant is a public agency that employs 50 or more people and has a
completed ADA transition plan that covers the public right of way/transportation.
(TDM and Unique Project Applicants Only) The applicant is not a public agency
subject to the self-evaluation requirements in Title II of the ADA.
Date plan completed:
Link to plan:
The applicant is a public agency that employs fewer than 50 people and has a
completed ADA self-evaluation that covers the public right of way/transportation. Yes
Date self-evaluation completed:
10/11/2013
Link to plan:
https://www.littlecanadamn.org/686/ADA-Self-Evaluation
Upload plan or self-evaluation if there is no link
Upload as PDF
10. The project must be accessible and open to the general public.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
Yes
11. The owner/operator of the facility must operate and maintain the project year-round for the useful life of the improvement. This includes assurance of year-round use of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities, per FHWA direction established 8/27/2008 and updated 4/15/2019. Unique projects are exempt from this qualifying requirement.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
Yes
12. The project must represent a permanent improvement with independent utility. The term ?independent utility? means the project provides benefits described in the application by itself and does not depend on any construction elements of the project being funded from other sources outside the regional solicitation, excluding the required non-federal match. Projects that include traffic management or transit operating funds as part of a construction project are exempt from this policy.
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
13. The project must not be a temporary construction project. A temporary construction project is defined as work that must be replaced within five years and is ineligible for funding. The project must also not be staged construction where the project will be replaced as part of future stages. Staged construction is eligible for funding as long as future stages build on, rather than replace, previous work
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
14. The project applicant must send written notification regarding the proposed project to all affected state and local units of government prior to submitting the application

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes

## Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

1. All roadway projects must be identified as a principal arterial (non-freeway facilities only) or A-minor arterial as shown on the latest TAB approved roadway functional classification map. Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects must be located on a minor collector and above functionally classified roadway in the urban areas or a major collector and above in the rural areas.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
Roadway Strategic Capacity and Reconstruction/Modernization and Spot Mobility projects only:
2. The project must be designed to meet 10-ton load limit standards.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement. Yes
Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement and Strategic Capacity projects only:
3. Projects requiring a grade-separated crossing of a principal arterial freeway must be limited to the federal share of those project costs identified as local (non-MnDOT) cost responsibility using MnDOT?s ?Cost Participation for Cooperative Construction Projects and Maintenance Responsibilities? manual. In the case of a federally funded trunk highway project, the policy guidelines should be read as if the funded trunk highway route is under local jurisdiction.
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
4. The bridge must carry vehicular traffic. Bridges can carry traffic from multiple modes. However, bridges that are exclusively for bicycle or pedestrian traffic must apply under one of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities application categories. Rail-only bridges are ineligible for funding.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:
5. The length of the in-place structure is 20 feet or longer.

Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
6. The bridge must have a Local Planning Index (LPI) of less than 60 OR a National Bridge Inventory (NBI) Rating of 3 or less for either Deck Geometry, Approach Roadway, or Waterway Adequacy as reported on the most recent Minnesota Structure Inventory Report.
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.
Roadway Expansion, Reconstruction/Modernization, and Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement projects only:
7. All roadway projects that involve the construction of a newexpanded interchange or new interchange ramps must have approval by the Metropolitan Council/MnDOT Interchange Planning Review Committee prior to application submittal. Please contact David Evin at MnDOT (David.Evin@state.mn.us or 651-234-7795) to determine whether your project needs to go through this process as described in Appendix F of the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan.
Check the box to indicate that the project meets this requirement.

## Requirements - Roadways Including Multimodal Elements

| Specific Roadway Elements |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| CONSTRUCTION PROJECT E®MENTS/COST ESTIMATES | Cost |
| Mobilization (approx 5\% of total cost) | $\$ 203,000.00$ |
| Removals (approx 5\% of total cost) | $\$ 280,800.00$ |
| Roadway (grading, borrow, etc.) | $\$ 1,542,300.00$ |
| Roadway (aggregates and paving) | $\$ 666,700.00$ |
| Subgrade Correction (muck) | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Storm Sewer | $\$ 770,000.00$ |
| Ponds | $\$ 200,000.00$ |
| Concrete ltems (curb \& gutter, sidewalks, median barriers) | $\$ 161,700.00$ |
| Traffic Control | $\$ 203,000.00$ |
| Striping | $\$ 60,900.00$ |
| Signing | $\$ 60,900.00$ |
| Lighting | $\$ 100,000.00$ |
| Turf- Erosion \& Landscaping | $\$ 203,000.00$ |
| Bridge | $\$ 0.00$ |


| Retaining Walls | \$0.00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Noise Wall (not calculated in cost effectiveness measure) | \$0.00 |
| Traffic Signals | \$0.00 |
| Wetland Mitigation | \$0.00 |
| Other Natural and Cultural Resource Protection | \$0.00 |
| RR Crossing | \$0.00 |
| Roadway Contingencies | \$721,900.00 |
| Other Roadway Elements | \$101,500.00 |
| Totals | \$5,275,700.00 |
| Specific Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements |  |
| CONSTRUCTION PROJECT E EMENTS/COST ESTIMATES | Cost |
| Path/Trail Construction | \$350,000.00 |
| Sidewalk Construction | \$118,800.00 |
| On-Street Bicycle Facility Construction | \$0.00 |
| Right-of-Way | \$0.00 |
| Pedestrian Curb Ramps (ADA) | \$40,000.00 |
| Crossing Aids (e.g., Audible Pedestrian Signals, HAMK) | \$0.00 |
| Pedestrian-scale Lighting | \$0.00 |
| Streetscaping | \$0.00 |
| Wayfinding | \$0.00 |
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Contingencies | \$0.00 |
| Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements | \$0.00 |
| Totals | \$508,800.00 |
| Specific Transit and TDM Elements |  |
| CONSTRUCTION PROJECT E EMENTS/COST ESTIMATES | Cost |
| Fixed Guideway Elements | \$0.00 |
| Stations, Stops, and Terminals | \$0.00 |
| Support Facilities | \$0.00 |
| Transit Systems (e.g. communications, signals, controls, fare collection, etc.) | \$0.00 |
| Vehicles | \$0.00 |
| Contingencies | \$0.00 |
| Right-of-Way | \$0.00 |
| Other Transit and TDMElements | \$0.00 |
| Totals | \$0.00 |

## Transit Operating Costs

Number of Platform hours 0
Cost Per Platform hour (full loaded Cost) $\$ 0.00$
Subtotal $\$ 0.00$

Other Costs - Administration, Overhead,etc. \$0.00

## PROTECT Funds Eligibility

One of the newfederal funding sources is Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT). Please describe which specific elements of your project and associated costs out of the Total TAB-Eigible Costs are eligible to receive PROTECT funds. Examples of potential eligible items may include: storm sener, ponding, erosion control/landscaping, retaining walls, newbridges over floodplains, and road realignments out of floodplains.

INFORMATION: Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) Formula Program Implementation Guidance (dot.gov).
Response: Eligible items include storm sewer, ponds, and turf erosion control and landscaping. These items total $\$ 1,173,000$.

## Totals

Total Cost
Construction Cost Total
Transit Operating Cost Total

## Congestion within Project Area:

The free-flow travel speed is the black number
Peak Hour Travel Speed:
21
The peak hour travel speed is the red number
Percentage Decrease in Travel Speed in Peak Hour Compared to Free-Flow (calculation):
Upload the "Level of Congestion" map
1702419628428_Little Canada Rd-Country Dr_Level of Congestion Map.pdf

## Congestion on adjacent Parallel Routes:

Adjacent Parallel Corridor TH 36

## Adjacent Parallel Corridor Start and End Points:

Start Point:
End Point:
Free-How Travel Speed:
The Free-Fow Travel Speed is black number.
Peak Hour Travel Speed:
48
The Peak-Hour Travel Speed is red number.
Percentage Decrease in Travel Speed in Peak Hour Compared to Free-Fow (calculation):
Upload the "Level of Congestion" map:

1702419628428_Little Canada Rd-Country Dr_Level of Congestion Map.pdf

## Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study:

Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a High Priority Intersection:
(70 Points)
Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Medium Priority Intersection:
(65 Points)
Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a Low Priority Intersection:
(60 Points)
Not listed as a priority in the study: Yes
(0 Points)

## Congestion Management and Safety Plan IV:

Proposed at-grade project that reduces delay at a CMSP opportunity area:
(70 Points)
Not listed as a CMSP priority location: Yes
(0 Points)

## Measure C: Current Heavy Commercial Traffic

RESPONSE: Select one for your project, based on the updated 2021 Regional Truck Corridor Study:
Along Tier 1 :
Miles:
0
(to the nearest 0.1 miles)
Along Tier 2:
Miles:
0
(to the nearest 0.1 miles)
Along Tier 3:
Miles:
0
(to the nearest 0.1 miles)
The project provides a direct and immediate connection (i.e., intersects) with either a Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 corridor:

Yes
None of the tiers:

## Measure A: Engagement

iii. Describe the progression of engagement activities in this project. A full response should answer these questions:

1. What engagement methods and tools were used?
2. Howdid you engage specific communities and populations likely to be directly impacted by the project?
3. What techniques did you use to reach populations traditionally not involved in community engagement related to transportation projects?
4. How were the project?s purpose and need identified?
5. How was the community engaged as the project was developed and designed?
6. How did you provide multiple opportunities for of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, persons with disabilities, youth, older adults, and residents in affordable housing to engage at different points of project development?
7. Howdid engagement influence the project plans or recommendations? How did you share back findings with community and re-engage to assess responsiveness of these changes?
8. If applicable, how will NEPA or Title VI regulations will guide engagement activities?

Response:

The project is located in Census Tract 421.01. Census Tract 421.02 is also within a $1 / 2$ mile of the project area but was excluded due to the dividing barrier of $\mathrm{I}-35 \mathrm{E}$. $18.3 \%$ of the population in the project area is below poverty level, per the 5 -year estimate from the 2021 ACS. This is above the Ramsey County's $13.2 \%$ and the Region's $8.1 \%$. This percentage is significantly higher for Black or African American alone population in the project area at $42.7 \%$ compared to the Ramsey County estimate of $26.7 \%$. The Black or African American population in the project area is $9.1 \%$ and Asian alone is $9.3 \%$, compared to $8.8 \%$ and $6.8 \%$ for the Region, respectively. The percentage of the population over 60 is $32.6 \%$ (Region is $20.2 \%$ ) and the percentage of the population with a disability $15.6 \%$ (Region is $10.0 \%$,). This analysis identifies vulnerable populations located in and surrounding the project area and affirms the need for this project.

A public open house was held on November 29th with the goal of better understanding community needs. Postcards were sent to notify households and businesses within a half mile radius of the project. About 30 people attended the meeting and 46 people responded to the online survey. An interactive map was also made available to gather input from the public with 18 comments submitted including concerns, ideas, and opportunities. The engagement revealed that there is frustration around signage and traffic signals at this intersection. There were several comments that the signaling at the intersection is confusing and that many drivers make right turns on red despite adequate signage. There was a lot of interest expressed for a roundabout at this intersection to improve congestion and confusion. Pedestrian and bike safety emerged as a priority for the project including implementing new connecting paths and a higher level of multimodal service. Participants also shared that congestion is a concern to be addressed at this intersection. Residents expressed a clear need for an improved intersection both for vehicles and pedestrians. 66\% of survey participants disagree or strongly disagreed that the intersection feels safe for motorists, with $80 \%$ disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that the intersection feels safe for pedestrians. 70\% agree or strongly agree that the intersection feels congested, with $87 \%$ agreeing or strongly agreeing that the intersection feels confusing. Detailed information is included in the attached engagement summary.

This engagement impacted the project by emphasizing the need for improved pedestrian facilities. As an outcome, the existing Country Drive alignment as well as the new Country drive alignment both will have a dedicated multimodal facility. relate to:
? pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements;
? public health benefits;
? direct access improvements for residents or improved access to destinations such as jobs, school, health care, or other;
? travel time improvements;
? gap closures;
? newtransportation services or modal options;
? leveraging of other beneficial projects and investments;
? and/or community connection and cohesion improvements.
This is not an exhaustive list. A full response will support the benefits claimed, identify benefits specific to Disadvantaged communities residing or engaged in activities near the project area, identify benefits addressing a transportation issue affecting Disadvantaged communities specifically identified through engagement, and substantiate benefits with data.
Acknowledge and describe any negative project impacts to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color populations, low-income populations, children, people with disabilities, youth, and older adults. Describe measures to mitigate these impacts. Unidentified or unmitigated negative impacts may result in a reduction in points.

Belowis a list of potential negative impacts. This is not an exhaustive list.
? Decreased pedestrian access through sidewalk removal / narrowing, placement of barriers along the walking path, increase in auto-oriented curb cuts, etc.
? Increased speed and/or ?cut-through? traffic.
? Removed or diminished safe bicycle access.
? Inclusion of some other barrier to access to jobs and other destinations.

Response:
The project area serves residential, commercial, and community uses. Medium and high-density residential developments are located adjacent to the project including Fleur Royale Condominiums, The Provinces Apartments, and townhomes. Adjacent businesses include restaurants such as Porterhouse Steak and Seafood, Gordies, and Caribou Coffee, employment offices such as BevSource, Agility Engineering \& Manufacturing Solutions, and American Family Insurance, and stores such as SwineBooks Pro, Advanced Medical Home Care, and New Day Thrift Store. Community uses along Country Dr include a public charter school with approximately 185 students (AFSA) and the Hmong Minnesota Senior Center. Disadvantaged community users will have improved, safer multimodal conditions to and between these destinations.

The connection to Little Canada Rd will be improved, meaning better access to the regional transportation system and less congested and safer access to l-35E. The pedestrian crossing of Little Canada Rd at Country Dr will be significantly improved through the conversion of the existing 4-lane undivided highway crossing with turn lanes to a single lane roundabout intersection with the addition of pedestrian refuge islands and elimination of pedestrian-vehicle conflict points. The existing pedestrian crossing distance is 80 ft from curb to curb. The proposed condition is $18-20 \mathrm{ft}$ crossing distance from curb to pedestrian refuge at the single lane roundabout.

Pedestrian facilities within the project area will be upgraded to meet ADA standards. The existing section of sidewalks on the north and south side of Little Canada Rd from Lakeshore Ave to Country Dr are non-compliant with ADA requirements, per City of Little Canada ADA Self-Evaluation (page 14) and will be upgraded to ADA compliance requirements.

The project will improve the connection from the existing Waterworks trail to Little Canada Rd by expanding the trail approximately $1 / 8$ mile to Little Canada Rd within the existing Country Dr right of way. A new sidewalk connection will be installed on the new alignment of Country Dr. The Waterworks Trail will have a new separated grade crossing underpass of Country Dr. The project will implement two north-south multimodal connections that will better connect to Little Canada Rd and Metro Transit Route 71 Little Canada - Westminster- Concord Inver Hills. This route runs east-west along Little Canada Rd with the closest designated stop located within the proposed realignment location for Little Canada Rd / Country Dr, approximately 200 feet east of Lake Shore Ave. The transit stop will be incorporated into the project with improved multimodal access to the stop. This route connects to Inver Hills Community College, South St. Paul, and downtown St. Paul.

## Measure C: Affordable Housing Access

Describe any affordable housing developments?existing, under construction, or planned?within $1 / 2$ mile of the proposed project. The applicant should note the number of existing subsidized units, which will be provided on the Socio-Economic Conditions map. Applicants can also describe other types of affordable housing (e.g., naturally-occurring affordable housing, manufactured housing) and under construction or planned affordable housing that is within a half mile of the project. If applicable, the applicant can provide self-generated PDF maps to support these additions. Applicants are encouraged to provide a self-generated PDF map describing how a project connects affordable housing residents to destinations (e.g., childcare, grocery stores, schools, places of worship).

Describe the project?s benefits to current and future affordable housing residents within $1 / 2$ mile of the project. Benefits must relate to affordable housing residents. Examples may include:
? specific direct access improvements for residents
? improved access to destinations such as jobs, school, health care or other;
? newtransportation services or modal options;
? and/or community connection and cohesion improvements.
This is not an exhaustive list. Since residents of affordable housing are more likely not to own a private vehicle, higher points will be provided to roadway projects that include other multimodal access improvements. A full response will support the benefits claimed, identify benefits specific to residents of affordable housing, identify benefits addressing a transportation issue affecting residents of affordable housing specifically identified through engagement, and substantiate benefits with data.

Response:
The socioeconomic conditions map shows the project location within a Regional Environmental Justice area. The auto-generated map estimates 154 affordable housing units in Census Tracts within a half mile of the project; however, HousingLink lists specific properties near the project with a number more than 2.5 times higher than that estimate. HousingLink identifies 6 properties with affordable housing served by the project area with a total of 405 units. 58 of these units are for households at or below 30\% of AMI, 188 units are for households at or below $50 \%$ of AMI, 41 for $60 \%$ AMI, and 118 for $80 \%$ AMI. These properties include the Provinces Apartments just 300 ft from the project area with 118 units including 1, 2, and 3 bedroom affordable units. The Garden Terrace Apartments and Commons buildings are approximately a half mile from the project area with another 71 affordable units. The North Star Estates Manufactured Home Community is located within a half mile of the project area north on Country Dr and is home to over 200 households. The project area is a key connection point for residents to and from commercial and job locations as well as community uses such as the Hmong Minnesota Senior Center.

The project improvements include significant pedestrian amenities including a dedicated sidewalk along the length of the Country Dr realignment and extension of the Waterworks trail through the existing Country Dr right of way to make two new north-south multimodal connections. The Waterworks Trail will have a new separated grade crossing underpass of Country Dr. Pedestrian crossing environment will be substantially improved through the conversion of the existing 4-lane undivided highway crossing with turn lanes to a single lane roundabout intersection with the addition of pedestrian refuge islands and elimination of pedestrian-vehicle conflict points. The existing pedestrian crossing distance is 80 ft from curb to curb and the proposed condition is $18-20 \mathrm{ft}$ crossing distance from curb to pedestrian refuge at the single lane roundabout. Shifting the Little Canada Rd/Country Dr intersection west 600 feet will mitigate confusion and conflicts with the Little Canada Rd/l-35E southbound ramp intersection, which is currently only 100 feet to the east. Pedestrians will be able to cross one direction of traffic at a time compared to the challenging and confusing coordinated signal intersection of Little Canada Rd/Country Dr and Little Canada Rd/l-35E southbound ramp intersection where pedestrians need to keep track of 8 conflicting directions of traffic during one attempted crossing of Little Canada Rd. The single lane roundabout will act as a traffic calming measure for the corridor to reduce speeds from the existing 4-lane undivided highway condition.

## Measure D: BONUS POINTS

## Project is located in an Area of Concentrated Poverty:

Project?s census tracts are above the regional average for population in poverty or population of color (Regional Environmental Justice Area):
Project located in a census tract that is below the regional average for population
in poverty or populations of color (Regional Environmental Justice Area):
Upload the ?Socio-Economic Conditions? map used for this measure.
1702419988788_Little Canada Rd-Country Dr_Socioeconomic Map.pdf

## Measure A: Congestion Reduction/Air Quality



| Total | Total | Delay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak | Peak | Reduced |
| Hour | Hour | Total |
| Delay | Delay |  |
| Reduced | Reduced |  |

## Measure B: Roadway projects that do not include new roadway segments or railroad grade-separation elements

| Total (CO, | Total (CO, | Total (CO, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOX, and | NOX, and | NOX, and |
| VOC) Peak | VOC) Peak | VOC) Peak |
| Hour | Hour | Hour |
| Emissions | Emissions | Emissions |
| without the | with the | Reduced by |
| Project | Project | the Project |
| (Kilograms): | (Kilograms): | (Kilograms): |
| 5.15 | 4.91 | 0.24 |
| 5 | 5 | 0 |

## Total

| Total Emissions Reduced: | 0.24 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upload Synchro Report | 1702504056555_Synchro_Combined.pdf |

Please upload attachrent in PDF form (Save Form then click 'Edit' in top right to upload file.)

Measure B: Roadway projects that are constructing new roadway segments, but do not include railroad grade-separation elements (for Roadway Expansion applications only):

| Total (CO, | Total (CO, | Total (CO, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOX, and | NOX, and | NOX, and |
| VOC) Peak | VOC) Peak | VOC) Peak |
| Hour | Hour | Hour |
| Emissions | Emissions | Emissions |
| without the | with the | Reduced by |
| Project | Project | the Project |
| (Kilograms): | (Kilograms): | (Kilograms): |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Total Parallel Roadway

Emissions Reduced on Parallel Roadways
0
Upload Synchro Report
Please upload attachment in PDF form (Save Form then click 'Edit' in top right to upload file.)

## New Roadway Portion:

Cruise speed in miles per hour with the project: 0
Vehicle miles traveled with the project: 0
Total delay in hours with the project: 0
Total stops in vehicles per hour with the project: 0
Fuel consumption in gallons: 0
Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced or Produced on New 0
Roadway (Kilograms):
EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit 1,400
characters; approximately 200 words)
Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms):0.0

## Measure B: Roadway projects that include railroad grade-separation elements

Cruise speed in miles per hour without the project: 0
Vehicle miles traveled without the project: 0
Total delay in hours without the project: 0
Total stops in vehicles per hour without the project: 0
Cruise speed in miles per hour with the project: 0
Vehicle miles traveled with the project: 0

| Total delay in hours with the project: | 0 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total stops in vehicles per hour with the project: | 0 |
| Fuel consumption in gallons (F1) | 0 |
| Fuel consumption in gallons (F2) | 0 |
| Fuel consumption in gallons (F3) | 0 |
| Total (CO, NOX, and VOC) Peak Hour Emissions Reduced by the Project (Kilograms): | 0 |
| EXPLANATION of methodology and assumptions used:(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words) |  |

## Measure A: Benefit of Crash Reduction

Crash Modification Factor Used:

(Limit 700 Characters; approximately 100 words)
Rationale for Crash Modification Selected:
(Limit 1400 Characters; approximately 200 words)
Project Benefit (\$) from B/C Ratio
Total Fatal (K) Crashes:
Total Serious Injury (A) Crashes:
Total Non-Motorized Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes:
Total Crashes:
Total Fatal (K) Crashes Reduced by Project:
Total Serious Injury (A) Crashes Reduced by Project:
Total Non-Motorized Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes Reduced by Project:
Total Crashes Reduced by Project:
Worksheet Attachment

CMF ID 212 - Conversion of signalized intersection into single or multi-lane roundabout

- Applies to serious injury, minor injury, and possible injury crashes of all type.

CMF ID 209 - Conversion of signalized intersection into single or multi-lane roundabout

- Applies to all crashes of all types and severities.

CMF ID 212 and 209 were selected as the intersection of Country Dr and Little Canada Rd is proposed to be converted from a signalized intersection to a single lane roundabout.

$$
\$ 4,562,651.00
$$

0
1
1
5
0
1

Upload Crash Modification Factors and B/C Worksheet in PDF form

## Measure B: Pedestrian Safety

Determine if these measures do not apply to your project. Does the project match either of the following descriptions?
If either of the items are checked yes, then score for entire pedestrian safety measure is zero. Applicant does not need to respond to the sub-measures and can proceed to the next section.

Project is primarily a freeway (or transitioning to a freeway) and does not provide No safe and comfortable pedestrian facilities and crossings.
Existing location lacks any pedestrian facilities (e.g., sidewalks, marked
crossings, wide shoulders in rural contexts) and project does not add pedestrian
elements (e.g., reconstruction of a roadway without sidewalks, that doesn?t also
add pedestrian crossings and sidewalk or sidepath on one or both sides).
SUB-M EASURE 1: Project-Based Pedestrian Safety Enhancements and Risk Elements
To receive maximum points in this category, pedestrian safety countermeasures selected for implementation in projects should be, to the greatest extent feasible, consistent with the countermeasure recommendations in the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan and state and national best practices. Links to resources are provided on the Regional Solicitation Resources web page.

Please answer the following two questions with as much detail as possible based on the known attributes of the proposed design. If any aspect referenced in this section is not yet determined, describe the range of options being considered, to the greatest extent available. If there are project elements that may increase pedestrian risk, describe how these risks are being mitigated.

1. Describe how this project will address the safety needs of people crossing the street at signalized intersections, unsignalized intersections, midblock locations, and roundabouts.

Treatments and countermeasures should be well-matched to the roadway?s context (e.g., appropriate for the speed, volume, crossing distance, and other location attributes). Refer to the Regional Solicitation Resources web page for guidance links.

The pedestrian crossing of Little Canada Road will be significantly improved through the conversion of the existing 4-lane undivided highway crossing with turn lanes to a single-lane roundabout intersection with the addition of pedestrian refuge islands and the elimination of pedestrian-vehicle conflict points. The existing pedestrian crossing distance is 80 ft from curb to curb. The proposed condition is $18-20$ feet crossing distance from curb to pedestrian refuge at the single-lane roundabout. Shifting the Little Canada Road/Country Drive intersection west 600 feet will mitigate confusion and conflicts with the Little Canada Road/l35E southbound ramp intersection, which is currently only 100 feet to the east. Pedestrians will be able to cross one direction of traffic at a time compared to the challenging and confusing coordinated signal intersection of Little Canada Road/Country Drive and Little Canada Road/I-35E southbound ramp intersection where pedestrians need to keep track of 8 conflicting directions of traffic during one attempted crossing of Little Canada Road. The risk of a double-blind situation where a vehicle in one lane yields or stops for the pedestrian, masking the visual of the pedestrian for the vehicle in the adjacent lane and likewise of the vehicle in the adjacent lane to the pedestrian, will also be eliminated by the lane reduction from 4 to 2 lanes. The single-lane roundabout will act as a traffic calming measure for the corridor to reduce speeds from the existing 4-lane undivided highway condition.

The project will also improve the connection from the existing Waterworks trail to Little Canada Road by expanding the trail approximately $1 / 8$ mile to Little Canada Road within the existing Country Drive right of way. This will create a dedicated multimodal trail connection and connect to the existing sidewalk on the north side of Little Canada Road. The Waterworks Trail will have a new separated grade crossing underpass of Country Dr. An additional, new sidewalk connection will be installed on the new alignment of Country Drive through the project area.

## (Limit 2, 800 characters; approximately 400 words)

Is the distance in between signalized intersections increasing (e.g., removing a signal)?
Select one: Yes
If yes, describe what measures are being used to fill the gap between protected crossing opportunities for pedestrians (e.g., adding High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk beacons to help motorists yield and help pedestrians find a suitable gap for crossing, turning signal into a roundabout to slow motorist speed, etc.).

## Response:

In this unique circumstance, the signal at Little Canada Road/Country Drive, one of the two intersections that make up the coordinated signal at Little Canada Road/Country Drive/l-35E southbound ramps, will be removed, realigned 600 feet west and converted to a single-lane roundabout leaving the existing signal at Little Canada Road/l-35E southbound ramps in place. The existing condition only allows one pedestrian crossing of Little Canada Road for both intersections, and this condition will be maintained. Although the signal at Little Canada Road/Country Drive will be removed, the traffic signal at Little Canada Road/l-35E southbound ramps will remain, 100 feet east of the existing Little Canada Road/Country Drive intersection. In addition to maintaining a traffic signal pedestrian crossing in the general proximity of the existing location, the pedestrian crossing environment options will be much improved through the single lane roundabout condition 600 feet west.

## (Linit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

Will your design increase the crossing distance or crossing time across any leg of an intersection? (e.g., by adding turn or through lanes, widening lanes, using a multi-phase crossing, prohibiting crossing on any leg of an intersection, pedestrian bridge requiring length detour, etc.). This does not include any increases to crossing distances solely due to the addition of bike lanes (i.e., no other through or turn lanes being added or widened).
Select one:
No
If yes,
? Howmany intersections will likely be affected?
Response:
? Describe what measures are being used to reduce exposure and delay for pedestrians (e.g., median crossing islands, curb bulb-outs, etc.)
Response:
(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
? If grade separated pedestrian crossings are being added and increasing crossing time, describe any features that are included that will reduce the detour required of pedestrians and make the separated crossing a more appealing option (e.g., shallowtunnel that doesn?t require much elevation change instead of pedestrian bridge with numerous switchbacks).
Response:
(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
If mid-block crossings are restricted or blocked, explain why this is necessary and howpedestrian crossing needs and safety are supported in other ways (e.g., nearest protected or enhanced crossing opportunity).
Response:
2. Describe how motorist speed will be managed in the project design, both for through traffic and turning movements. Describe any project-related factors that may affect speed directly or indirectly, even if speed is not the intended outcome (e.g., wider lanes and turning radii to facilitate freight movements, adding turn lanes to alleviate peak hour congestion, etc.). Note any strategies or treatments being considered that are intended to help motorists drive slower (e.g., visual narrowing, narrowlanes, truck aprons to mitigate wide turning radii, etc.) or protect pedestrians if increasing motorist speed (e.g., buffers or other separation from moving vehicles, crossing treatments appropriate for higher speed roadways, etc.).
Response:
The intersection of Little Canada Road and Country Drive will be converted from a 4-lane undivided highway with turn lanes condition to a single-lane roundabout with medians serving as pedestrian refuges. Overall pavement width will be significantly decreased, which is shown to reduce speeds. The single-lane roundabout will incorporate traffic calming measures to slow traffic through the intersection and will be a significant improvement to managing speed and turning movements compared to the existing condition. For example, the existing southbound right from Country Drive to Little Canada Road is designed to encourage vehicles to enter the intersection past the pedestrian crosswalk stop bar and includes extra pavement for faster turning movements. The single-lane roundabout will create a much different, more predictable intersection feel by also eliminating the confusion between the interconnected signal intersection with the $I-$ 35E southbound ramp 100 feet east.

## (Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

If known, what are the existing and proposed design, operation, and posted speeds? Is this an increase or decrease from existing conditions?
The existing posted speed limit is 35 mph on Country Drive and 30 mph on Little Canada Road. These posted speed limits will not change. The addition of the roundabout at the Little Canada Road/Country Drive intersection will decrease speed from the existing condition. The design speed for vehicles entering the single-lane roundabout is 15 mph .

## (Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

SUB-M EASURE 2: Existing Location-Based Pedestrian Safety Risk Factors
These factors are based on based on trends and patterns observed in pedestrian crash analysis done for the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. Check off how many of the following factors are present. Applicants receive more points if more risk factors are present.
Existing road configuration is a One-way, $3+$ through lanes
or
Existing road configuration is a Two-way, 4+ through lanes Yes
Existing road has a design speed, posted speed limit, or speed study/data Yes showing 85th percentile travel speeds in excess of 30 MPH or more Yes
Existing road has AADT of greater than 15,000 vehicles per day Yes

SUB-M EASURE 3: Existing Location-Based Pedestrian Safety Exposure Factors
These factors are based on based on trends and patterns observed in pedestrian crash analysis done for the Regional Pedestrian Safety Action Plan. Check off how many of the following existing location exposure factors are present. Applicants receive more points if more risk factors are present.

Existing road has transit running on or across it with 1+ transit stops in the project area (lf flag-stop route with no fixed stops, then 1+ locations in the project area where roadside stops are allowed. Do not count portions of transit routes Yes with no stops, such as non-stop freeway sections of express or limited-stop routes.)
Existing road has high-frequency transit running on or across it and 1+ highfrequency stops in the project area (high-frequency defined as service at least every 15 minutes from 6am to 7pm weekdays and 9am to 6pm Saturdays.)
Existing road is within 500 ? of $1+$ shopping, dining, or entertainment destinations Yes (e.g., grocery store, restaurant)

If checked, please describe:
(Linit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)
Existing road is within 500 ? of other known pedestrian generators (e.g., school, civic/community center, senior housing, multifamily housing, regulatorily- Yes designated affordable housing)
If checked, please describe:
The project area serves residential and community uses. Medium and highdensity residential developments are located adjacent to the project including Fleur Royale Condominiums, The Provinces Apartments, and townhomes. The Hmong Minnesota Senior Center is 500 feet north of the project area and AFSA, a K-8 public charter school with approximately 185 students, is adjacent to the Senior Center.
(Limit 1,400 characters; approximately 200 words)

## Measure A: Multimodal Elements and Existing Connections

The proposed multimodal improvements will better serve regular multimodal users to and from adjacent land uses including multifamily housing, business, restaurants, and community uses including a public charter school and the Hmong Minnesota Senior Center.

The pedestrian crossing of Little Canada Rd will be improved through the addition of pedestrian refuge islands and elimination of pedestrian-vehicle conflict points through the installation of a single-lane roundabout. The existing pedestrian crossing distance is 80 ft from curb to curb. The proposed condition is $18-20 \mathrm{ft}$ from curb to refuge island. Shifting the Little Canada Rd/Country Dr intersection west 600 ft will mitigate confusion and conflicts with the Little Canada Rd/l-35E SB ramp intersection, which is currently only 100 ft to the east. Pedestrians will be able to cross one direction of traffic at a time compared to the confusing coordinated signal intersection where pedestrians need to keep track of 8 conflicting directions of traffic during one crossing of Little Canada Rd.

Pedestrian facilities within the project area will be upgraded to meet ADA standards. The existing sidewalks on the north and south side of Little Canada Rd from Lakeshore Ave to Country Dr are non-compliant with ADA requirements, per City of Little Canada ADA Self-Evaluation (pg 14) and will be upgraded to meet ADA compliance requirements.

An additional, new sidewalk connection will be installed on the new alignment of Country Dr through the project area, meaning two north-south multimodal connections will be built. The connection from the existing Waterworks trail to Little Canada Rd within the existing Country Dr right of way will be expanded approximately $1 / 8$ mile to Little Canada Rd. The Waterworks Trail will have a new separated grade crossing underpass of Country Dr.

Little Canada Rd is an RBTN Tier 1 Corridor and the existing and proposed Country Dr location is within the RBTN Tier 2 Corridor. For the Regional Bicycle Barriers designation, the intersection of Little Canada Rd and Country Dr is within the buffer area for the Tier 2 Expressway Barrier Crossing area for I-35E and I694. The trail improvements within the existing Country Dr alignment and the sidewalk along the new Country Dr alignment will provide alternative north-south connections within the barrier area.

Metro Transit Route 71 Little Canada - Westminster- Concord - Inver Hills runs east-west along Little Canada Rd with the closest designated stop located within the proposed realignment location for Little Canada Rd / Country Dr, approximately 200 feet east of Lake Shore Ave. The transit stop will be incorporated into the proposed project. This route connects to Inver Hills Community College, South St. Paul, and downtown St. Paul.
(Limit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words)

## Transit Projects Not Requiring Construction

If the applicant is completing a transit application that is operations only, check the box and do not complete the remainder of the form. These projects will receive full points for the Risk Assessment.

Park-and-Ride and other transit construction projects require completion of the Risk Assessment below.
Check Here if Your Transit Project Does Not Require Construction

## Measure A: Risk Assessment - Construction Projects

## 1. Public Involvement ( 20 Percent of Points)

Projects that have been through a public process with residents and other interested public entities are more likely than others to be successful. The project applicant must indicate that events and/or targeted outreach (e.g., surveys and other web-based input) were held to help identify the transportation problem, howthe potential solution was selected instead of other options, and the public involvement completed to date on the project. The focus of this section is on the opportunity for public input as opposed to the quality of input. NOTE: A written response is required and failure to respond will result in zero points.
Multiple types of targeted outreach efforts (such as meetings or online/mail outreach) specific to this project with the general public and partner agencies Yes have been used to help identify the project need.

At least one meeting specific to this project with the general public has been used to help identify the project need.
50\%
At least online/mail outreach effort specific to this project with the general public
has been used to help identify the project need.
50\%
No meeting or outreach specific to this project was conducted, but the project was identified through meetings and/or outreach related to a larger planning effort.
25\%
No outreach has led to the selection of this project.
0\%
Describe the type(s) of outreach selected for this project (i.e., online or in-person meetings, surveys, demonstration projects), the method(s) used to announce outreach opportunities, and how many people participated. Include any public website links to outreach opportunities.
Response:
A public open house was held on November 29th. Postcards were sent to notify households and businesses within a half mile radius of the project. Approximately 30 people attended and 46 people filled out a project needs survey. An interactive map was also made available to gather input from the public on corridor needs and ideas:
https://gis.bolton-menk.com/inputid/?app=LittleCanadaRoadCountryDrive. 18 responses were received. Detailed information is included in the attached engagement summary.

## imit 2,800 characters; approximately 400 words

## 2. Layout ( 25 Percent of Points)

Layout includes proposed geometrics and existing and proposed right-of-way boundaries. A basic layout should include a base map (north arrow, scale; legend;* city and/or county limits; existing ROW, labeled; existing signals;* and bridge numbers*) and design data (proposed alignments; bike and/or roadway lane widths; shoulder width;* proposed signals;* and proposed ROW). An aerial photograph with a line showing the project?s termini does not suffice and will be awarded zero points. *If applicable
Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted jurisdictions (i.e.,
cities/counties/MnDOT. If a MnDOT trunk highway is impacted, approval by MnDOT must have occurred to receive full points. A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.
100\%
A layout does not apply (signal replacement/signal timing, stand-alone streetscaping, minor intersection improvements). Applicants that are not certain whether a layout is required should contact Colleen Brown at MnDOT Metro State Aid? colleen.brown@state.mn.us.

100\%
For projects where MnDOT trunk highways are impacted and a MnDOT Staff Approved layout is required. Layout approved by the applicant and all impacted local jurisdictions (i.e., cities/counties), and layout review and approval by MnDOT is pending. A PDF of the layout must be attached along with letters from each jurisdiction to receive points.
75\%
Layout completed but not approved by all jurisdictions. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.
50\%
Layout has been started but is not complete. A PDF of the layout must be attached to receive points.
25\%
Layout has not been started
0\%
Attach Layout 1702588300633_Reduced_Roundabout_Figure-Location_Map_2023 11 29.pdf
Please upload attachrent in PDF form
Additional Attachments
Please upload attachment in PDF form
3. Review of Section 106 Historic Resources (15 Percent of Points)

No known historic properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places are located in the project area, and project is not located on an Yes identified historic bridge

100\%
There are historical/archeological properties present but determination of ?no historic properties affected? is anticipated.

100\%
Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of ?no adverse effect?
anticipated
80\%
Historic/archeological property impacted; determination of ?adverse effect?
anticipated

40\%
Unsure if there are any historic/archaeological properties in the project area.
0\%
Project is located on an identified historic bridge

## 4. Right-of-Way ( 25 Percent of Points)

Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit either not required or all have been acquired 100\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit required - plat, legal descriptions, or official map complete
50\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit required - parcels identified
25\%
Right-of-way, permanent or temporary easements, and/or MnDOT agreement/limited-use permit required - parcels not all identified \%
5. Railroad Involvement ( 15 Percent of Points)

No railroad involvement on project or railroad Right-of-Way agreement is executed (include signature page, if applicable)

Yes
100\%
Signature Page
Please upload attachnent in PDF form
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have begun
50\%
Railroad Right-of-Way Agreement required; negotiations have not begun.
0\%

## Measure A: Cost Effectiveness

Total Project Cost (entered in Project Cost Form):
Enter Amount of the Noise Walls:
Total Project Cost subtract the amount of the noise walls:
Enter amount of any outside, competitive funding:
Attach documentation of award:
Points Awarded in Previous Criteria
Cost Effectiveness
\$5,784,500.00
$\$ 0.00$
\$5,784,500.00
$\$ 0.00$
$\$ 0.00$

## Other Attachments

File Name
Little Canada Country Dr_Affordable_Housing.pdf Little Canada Rd-Country Dr_Ramsey County LOS.pdf Little Canada Rd_Country Dr_Existing conditions.pdf Little Canada Rd_Country Dr_Letters of Support.pdf Little Canada Road OH Summary_07DEC23.pdf Little Canada-Country Dr_One Page Description.pdf Little Canada_Resolution 2023-152 - Regional Solicitation.pdf MnDOT LOS_2024 Regional Solicitation_LCl-35E.pdf Reduced_Roundabout_Figure-Location_Map_2023 11 29.pdf

| Description | File Size |
| :--- | :--- |
| Affordable Housing Map and Attachments | 5.2 MB |
| Letter of Support from Ramsey County | 250 KB |
| Existing Conditions Photos | 7.0 MB |
| Letters of Support | 4.1 MB |
| Open House Engagement Summary | 851 KB |
| One Page Project Summary | 400 KB |
| Resolution | 87 KB |
| MnDOT Letter of Support | 208 KB |
| Project Location and Layout | 2.6 MB |





Points
Regional Environmental Justice Area
Area of Concentrated Poverty

For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit For complete disclaimer of accuracy, please visit
http://giswebsite.metc.state.mn.us/gissite/notice.aspx

|  | $\rangle$ |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\dagger$ |  | \% |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 687 | 593 | 153 | 292 | 32 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 687 | 593 | 153 | 292 | 32 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  |  | 0 | , | 475 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 100 |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.972 |  | 0.987 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.957 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1877 | 1796 | 0 | 1724 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.957 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1877 | 1796 | 0 | 1724 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 30 | 30 |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1330 | 377 |  | 708 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 30.2 | 8.6 |  | 16.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 7\% | 1\% | 1\% | 10\% | 4\% | 5\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 15 | 687 | 593 | 153 | 292 | 32 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 702 | 746 | 0 | 324 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Left | Right | Left | Right |
| Median Width(t) |  | 0 | 3 |  | 12 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |  | 32 | 20 |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 17 |  |  | 14 | 18 | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Yield | Yield |  | Yield |  |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type: Other

Control Type: Roundabout
Intersection Capacity Utilization 73.0\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\frac{1}{\dagger}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 中4 |  |  |  |  |  | \＆ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 2 | 220 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 2 | 220 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length（ft） | 0 |  | 0 | 170 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 550 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length（ft） | 100 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.965 | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 0 | 3539 | 1599 | 1787 | 3471 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1598 | 1461 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.347 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 0 | 3539 | 1599 | 653 | 3471 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1598 | 1461 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 405 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed（mph） |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |
| Link Distance（ft） |  | 145 |  |  | 680 |  |  | 675 |  |  | 1315 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 3.3 |  |  | 15.5 |  |  | 13.1 |  |  | 25.6 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 0\％ | 2\％ | 1\％ | 1\％ | 4\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 5\％ | 0\％ | 5\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 2 | 220 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20\％ |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 176 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（ft） |  | 6 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Link Offset（ft） |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（ft） |  | 20 |  |  | 24 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed（mph） | 15 |  | 14 | 16 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 16 |  | 13 |
| Number of Detectors |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Detector Template |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Left |  |  |
| Leading Detector（ft） |  | 0 | 0 | 26 | 126 |  |  |  |  | 20 | 126 | 126 |
| Trailing Detector（ft） |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 120 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Detector 1 Position（ft） |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Detector 1 Size（ft） |  | 20 | 20 | 21 | 20 |  |  |  |  | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Detector 1 Type |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  |  |  | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） |  | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
| Detector 2 Position（ft） |  |  |  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  | 120 | 120 |
| Detector 2 Size（ft） |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |
| Detector 2 Type |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Extend |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Turn Type |  | NA | Perm | pm＋pt | NA |  |  |  |  | Perm | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase |  | 6 | 6 | 25 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  | 15.0 | 15.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 13.0 | 35.0 |  |  |  |  | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| Total Split (s) |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 13.0 | 39.0 |  |  |  |  | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| Total Split (\%) |  | 47.3\% | 47.3\% | 23.6\% | 70.9\% |  |  |  |  | 29.1\% | 29.1\% | 29.1\% |
| Maximum Green (s) |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) |  | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 2.0 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 8.0 | 8.0 | 5.0 | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  | Lag | Lag | Lead |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode |  | C-Max | C-Max | None | C-Max |  |  |  |  | None | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 21.3 | 21.3 | 34.3 | 31.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.7 | 8.7 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.62 | 0.57 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.43 | 0.47 | 0.29 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.75 | 0.76 |
| Control Delay |  | 14.9 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 43.6 | 46.2 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 14.9 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 43.6 | 46.2 |
| LOS |  | B | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  | D | D |
| Approach Delay |  | 10.4 |  |  | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 44.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |
| 90th \%ile Green (s) |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 90th \%ile Term Code |  | Coord | Coord | Max | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 70th \%ile Green (s) |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 70th \%ile Term Code |  | Coord | Coord | Max | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 50th \%ile Green (s) |  | 18.6 | 18.6 | 7.4 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 50th \%ile Term Code |  | Coord | Coord | Gap | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 30th \%ile Green (s) |  | 19.3 | 19.3 | 6.7 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 30th \%ile Term Code |  | Coord | Coord | Gap | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 10th \%ile Green (s) |  | 32.4 | 32.4 | 0.0 | 32.4 |  |  |  |  | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 |
| 10th \%ile Term Code |  | Coord | Coord | Skip | Coord |  |  |  |  | Gap | Gap | Gap |
| Stops (vph) |  | 417 | 49 | 60 | 244 |  |  |  |  |  | 162 | 148 |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  | 5 | , | 1 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 4 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  | 330 | 74 | 96 | 342 |  |  |  |  |  | 329 | 310 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  | 64 | 14 | 19 | 66 |  |  |  |  |  | 64 | 60 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  | 77 | 17 | 22 | 79 |  |  |  |  |  | 76 | 72 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 77 | 0 | 18 | 41 |  |  |  |  |  | 63 | 58 |
| Queue Length 95th ( ft ) |  | 119 | 50 | 37 | 63 |  |  |  |  |  | \#153 | \#148 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 65 |  |  | 600 |  |  | 595 |  |  | 1235 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  | 170 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 550 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1367 | 866 | 571 | 1974 |  |  |  |  |  | 261 | 239 |


|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | , | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.43 | 0.47 | 0.28 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.73 | 0.74 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 55
Actuated Cycle Length: 55
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:WBTL and 6:EBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 55
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.76

| Intersection Signal Delay: 15.2 | Intersection LOS: B |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $63.2 \%$ | ICU Level of Service B |

Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 2: I-35E West Ramps \& Little Canada Rd




| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 979 | 0 | 1367 | 490 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 975 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 392 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 4.14 | - | 6.84 | 6.94 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - |  | 5.84 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - |  | 5.84 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | 2.22 | - | 3.52 | 3.32 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 701 | - | 138 | 524 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 326 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 652 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 701 |  | 135 | 524 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 135 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 326 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 636 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 0.2 |  | 15.6 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | C |  |
| HCMLOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 360 | - | - | 701 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.053 | - | - | 0.014 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 15.6 | - | - | 10.2 | 0.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | C | - | - | B | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.2 | - | - | 0 | - |

## 1: Little Canada Rd \& Country Dr

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1772 |
| Control Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 0 |
| Stops / Veh | 1.00 |
| Stops (\#) | 1772 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 30 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 10 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 303 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 22 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 13.6 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.56 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.30 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.36 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 |

## 2: I-35E West Ramps \& Little Canada Rd

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2045 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 15 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 15 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 9 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.53 |
| Stops (\#) | 1080 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 14 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 15 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 207 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 21 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 9.8 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.48 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.29 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.34 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 16 |

## 8: Little Canada Rd

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1751 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 0 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.03 |
| Stops (\#) | 47 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 29 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 4 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 131 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 6 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 22.8 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 0.40 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.08 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.09 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 |

## Network Totals

| Number of Intersections | 3 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 6 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 6 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 9 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.52 |
| Stops (\#) | 2899 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 22 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 30 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 642 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 49 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 13.0 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.44 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.67 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.80 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 16 |
| Performance Index | 16.8 |

## 1: Little Canada Rd \& Country Dr

| Direction | EB | WB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 702 | 746 | 324 | 1772 |
| Control Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stops / Veh | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Stops (\#) | 302 | 746 | 324 | 1772 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 6 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 177 | 3 | 1 | 10 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 11 | 83 | 43 | 303 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 15.8 | 11.0 | 4 | 22 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 0.78 | 0.53 | 12.1 | 13.6 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 0.15 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 1.56 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.18 | 0.12 | 0.06 | 0.30 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## 2: I-35E West Ramps \& Little Canada Rd

| Direction | EB | WB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 986 | 693 | 366 | 2045 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 10 | 6 | 45 | 15 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 10 | 6 | 45 | 15 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 3 | 1 | 5 | 9 |
| Stops $\operatorname{Veh}$ | 0.47 | 0.44 | 0.85 | 0.53 |
| Stops (\#) | 466 | 304 | 310 | 1080 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 7 | 21 | 13 | 14 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 4 | 4 | 7 | 15 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 27 | 89 | 91 | 207 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 6 | 6 | 9 | 21 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 4.7 | 14.3 | 10.0 | 9.8 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 0.40 | 0.44 | 0.64 | 1.48 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.29 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.34 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 |

## 8: Little Canada Rd

| Direction | EB | WB | NB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 979 | 753 | 19 | 1751 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.00 | 0.04 | 1.00 | 0.03 |
| Stops (\#) | 0 | 28 | 19 | 47 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 30 | 28 | 7 | 29 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 109 | 21 | 1 | 131 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 4 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 24.3 | 20.0 | NA | 22.8 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 0.31 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.40 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.08 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.09 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Network Totals

| Number of Intersections | 3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 6 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 6 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 9 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.52 |
| Stops (\#) | 2899 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 22 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 30 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 642 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 49 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 13.0 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.44 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.67 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.80 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 16 |
| Performance Index | 16.8 |


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | $4$ | 4 | $p$ |  |  | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | *中浐 |  |  | $\uparrow \uparrow$ |  |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 682 | 5 | 10 | 592 | 151 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 288 | 4 | 32 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 682 | 5 | 10 | 592 | 151 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 288 | 4 | 32 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 175 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 475 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.970 |  |  | 0.886 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.997 |  |  | 0.953 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 5119 | 0 | 0 | 3403 | 0 | 0 | 1663 | 0 | 0 | 1742 | 1538 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.903 |  |  | 0.946 |  |  | 0.980 |  |  | 0.715 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 4627 | 0 | 0 | 3222 | 0 | 0 | 1635 | 0 | 0 | 1307 | 1538 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 54 |  |  | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1330 |  |  | 141 |  |  | 395 |  |  | 708 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 30.2 |  |  | 3.2 |  |  | 9.0 |  |  | 16.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 7\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 10\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 1\% | 5\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 15 | 682 | 5 | 10 | 592 | 151 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 288 | 4 | 32 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 702 | 0 | 0 | 753 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 292 | 32 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |  | 32 |  |  | 20 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 17 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 14 | 15 |  | 9 | 18 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Detector Template | Left |  |  | Left |  |  | Left |  |  | Left |  |  |
| Leading Detector (ft) | 20 | 126 |  | 20 | 0 |  | 20 | 26 |  | 20 | 126 | 26 |
| Trailing Detector (ft) | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Detector 1 Position(ft) | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Detector 1 Size(ft) | 20 | 21 |  | 20 | 20 |  | 20 | 21 |  | 20 | 21 | 21 |
| Detector 1 Type | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl+Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 20.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
| Detector 2 Position(ft) |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 120 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(ft) |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 6 |  | 5 | 24 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 3 |  |


| Lane Group $\quad$ L2 |
| :--- |
| Lanefonfigurations |
| Traffic Volume (vph) |
| Future Volume (vph) |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |
| Storage Length (ft) |
| Storage Lanes |
| Taper Length (ft) |
| Lane Util. Factor |
| Frt |
| Flt Protected |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |
| Flt Permitted |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |
| Right Turn on Red |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |
| Link Speed (mph) |
| Link Distance (ft) |
| Travel Time (s) |
| Peak Hour Factor |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |
| Lane Alignment |
| Median Width(ft) |
| Link Offset(ft) |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |
| Headway Factor |
| Turning Speed (mph) |
| Number of Detectors |
| Detector Template |
| Leading Detector (ft) |
| Trailing Detector (ft) |
| Detector 1 Position(ft) |
| Detector 1 Size(ft) |
| Detector 1 Type |
| Detector 1 Channel |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |
| Detector 2 Position(ft) |
| Detector 2 Size(ft) |
| Detector 2 Type |
| Detector 2 Channel |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | $4$ | $\dagger$ | \% | $\checkmark$ | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Permitted Phases | 6 |  |  | 24 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Detector Phase | 6 | 6 |  | 25 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Switch Phase |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 13.0 |  |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 26.0 | 26.0 |  | 13.0 |  |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 32.5\% | 32.5\% |  | 16.3\% |  |  | 31.3\% | 31.3\% |  | 31.3\% | 31.3\% | 31.3\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 8.0 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.0 |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 2.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Lead/Lag | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max |  | None |  |  | None | None |  | None | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 11.0 | 11.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 18.3 |  |  | 39.0 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.23 |  |  | 0.49 |  |  | 0.22 |  |  | 0.22 | 0.22 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.66 |  |  | 0.47 |  |  | 0.05 |  |  | 0.99 | 0.09 |
| Control Delay |  | 31.7 |  |  | 2.1 |  |  | 13.5 |  |  | 85.1 | 25.5 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.2 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 31.7 |  |  | 2.3 |  |  | 13.5 |  |  | 85.1 | 25.5 |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | F | C |
| Approach Delay |  | 31.7 |  |  | 2.3 |  |  | 13.5 |  |  | 79.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |
| 90th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 8.0 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 90th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Coord |  | Max |  |  | Hold | Hold |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 70th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 8.0 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 70th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Coord |  | Max |  |  | Hold | Hold |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 50th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 8.0 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 50th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Coord |  | Max |  |  | Hold | Hold |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 30th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 8.0 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 30th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Coord |  | Max |  |  | Hold | Hold |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 10th \%ile Green (s) | 19.3 | 19.3 |  | 6.7 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 10th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Coord |  | Gap |  |  | Hold | Hold |  | Max | Max | Max |
| Stops (vph) |  | 616 |  |  | 84 |  |  | 9 |  |  | 242 | 28 |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  | 15 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 8 | 0 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  | 1064 |  |  | 113 |  |  | 11 |  |  | 560 | 35 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  | 207 |  |  | 22 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 109 | 7 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  | 247 |  |  | 26 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 130 | 8 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 117 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 146 | 13 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 158 |  |  | m0 |  |  | 18 |  |  | \#302 | 35 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1250 |  |  | 61 |  |  | 315 |  |  | 628 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 475 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1056 |  |  | 1608 |  |  | 380 |  |  | 294 | 346 |


| Lane Group | $\emptyset 2$ | $\emptyset 4$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  |  |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 15.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 24.0 | 15.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 39.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 49\% | 20\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 31.0 | 9.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 4.5 | 3.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | None |  |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 20.0 |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |
| 90th \%ile Green (s) | 31.0 | 9.0 |  |
| 90th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Max |  |
| 70th \%ile Green (s) | 31.0 | 9.0 |  |
| 70th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Max |  |
| 50th \%ile Green (s) | 31.0 | 9.0 |  |
| 50th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Max |  |
| 30th \%ile Green (s) | 31.0 | 9.0 |  |
| 30th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Max |  |
| 10th \%ile Green (s) | 31.0 | 9.0 |  |
| 10th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Max |  |
| Stops (vph) |  |  |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  |  |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th ( ft ) |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  |  |
| Existing PM Peak Little Bolton \& Menk, Inc. | $\text { da Rd } 11$ | am 0 | Synchro 11 Report Page 4 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 261 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.67 |  |  | 0.56 |  |  | 0.05 |  |  | 0.99 | 0.09 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:WBTL and 6:EBTL, Start of 1st Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 27.8 |  |  | Intersection LOS: C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 63.8\% ICU Level of Service B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| m Volume for 95th percentile queue is | metere | by upstr | am sign |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Little Canada Rd \& Country Dr


| Lane Group $\quad \varnothing 2 \quad \varnothing 4$ |
| :--- |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |
| Storage Cap Reductn |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |
| Intersection Summary |


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  |  | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 44 |  |  |  |  |  | $\ddagger$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 2 | 220 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 2 | 220 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 170 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 550 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 100 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.965 | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3539 | 1599 | 1787 | 3471 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1598 | 1461 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.340 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 3539 | 1599 | 640 | 3471 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1598 | 1461 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 405 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 141 |  |  | 680 |  |  | 675 |  |  | 1315 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 3.2 |  |  | 15.5 |  |  | 13.1 |  |  | 25.6 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 5\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 2 | 220 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20\% |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 176 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(ft) |  | 6 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |  | 20 |  |  | 24 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 |  | 14 | 16 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 16 |  | 13 |
| Number of Detectors |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Detector Template |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Left |  |  |
| Leading Detector (ft) |  | 0 | 0 | 26 | 126 |  |  |  |  | 20 | 126 | 126 |
| Trailing Detector (ft) |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 120 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Detector 1 Position(ft) |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Detector 1 Size(ft) |  | 20 | 20 | 21 | 20 |  |  |  |  | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Detector 1 Type |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |  |  |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |  | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
| Detector 2 Position(ft) |  |  |  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  | 120 | 120 |
| Detector 2 Size(ft) |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |
| Detector 2 Type |  |  |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  |  |  |  | Cl+Ex | Extend |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Turn Type |  | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  |  |  |  | Split | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 63 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |


| Lane Group | $\emptyset 3$ | $\varnothing 6$ | $\varnothing 8$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane\%onfigurations |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) |  |  |  |
| Future Volume (vph) |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |  |  |  |
| Storage Length (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Lanes |  |  |  |
| Taper Length (ft) |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  |  |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |  |  |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |  |  |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |  |  |  |
| Lane Alignment |  |  |  |
| Median Width(ft) |  |  |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  |  |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |  |  |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor |  |  |  |
| Turning Speed (mph) |  |  |  |
| Number of Detectors |  |  |  |
| Detector Template |  |  |  |
| Leading Detector (ft) |  |  |  |
| Trailing Detector (ft) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Position(ft) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Size(ft) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Type |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Position(ft) |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Size(ft) |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  |  |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 3 | 6 | 8 |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 63 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase |  |  |  | 25 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  |  |  | 5.0 | 15.0 |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) |  |  |  | 13.0 | 24.0 |  |  |  |  | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| Total Split (s) |  |  |  | 13.0 | 39.0 |  |  |  |  | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| Total Split (\%) |  |  |  | 16.3\% | 48.8\% |  |  |  |  | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 20.0\% |
| Maximum Green (s) |  |  |  | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.5 |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) |  |  |  | 2.0 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  |  | 5.0 | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  | Lead |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode |  |  |  | None | C-Max |  |  |  |  | None | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  |  |  |  | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 43.3 | 43.3 | 34.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.42 | 0.39 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.30 | 0.39 | 0.42 | 0.40 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.06 | 1.07 |
| Control Delay |  | 2.2 | 1.5 | 18.2 | 18.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 122.5 | 129.0 |
| Queue Delay |  | 1.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 3.1 | 4.0 | 18.2 | 18.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 122.5 | 129.0 |
| LOS |  | A | A | B | B |  |  |  |  |  | F | F |
| Approach Delay |  | 3.5 |  |  | 18.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 125.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |
| 90th \%ile Green (s) |  |  |  | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 90th \%ile Term Code |  |  |  | Max | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 70th \%ile Green (s) |  |  |  | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 70th \%ile Term Code |  |  |  | Max | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 50th \%ile Green (s) |  |  |  | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 50th \%ile Term Code |  |  |  | Max | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 30th \%ile Green (s) |  |  |  | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 30th \%ile Term Code |  |  |  | Max | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 10th \%ile Green (s) |  |  |  | 6.7 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 10th \%ile Term Code |  |  |  | Gap | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| Stops (vph) |  | 32 | 39 | 97 | 368 |  |  |  |  |  | 151 | 139 |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 7 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  | 75 | 55 | 138 | 483 |  |  |  |  |  | 537 | 513 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  | 15 | 11 | 27 | 94 |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 100 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  | 17 | 13 | 32 | 112 |  |  |  |  |  | 124 | 119 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 12 | 11 | 49 | 98 |  |  |  |  |  | ~111 | ~104 |
| Queue Length 95th ( ft ) |  | m14 | m15 | 88 | 140 |  |  |  |  |  | \#242 | \#231 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 61 |  |  | 600 |  |  | 595 |  |  | 1235 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  | 170 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 550 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1913 | 1050 | 386 | 1345 |  |  |  |  |  | 179 | 164 |


| Lane Group | Ø3 Ø6 Ø8 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  |  |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 15.0 | 7.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 13.0 | 24.0 | 15.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 26.0 | 25.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 31\% | 33\% | 31\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.0 | 4.5 | 3.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  |  |
| Lead/Lag |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | C-Max | None |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 18.0 | 11.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |
| 90th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 90th \%ile Term Code | Max | Coord | Hold |
| 70th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 70th \%ile Term Code | Max | Coord | Hold |
| 50th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 50th \%ile Term Code | Max | Coord | Hold |
| 30th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 30th \%ile Term Code | Max | Coord | Hold |
| 10th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 19.3 | 18.0 |
| 10th \%ile Term Code | Max | Coord | Hold |
| Stops (vph) |  |  |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  |  |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 1011 | 503 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.64 | 0.74 | 0.41 | 0.40 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.06 | 1.07 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other | Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:WBTL and 6:EBTL, Start of 1st Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 30.5 |  |  | Intersection LOS: C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 63.2\% ICU Level of Service B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 2: I-35E West Ramps \& Little Canada Rd


| Lane Group | $\varnothing 3 \quad \emptyset 6 \quad \varnothing 8$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |

## 1: Little Canada Rd \& Country Dr

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1798 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 28 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 28 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 14 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.54 |
| Stops (\#) | 979 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 11 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 22 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 242 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 26 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 9.5 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.79 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.35 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.41 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 |

## 2: I-35E West Ramps \& Little Canada Rd

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2045 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 30 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 1 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 30 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 17 |
| Stops | Veh |
| Stops (\#) | 8.40 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 9 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 24 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 207 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 26 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 7.9 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.82 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.35 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.42 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 22 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 9 |

Network Totals

| Number of Intersections | 2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 29 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 29 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 31 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.47 |
| Stops ( (\#) | 1805 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 10 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 46 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 449 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 52 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 8.7 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.61 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.70 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.84 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 22 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 9 |
| Performance Index | 36.2 |

## 1: Little Canada Rd \& Country Dr

| Direction | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 702 | 753 | 19 | 324 | 1798 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 32 | 2 | 13 | 79 | 28 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 32 | 2 | 13 | 79 | 28 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 6 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.88 | 0.11 | 0.47 | 0.83 | 0.54 |
| Stops (\#) | 616 | 84 | 9 | 270 | 979 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 15 | 17 | 12 | 5 | 11 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 12 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 22 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 177 | 20 | 1 | 43 | 242 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 15 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 26 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 11.6 | 12.2 | NA | 5.1 | 9.5 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.06 | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.59 | 1.79 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.21 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.35 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.25 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.41 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## 2: I-35E West Ramps \& Little Canada Rd

| Direction | EB | WB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 986 | 693 | 366 | 2045 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 2 | 19 | 126 | 30 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 3 | 19 | 126 | 30 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 1 | 4 | 13 | 17 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.07 | 0.67 | 0.79 | 0.40 |
| Stops ( (\#) | 11 | 465 | 29 | 826 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 14 | 14 | 6 | 9 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 2 | 7 | 15 | 24 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 26 | 89 | 91 | 207 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 2 | 9 | 15 | 26 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 12.1 | 10.0 | 6.1 | 7.9 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 0.15 | 0.62 | 1.05 | 1.82 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.35 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.24 | 0.42 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 22 | 22 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 |

Network Totals

| Number of Intersections | 2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 29 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 29 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 31 |
| Stops / /eh | 0.47 |
| Stops ( (\#) | 1805 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 10 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 46 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 449 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 52 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 8.7 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.61 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.70 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.84 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 22 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 9 |
| Performance Index | 36.2 |


|  | $\rangle$ |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\dagger$ |  | \% |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 687 | 593 | 153 | 292 | 32 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 687 | 593 | 153 | 292 | 32 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  |  | 0 | , | 475 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 100 |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.972 |  | 0.987 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.957 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1877 | 1796 | 0 | 1724 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.957 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1877 | 1796 | 0 | 1724 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 30 | 30 |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1330 | 377 |  | 708 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 30.2 | 8.6 |  | 16.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 7\% | 1\% | 1\% | 10\% | 4\% | 5\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 15 | 687 | 593 | 153 | 292 | 32 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 702 | 746 | 0 | 324 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Left | Right | Left | Right |
| Median Width(t) |  | 0 | 3 |  | 12 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |  | 32 | 20 |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 17 |  |  | 14 | 18 | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Yield | Yield |  | Yield |  |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type: Other

Control Type: Roundabout
Intersection Capacity Utilization 73.0\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\frac{1}{\dagger}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 中4 |  |  |  |  |  | \＆ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 2 | 220 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 2 | 220 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length（ft） | 0 |  | 0 | 170 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 550 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length（ft） | 100 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.965 | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 0 | 3539 | 1599 | 1787 | 3471 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1598 | 1461 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.347 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 0 | 3539 | 1599 | 653 | 3471 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1598 | 1461 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 405 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed（mph） |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |
| Link Distance（ft） |  | 145 |  |  | 680 |  |  | 675 |  |  | 1315 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 3.3 |  |  | 15.5 |  |  | 13.1 |  |  | 25.6 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 0\％ | 2\％ | 1\％ | 1\％ | 4\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 5\％ | 0\％ | 5\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 2 | 220 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20\％ |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 176 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（ft） |  | 6 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Link Offset（ft） |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（ft） |  | 20 |  |  | 24 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed（mph） | 15 |  | 14 | 16 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 16 |  | 13 |
| Number of Detectors |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Detector Template |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Left |  |  |
| Leading Detector（ft） |  | 0 | 0 | 26 | 126 |  |  |  |  | 20 | 126 | 126 |
| Trailing Detector（ft） |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 120 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Detector 1 Position（ft） |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Detector 1 Size（ft） |  | 20 | 20 | 21 | 20 |  |  |  |  | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Detector 1 Type |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  |  |  | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） |  | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
| Detector 2 Position（ft） |  |  |  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  | 120 | 120 |
| Detector 2 Size（ft） |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |
| Detector 2 Type |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Extend |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Turn Type |  | NA | Perm | pm＋pt | NA |  |  |  |  | Perm | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 6 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase |  | 6 | 6 | 25 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  | 15.0 | 15.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 13.0 | 35.0 |  |  |  |  | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| Total Split (s) |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 13.0 | 39.0 |  |  |  |  | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| Total Split (\%) |  | 47.3\% | 47.3\% | 23.6\% | 70.9\% |  |  |  |  | 29.1\% | 29.1\% | 29.1\% |
| Maximum Green (s) |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) |  | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 2.0 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 8.0 | 8.0 | 5.0 | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  | Lag | Lag | Lead |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode |  | C-Max | C-Max | None | C-Max |  |  |  |  | None | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 11.0 | 11.0 |  | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 21.3 | 21.3 | 34.3 | 31.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.7 | 8.7 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.62 | 0.57 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.43 | 0.47 | 0.29 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.75 | 0.76 |
| Control Delay |  | 14.9 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 43.6 | 46.2 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 14.9 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 43.6 | 46.2 |
| LOS |  | B | A | A | A |  |  |  |  |  | D | D |
| Approach Delay |  | 10.4 |  |  | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 44.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |
| 90th \%ile Green (s) |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 90th \%ile Term Code |  | Coord | Coord | Max | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 70th \%ile Green (s) |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 70th \%ile Term Code |  | Coord | Coord | Max | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 50th \%ile Green (s) |  | 18.6 | 18.6 | 7.4 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 50th \%ile Term Code |  | Coord | Coord | Gap | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 30th \%ile Green (s) |  | 19.3 | 19.3 | 6.7 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 30th \%ile Term Code |  | Coord | Coord | Gap | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 10th \%ile Green (s) |  | 32.4 | 32.4 | 0.0 | 32.4 |  |  |  |  | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 |
| 10th \%ile Term Code |  | Coord | Coord | Skip | Coord |  |  |  |  | Gap | Gap | Gap |
| Stops (vph) |  | 417 | 49 | 60 | 244 |  |  |  |  |  | 162 | 148 |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  | 5 | , | 1 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 4 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  | 330 | 74 | 96 | 342 |  |  |  |  |  | 329 | 310 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  | 64 | 14 | 19 | 66 |  |  |  |  |  | 64 | 60 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  | 77 | 17 | 22 | 79 |  |  |  |  |  | 76 | 72 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 77 | 0 | 18 | 41 |  |  |  |  |  | 63 | 58 |
| Queue Length 95th ( ft ) |  | 119 | 50 | 37 | 63 |  |  |  |  |  | \#153 | \#148 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 65 |  |  | 600 |  |  | 595 |  |  | 1235 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  | 170 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 550 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1367 | 866 | 571 | 1974 |  |  |  |  |  | 261 | 239 |


|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 | , | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.43 | 0.47 | 0.28 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.73 | 0.74 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 55
Actuated Cycle Length: 55
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:WBTL and 6:EBT, Start of 1st Green
Natural Cycle: 55
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.76

| Intersection Signal Delay: 15.2 | Intersection LOS: B |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $63.2 \%$ | ICU Level of Service B |

Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 2: I-35E West Ramps \& Little Canada Rd




| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 979 | 0 | 1367 | 490 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 975 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 392 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 4.14 | - | 6.84 | 6.94 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - |  | 5.84 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - |  | 5.84 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | 2.22 | - | 3.52 | 3.32 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 701 | - | 138 | 524 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 326 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 652 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 701 |  | 135 | 524 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 135 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 326 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 636 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 0.2 |  | 15.6 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | C |  |
| HCMLOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 360 | - | - | 701 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.053 | - | - | 0.014 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 15.6 | - | - | 10.2 | 0.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | C | - | - | B | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.2 | - | - | 0 | - |

## 1: Little Canada Rd \& Country Dr

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1772 |
| Control Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 0 |
| Stops / Veh | 1.00 |
| Stops (\#) | 1772 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 30 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 10 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 303 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 22 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 13.6 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.56 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.30 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.36 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 |

## 2: I-35E West Ramps \& Little Canada Rd

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2045 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 15 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 15 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 9 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.53 |
| Stops (\#) | 1080 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 14 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 15 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 207 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 21 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 9.8 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.48 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.29 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.34 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 16 |

## 8: Little Canada Rd

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1751 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 0 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.03 |
| Stops (\#) | 47 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 29 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 4 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 131 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 6 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 22.8 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 0.40 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.08 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.09 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 |

## Network Totals

| Number of Intersections | 3 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 6 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 6 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 9 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.52 |
| Stops (\#) | 2899 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 22 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 30 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 642 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 49 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 13.0 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.44 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.67 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.80 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 16 |
| Performance Index | 16.8 |

## 1: Little Canada Rd \& Country Dr

| Direction | EB | WB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 702 | 746 | 324 | 1772 |
| Control Delay / Veh $(\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{v})$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stops / Veh | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Stops (\#) | 302 | 746 | 324 | 1772 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 6 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 177 | 3 | 1 | 10 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 11 | 83 | 43 | 303 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 15.8 | 11.0 | 4 | 22 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 0.78 | 0.53 | 12.1 | 13.6 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 0.15 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 1.56 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.18 | 0.12 | 0.06 | 0.30 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## 2: I-35E West Ramps \& Little Canada Rd

| Direction | EB | WB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 986 | 693 | 366 | 2045 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 10 | 6 | 45 | 15 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 10 | 6 | 45 | 15 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 3 | 1 | 5 | 9 |
| Stops $\operatorname{Veh}$ | 0.47 | 0.44 | 0.85 | 0.53 |
| Stops (\#) | 466 | 304 | 310 | 1080 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 7 | 21 | 13 | 14 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 4 | 4 | 7 | 15 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 27 | 89 | 91 | 207 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 6 | 6 | 9 | 21 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 4.7 | 14.3 | 10.0 | 9.8 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 0.40 | 0.44 | 0.64 | 1.48 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.29 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.34 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 |

## 8: Little Canada Rd

| Direction | EB | WB | NB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 979 | 753 | 19 | 1751 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.00 | 0.04 | 1.00 | 0.03 |
| Stops (\#) | 0 | 28 | 19 | 47 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 30 | 28 | 7 | 29 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 109 | 21 | 1 | 131 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 4 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 24.3 | 20.0 | NA | 22.8 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 0.31 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.40 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.08 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.09 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Network Totals

| Number of Intersections | 3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 6 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 6 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 9 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.52 |
| Stops (\#) | 2899 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 22 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 30 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 642 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 49 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 13.0 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.44 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.67 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.80 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 16 |
| Performance Index | 16.8 |


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | $4$ | 4 | $p$ |  |  | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | *中浐 |  |  | $\uparrow \uparrow$ |  |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 682 | 5 | 10 | 592 | 151 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 288 | 4 | 32 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 682 | 5 | 10 | 592 | 151 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 288 | 4 | 32 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 175 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 475 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.970 |  |  | 0.886 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.999 |  |  | 0.997 |  |  | 0.953 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 5119 | 0 | 0 | 3403 | 0 | 0 | 1663 | 0 | 0 | 1742 | 1538 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.903 |  |  | 0.946 |  |  | 0.980 |  |  | 0.715 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 4627 | 0 | 0 | 3222 | 0 | 0 | 1635 | 0 | 0 | 1307 | 1538 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  | 54 |  |  | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1330 |  |  | 141 |  |  | 395 |  |  | 708 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 30.2 |  |  | 3.2 |  |  | 9.0 |  |  | 16.1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 7\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 10\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 1\% | 5\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 15 | 682 | 5 | 10 | 592 | 151 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 288 | 4 | 32 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 702 | 0 | 0 | 753 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 292 | 32 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |  | 32 |  |  | 20 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 17 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 14 | 15 |  | 9 | 18 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Detector Template | Left |  |  | Left |  |  | Left |  |  | Left |  |  |
| Leading Detector (ft) | 20 | 126 |  | 20 | 0 |  | 20 | 26 |  | 20 | 126 | 26 |
| Trailing Detector (ft) | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Detector 1 Position(ft) | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Detector 1 Size(ft) | 20 | 21 |  | 20 | 20 |  | 20 | 21 |  | 20 | 21 | 21 |
| Detector 1 Type | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl+Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 20.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 5.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
| Detector 2 Position(ft) |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 120 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(ft) |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 6 |  | 5 | 24 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 3 |  |


| Lane Group $\quad$ L2 |
| :--- |
| Lanefonfigurations |
| Traffic Volume (vph) |
| Future Volume (vph) |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |
| Storage Length (ft) |
| Storage Lanes |
| Taper Length (ft) |
| Lane Util. Factor |
| Frt |
| Flt Protected |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |
| Flt Permitted |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |
| Right Turn on Red |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |
| Link Speed (mph) |
| Link Distance (ft) |
| Travel Time (s) |
| Peak Hour Factor |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |
| Lane Alignment |
| Median Width(ft) |
| Link Offset(ft) |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |
| Headway Factor |
| Turning Speed (mph) |
| Number of Detectors |
| Detector Template |
| Leading Detector (ft) |
| Trailing Detector (ft) |
| Detector 1 Position(ft) |
| Detector 1 Size(ft) |
| Detector 1 Type |
| Detector 1 Channel |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |
| Detector 2 Position(ft) |
| Detector 2 Size(ft) |
| Detector 2 Type |
| Detector 2 Channel |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | $4$ | $\dagger$ | \% | $\checkmark$ | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Permitted Phases | 6 |  |  | 24 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Detector Phase | 6 | 6 |  | 25 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Switch Phase |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 |  | 13.0 |  |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 26.0 | 26.0 |  | 13.0 |  |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 32.5\% | 32.5\% |  | 16.3\% |  |  | 31.3\% | 31.3\% |  | 31.3\% | 31.3\% | 31.3\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 8.0 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.0 |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 2.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Lead/Lag | Lag | Lag |  | Lead |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max |  | None |  |  | None | None |  | None | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 11.0 | 11.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 18.3 |  |  | 39.0 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.23 |  |  | 0.49 |  |  | 0.22 |  |  | 0.22 | 0.22 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.66 |  |  | 0.47 |  |  | 0.05 |  |  | 0.99 | 0.09 |
| Control Delay |  | 31.7 |  |  | 2.1 |  |  | 13.5 |  |  | 85.1 | 25.5 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.2 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 31.7 |  |  | 2.3 |  |  | 13.5 |  |  | 85.1 | 25.5 |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | F | C |
| Approach Delay |  | 31.7 |  |  | 2.3 |  |  | 13.5 |  |  | 79.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |
| 90th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 8.0 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 90th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Coord |  | Max |  |  | Hold | Hold |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 70th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 8.0 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 70th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Coord |  | Max |  |  | Hold | Hold |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 50th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 8.0 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 50th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Coord |  | Max |  |  | Hold | Hold |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 30th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 8.0 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 30th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Coord |  | Max |  |  | Hold | Hold |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 10th \%ile Green (s) | 19.3 | 19.3 |  | 6.7 |  |  | 18.0 | 18.0 |  | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 10th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Coord |  | Gap |  |  | Hold | Hold |  | Max | Max | Max |
| Stops (vph) |  | 616 |  |  | 84 |  |  | 9 |  |  | 242 | 28 |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  | 15 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 8 | 0 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  | 1064 |  |  | 113 |  |  | 11 |  |  | 560 | 35 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  | 207 |  |  | 22 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 109 | 7 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  | 247 |  |  | 26 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 130 | 8 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 117 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 146 | 13 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 158 |  |  | m0 |  |  | 18 |  |  | \#302 | 35 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1250 |  |  | 61 |  |  | 315 |  |  | 628 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 475 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1056 |  |  | 1608 |  |  | 380 |  |  | 294 | 346 |


| Lane Group | $\emptyset 2$ | $\emptyset 4$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  |  |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 15.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 24.0 | 15.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 39.0 | 16.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 49\% | 20\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 31.0 | 9.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 4.5 | 3.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | None |  |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 20.0 |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |
| 90th \%ile Green (s) | 31.0 | 9.0 |  |
| 90th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Max |  |
| 70th \%ile Green (s) | 31.0 | 9.0 |  |
| 70th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Max |  |
| 50th \%ile Green (s) | 31.0 | 9.0 |  |
| 50th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Max |  |
| 30th \%ile Green (s) | 31.0 | 9.0 |  |
| 30th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Max |  |
| 10th \%ile Green (s) | 31.0 | 9.0 |  |
| 10th \%ile Term Code | Coord | Max |  |
| Stops (vph) |  |  |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  |  |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th ( ft ) |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  |  |
| Existing PM Peak Little Bolton \& Menk, Inc. | $\text { da Rd } 11$ | am 0 | Synchro 11 Report Page 4 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 261 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.67 |  |  | 0.56 |  |  | 0.05 |  |  | 0.99 | 0.09 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:WBTL and 6:EBTL, Start of 1st Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 27.8 |  |  | Intersection LOS: C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 63.8\% ICU Level of Service B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| m Volume for 95th percentile queue is | metere | by upstr | am sign |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Little Canada Rd \& Country Dr


| Lane Group $\quad \varnothing 2 \quad \varnothing 4$ |
| :--- |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |
| Storage Cap Reductn |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |
| Intersection Summary |


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  |  | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 44 |  |  |  |  |  | $\ddagger$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 2 | 220 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 2 | 220 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 170 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 550 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 100 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.965 | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3539 | 1599 | 1787 | 3471 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1598 | 1461 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  | 0.340 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.963 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 3539 | 1599 | 640 | 3471 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1598 | 1461 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 405 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 30 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 141 |  |  | 680 |  |  | 675 |  |  | 1315 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 3.2 |  |  | 15.5 |  |  | 13.1 |  |  | 25.6 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 5\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 2 | 220 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20\% |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 581 | 405 | 160 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 176 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(ft) |  | 6 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |  | 20 |  |  | 24 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 |  | 14 | 16 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 16 |  | 13 |
| Number of Detectors |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Detector Template |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Left |  |  |
| Leading Detector (ft) |  | 0 | 0 | 26 | 126 |  |  |  |  | 20 | 126 | 126 |
| Trailing Detector (ft) |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 120 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Detector 1 Position(ft) |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Detector 1 Size(ft) |  | 20 | 20 | 21 | 20 |  |  |  |  | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Detector 1 Type |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |  |  |  |  | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |  | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
| Detector 2 Position(ft) |  |  |  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  | 120 | 120 |
| Detector 2 Size(ft) |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |
| Detector 2 Type |  |  |  |  | Cl+Ex |  |  |  |  |  | Cl+Ex | Extend |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Turn Type |  | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA |  |  |  |  | Split | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 63 |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |


| Lane Group | $\emptyset 3$ | $\varnothing 6$ | $\varnothing 8$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane\%onfigurations |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) |  |  |  |
| Future Volume (vph) |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |  |  |  |
| Storage Length (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Lanes |  |  |  |
| Taper Length (ft) |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  |  |  |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  |  |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |  |  |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |  |  |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |  |  |  |
| Lane Alignment |  |  |  |
| Median Width(ft) |  |  |  |
| Link Offset(ft) |  |  |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) |  |  |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor |  |  |  |
| Turning Speed (mph) |  |  |  |
| Number of Detectors |  |  |  |
| Detector Template |  |  |  |
| Leading Detector (ft) |  |  |  |
| Trailing Detector (ft) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Position(ft) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Size(ft) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Type |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Position(ft) |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Size(ft) |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  |  |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 3 | 6 | 8 |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 63 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase |  |  |  | 25 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) |  |  |  | 5.0 | 15.0 |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) |  |  |  | 13.0 | 24.0 |  |  |  |  | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| Total Split (s) |  |  |  | 13.0 | 39.0 |  |  |  |  | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| Total Split (\%) |  |  |  | 16.3\% | 48.8\% |  |  |  |  | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 20.0\% |
| Maximum Green (s) |  |  |  | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.5 |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) |  |  |  | 2.0 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  |  | 5.0 | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  | Lead |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode |  |  |  | None | C-Max |  |  |  |  | None | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  |  |  |  | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 43.3 | 43.3 | 34.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.42 | 0.39 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.30 | 0.39 | 0.42 | 0.40 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.06 | 1.07 |
| Control Delay |  | 2.2 | 1.5 | 18.2 | 18.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 122.5 | 129.0 |
| Queue Delay |  | 1.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 3.1 | 4.0 | 18.2 | 18.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 122.5 | 129.0 |
| LOS |  | A | A | B | B |  |  |  |  |  | F | F |
| Approach Delay |  | 3.5 |  |  | 18.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 125.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |
| 90th \%ile Green (s) |  |  |  | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 90th \%ile Term Code |  |  |  | Max | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 70th \%ile Green (s) |  |  |  | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 70th \%ile Term Code |  |  |  | Max | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 50th \%ile Green (s) |  |  |  | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 50th \%ile Term Code |  |  |  | Max | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 30th \%ile Green (s) |  |  |  | 8.0 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 30th \%ile Term Code |  |  |  | Max | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| 10th \%ile Green (s) |  |  |  | 6.7 | 31.0 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| 10th \%ile Term Code |  |  |  | Gap | Coord |  |  |  |  | Max | Max | Max |
| Stops (vph) |  | 32 | 39 | 97 | 368 |  |  |  |  |  | 151 | 139 |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 7 |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  | 75 | 55 | 138 | 483 |  |  |  |  |  | 537 | 513 |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  | 15 | 11 | 27 | 94 |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 100 |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  | 17 | 13 | 32 | 112 |  |  |  |  |  | 124 | 119 |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 0 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) |  | 12 | 11 | 49 | 98 |  |  |  |  |  | ~111 | ~104 |
| Queue Length 95th ( ft ) |  | m14 | m15 | 88 | 140 |  |  |  |  |  | \#242 | \#231 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 61 |  |  | 600 |  |  | 595 |  |  | 1235 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  | 170 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 550 |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1913 | 1050 | 386 | 1345 |  |  |  |  |  | 179 | 164 |


| Lane Group | Ø3 Ø6 Ø8 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase |  |  |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 15.0 | 7.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 13.0 | 24.0 | 15.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 26.0 | 25.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 31\% | 33\% | 31\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.0 | 4.5 | 3.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  |  |
| Lead/Lag |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | C-Max | None |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 18.0 | 11.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |
| 90th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 90th \%ile Term Code | Max | Coord | Hold |
| 70th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 70th \%ile Term Code | Max | Coord | Hold |
| 50th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 50th \%ile Term Code | Max | Coord | Hold |
| 30th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| 30th \%ile Term Code | Max | Coord | Hold |
| 10th \%ile Green (s) | 18.0 | 19.3 | 18.0 |
| 10th \%ile Term Code | Max | Coord | Hold |
| Stops (vph) |  |  |  |
| Fuel Used(gal) |  |  |  |
| CO Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  |
| NOx Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  |
| VOC Emissions (g/hr) |  |  |  |
| Dilemma Vehicles (\#) |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 1011 | 503 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.64 | 0.74 | 0.41 | 0.40 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.06 | 1.07 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other | Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:WBTL and 6:EBTL, Start of 1st Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 30.5 |  |  | Intersection LOS: C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 63.2\% ICU Level of Service B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 2: I-35E West Ramps \& Little Canada Rd


| Lane Group | $\varnothing 3 \quad \emptyset 6 \quad \varnothing 8$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |

## 1: Little Canada Rd \& Country Dr

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 1798 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 28 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 28 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 14 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.54 |
| Stops (\#) | 979 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 11 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 22 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 242 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 26 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 9.5 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.79 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.35 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.41 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 |

## 2: I-35E West Ramps \& Little Canada Rd

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 2045 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 30 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 1 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 30 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 17 |
| Stops | Veh |
| Stops (\#) | 8.40 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 9 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 24 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 207 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 26 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 7.9 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.82 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.35 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.42 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 22 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 9 |

Network Totals

| Number of Intersections | 2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 29 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 29 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 31 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.47 |
| Stops ( (\#) | 1805 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 10 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 46 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 449 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 52 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 8.7 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.61 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.70 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.84 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 22 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 9 |
| Performance Index | 36.2 |

## 1: Little Canada Rd \& Country Dr

| Direction | EB | WB | NB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 702 | 753 | 19 | 324 | 1798 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 32 | 2 | 13 | 79 | 28 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 32 | 2 | 13 | 79 | 28 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 6 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.88 | 0.11 | 0.47 | 0.83 | 0.54 |
| Stops (\#) | 616 | 84 | 9 | 270 | 979 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 15 | 17 | 12 | 5 | 11 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 12 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 22 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 177 | 20 | 1 | 43 | 242 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 15 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 26 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 11.6 | 12.2 | NA | 5.1 | 9.5 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 1.06 | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.59 | 1.79 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.21 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.35 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.25 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.41 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## 2: I-35E West Ramps \& Little Canada Rd

| Direction | EB | WB | SB | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 986 | 693 | 366 | 2045 |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 2 | 19 | 126 | 30 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 3 | 19 | 126 | 30 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 1 | 4 | 13 | 17 |
| Stops / Veh | 0.07 | 0.67 | 0.79 | 0.40 |
| Stops ( (\#) | 11 | 465 | 29 | 826 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 14 | 14 | 6 | 9 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 2 | 7 | 15 | 24 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 26 | 89 | 91 | 207 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 2 | 9 | 15 | 26 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 12.1 | 10.0 | 6.1 | 7.9 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 0.15 | 0.62 | 1.05 | 1.82 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.35 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.24 | 0.42 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 | 0 | 22 | 22 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 |

Network Totals

| Number of Intersections | 2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Control Delay / Veh (s/v) | 29 |
| Queue Delay / Veh (s/v) | 0 |
| Total Delay / Veh (s/v) | 29 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 31 |
| Stops / /eh | 0.47 |
| Stops ( (\#) | 1805 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 10 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 46 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 449 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 52 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 8.7 |
| CO Emissions (kg) | 3.61 |
| NOx Emissions (kg) | 0.70 |
| VOC Emissions (kg) | 0.84 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 22 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 9 |
| Performance Index | 36.2 |

## Traffic Safety Benefit-Cost Calculation

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Reactive Project

## A. Roadway Description

| Route | Little Canada Rd | District | Metro | County |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | End RP |  | Miles |  |
| Begin RP |  |  |  |  |
| Location | Little Canada Rd at Country Dr |  |  |  |

## B. Project Description

| Proposed Work | Install single lan | ection of Little Can | da Rd at Country Dr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Cost* | \$5,784,500 | Installation Year | 2026 |
| Project Service Life | 20 years | Traffic Growth Factor | 0.5\% |
| * exclude Right of Way | rom Project Cost |  |  |


| C. Crash Modification Factor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference | CMF ID 209 and 212 |
| 0.26 | Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |  |
|  | Moderate Injury (B) Crashes | Crash Type | CMF ID 209 was applied to the PDO crashes, CMF ID 212 |
| 0.26 | Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  | was applied to the injury crashes |
| 0.65 | Property Damage Only Crashes |  | www.CMFclearinghouse.org |

## D. Crash Modification Factor (optional second CMF)

| Fatal (K) Crashes | Reference |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Serious Injury (A) Crashes |  |  |
| Moderate Injury (B) Crashes | Crash Type |  |
| Possible Injury (C) Crashes |  |  |
| Property Damage Only Crashes |  | www.CMFclearinghouse.org |


| E. Crash Data |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin Date <br> Data Source | 1/1/2 | End Date | 12/31/2022 | 3 years |
|  | MnCMAT2 |  |  |  |
|  | Crash Severity | CMF ID 209 was applied to the PDO crashes, CMF ID 212 was applied to the injury crashes | < optional 2nd CMF > |  |
|  | K crashes |  |  |  |
|  | A crashes | 1 |  |  |
|  | $B$ crashes |  |  |  |
|  | C crashes | 1 |  |  |
|  | PDO crashes | 3 |  |  |

F. Benefit-Cost Calculation

| $\$ 4,562,651$ | Benefit (present value) |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 5,784,500$ | Cost |

## $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio $=0.79$

Proposed project expected to reduce 1 crashes annually, 1 of which involving fatality or serious injury.
F. Analysis Assumptions

| Crash Severity |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| K crashes | $\$ 1,600,000$ |
| A crashes | $\$ 800,000$ |
| B crashes | $\$ 250,000$ |
| C crashes | $\$ 130,000$ |
| PDO crashes | $\$ 15,000$ |

Link: mndot.gov/planning/program/appendix_a.html

| Real Discount Rate: | $0.8 \%$ | Default |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Traffic Growth Rate: | $0.5 \%$ | Revised |
| Project Service Life: | 20 years | Revised |

G. Annual Benefit

| Crash Severity | Crash Reduction | Annual Reduction | Annual Benefit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| A crashes | 0.74 | 0.25 | $\$ 197,333$ |
| B crashes | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\$ 0$ |
| C crashes | 0.74 | 0.25 | $\$ 32,067$ |
| PDO crashes | 1.05 | 0.35 | $\$ 5,250$ |

## H. Amortized Benefit

| Year | Crash Benefits | Present Value |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2026 | \$234,650 | \$234,650 | Total $=\$ 4,562,651$ |
| 2027 | \$235,823 | \$233,952 |  |
| 2028 | \$237,002 | \$233,255 |  |
| 2029 | \$238,187 | \$232,561 |  |
| 2030 | \$239,378 | \$231,869 |  |
| 2031 | \$240,575 | \$231,179 |  |
| 2032 | \$241,778 | \$230,491 |  |
| 2033 | \$242,987 | \$229,805 |  |
| 2034 | \$244,202 | \$229,121 |  |
| 2035 | \$245,423 | \$228,439 |  |
| 2036 | \$246,650 | \$227,759 |  |
| 2037 | \$247,883 | \$227,081 |  |
| 2038 | \$249,123 | \$226,405 |  |
| 2039 | \$250,368 | \$225,732 |  |
| 2040 | \$251,620 | \$225,060 |  |
| 2041 | \$252,878 | \$224,390 |  |
| 2042 | \$254,143 | \$223,722 |  |
| 2043 | \$255,413 | \$223,056 |  |
| 2044 | \$256,690 | \$222,392 |  |
| 2045 | \$257,974 | \$221,731 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 | NOTE: |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 | This calculation relies on the real discount rate, which accounts |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 | for inflation. No further discounting is necessary. |
| 0 | \$0 | \$0 |  |

## CMF / CRF Details

CMF ID: 209
CMF Name: Conversion of signalized intersection into single- or multi-lane rour

## Description:

## Prior Condition: No Prior Condition(s)

## Category: Intersection geometry

Study ID: Observational Before-After Study of the Safety Effect of U.S. Roundabout Conversions Using the Empirical Bayes Method, Persaud et al. $\underline{\underline{2001}}$

|  | Star Quality Rating |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Star Quality Rating: | 4 Stars |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |  |
| Value: | 0.65 |  |
| Adjusted Standard Error: | 0.16 |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 0.09 |  |


|  |  |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | Crash Reduction Factor |
| Value: | 35 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: | 16 |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 9 |

## Applicability

| Crash Type: | All |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crash Severity: | All |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Minimum Number of Lanes: |  |
| Maximum Number of Lanes: |  |
| Number of Lanes Direction: |  |
| Number of Lanes Comment: |  |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Minimum Speed Limit: |  |
| Maximum Speed Limit: |  |
| Speed Unit: |  |
| Speed Limit Comment: |  |
| Area Type: | Urban |
| Traffic Volume: |  |
| Average Traffic Volume: |  |
| Time of Day: |  |
|  | If countermeasure is intersection-based. |
| Intersection Type: | Roadway/roadway (not interchange related) |
| Intersection Geometry: | Not specified |
| Traffic Control: | Stop-controlled |
| Major Road Traffic Volume: |  |
| Minor Road Traffic Volume: |  |

Average Major Road Volume:

Average Minor Road Volume:

## Development Details



|  | Other Details |
| ---: | :--- |
| Included in HSM: | No |
| Date Added to Clearinghouse: | Dec 01, 2009 |
| Comments: |  |

This site is funded by the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration and maintained by the University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center

The information contained in the Crash Modification Factors (CMF) Clearinghouse is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the use of the information contained in the CMF Clearinghouse. The information contained in the CMF Clearinghouse does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation, nor is it a substitute for sound engineering judgment.

## CMF / CRF Details

CMF ID: 212
CMF Name: Conversion of signalized intersection into single- or multi-lane rour

## Description:

## Prior Condition: No Prior Condition(s)

## Category: Intersection geometry

Study ID: Observational Before-After Study of the Safety Effect of U.S. Roundabout Conversions Using the Empirical Bayes Method, Persaud et al. $\underline{\underline{2001}}$

|  | Star Quality Rating |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Star Quality Rating: | 4 Stars |
|  | Crash Modification Factor (CMF) |
| Value: | 0.26 |
| Adjusted Standard Error: | 0.25 |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 0.14 |


|  |  | Crash Reduction Factor |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Value: | 74 |  |
| Adjusted Standard Error: | 25 |  |
| Unadjusted Standard Error: | 14 |  |

## Applicability

| Crash Type: | All |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crash Severity: | A (serious injury), B (minor injury), C (possible injury) |
| Roadway Types: | Not specified |
| Minimum Number of Lanes: |  |
| Maximum Number of Lanes: |  |
| Number of Lanes Direction: |  |
| Number of Lanes Comment: |  |
| Road Division Type: |  |
| Minimum Speed Limit: |  |
| Maximum Speed Limit: |  |
| Speed Unit: |  |
| Speed Limit Comment: |  |
| Area Type: | Urban |
| Traffic Volume: |  |
| Average Traffic Volume: |  |
| Time of Day: |  |
|  | If countermeasure is intersection-based. |
| Intersection Type: | Roadway/roadway (not interchange related) |
| Intersection Geometry: | Not specified |
| Traffic Control: | Stop-controlled |
| Major Road Traffic Volume: |  |
| Minor Road Traffic Volume: |  |

Average Major Road Volume:

Average Minor Road Volume:

## Development Details



|  | Other Details |
| ---: | :--- |
| Included in HSM: | No |
| Date Added to Clearinghouse: | Dec 01, 2009 |
| Comments: |  |

This site is funded by the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration and maintained by the University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center

The information contained in the Crash Modification Factors (CMF) Clearinghouse is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the use of the information contained in the CMF Clearinghouse. The information contained in the CMF Clearinghouse does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation, nor is it a substitute for sound engineering judgment.

Crash Detail Report - Short Form

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { INCIDENT ID } \\ & 01011236 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE SYS } \\ & \text { 04-CSAH } \end{aligned}$ | ROUTE NUM <br> 0021 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { MEASURE } \\ & 0.154 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | ROUTE NAMELITTLE CANADA RD |  |  | ROUTE ID <br> 0400006595070021-I |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COUNTY } \\ & \text { 62-Ramsey } \end{aligned}$ | CITYLittle Canada |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT COUNTRY |  |  | \# VEH | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \# \text { KILL } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}\right.$ | DATE 03/03/22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TIME } \\ & 14: 50 \end{aligned}$ | DAY <br> Thu | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAT } \\ & 45.023219 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LONG } \\ & -93.091012 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM X } \\ & 492830.4 \end{aligned}$ | $l_{\text {UTM Y }} \begin{aligned} & \text { Y } \end{aligned}$ | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE <br> Rear End |  | CRASH S <br> N - Prop | EVERITY Damag | Only | FIRST Moto | HARMF Vehicl |  | sport |  | Daylight |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Clear |


|  | Unit 1 | Unit 2 | Unit 3 | Unit 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Motor Vehicle in Transport |  |  |
| Vehicle Type | Passenger Car | Passenger Car |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Southbound | Southbound |  |  |
| Maneuver | Turning Left | Vehicle Stopped or Stalled in |  |  |
| Age/Sex | 40 F | 47 F |  |  |
| Physical Cond | Apparently Normal | Apparently Normal |  |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | Following Too Closely | No Clear Contributing Action |  |  |


| OFFICER SKETCH | NARRATIVE <br> UNIT 1-2013 WHITE HONDA CROSSTOUR BEARING MN PLATE NNB590 OPERATED BY BONO OHALLORAN, SARAH ELISABETH D.O.B. 7/21/81. AMERICAN FAMILY INSURANCE POLICY NUMBER 1716-5872-04-95-FPPA-MN UNIT 2-2015 UNK CHRYSLER TOWN \& COUNTRY BEARING MN PLATE NHF995 OPERATED BY PARKER, SARAH ELIZABETH D.O.B 10/12/74 (IDENTIFIED BY DL) PROGRESSIVE INSURANCE POLICY NUMBER 932830530 THE INTERSECTION IS CONTROLLED BY A SEMAPHORE. THE CONDITIONS OF THE ROAD WERE DRY AND THE WEATHER CLEAR WITH NO PRECIPITATION. BONO (UNIT 1) STATED SHE WAS AT THE STOPLIGHT SOUTHBOUND COUNTRY DR. AT LITTLE CANADA RD. IN THE LEFT TURN LANE TO MERGE ONTO THE ON RAMP TO 35E SOUTH. THE LIGHT TURNED GREEN SHE BEGAN TO DRIVE. SHE THOUGHT UNIT 2 BEGAN TO DRIVE. WHEN UNIT 2 DID NOT MOVE SHE RAN INTO THE BACK OF THE VEHICLE. I OBSERVED THE REAR DOOR OF UNIT 2 PUSHED IN. BONO STATED THAT BEFORE MY |
| :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { INCIDENT ID } \\ 00848261 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { ROUTE SYS } \\ \text { O4-CSAH } \end{array}$ | ROUTE NUM 0021 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEASURE } \\ & 0.177 \end{aligned}$ |  | ROUTE NAMELITTLE CANADA RD |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { ROUTE ID } \\ \text { 0400006595070021-I } \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { COUNTY } \\ 62-R a m s e y ~ \end{array}$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { CITY } \\ & \text { Little Canada }\end{aligned}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT WITH |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# VEH } \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{0}^{\# \text { KILL }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DATE } \\ & 10 / 20 / 20 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{l\|l} \hline & \text { TIME } \\ 20 & 15: 35 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DAY } \\ & \text { Tue } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAT } \\ & 45.023109 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $-93.090578$ | UTM X 492864.5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM Y } \\ & 4985520.6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE <br> Rear End |  | CRASH SEVERITY C - Possible Injury |  |  | FIRST HARMFULMotor Vehicle In Transport |  |  |  |  | LIGHT COND Daylight |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Snow |
| Di <br> Contr | Unit Type Vehicle Type ction of Travel Maneuver Age/Sex Physical Cond uting Factor 1 | Hit-And-R <br> Passenger <br> Westbound <br> Moving F |  | 1 |  | Motor Vehi Passenger Westbound Vehicle Sto 44 M <br> Apparently No Clear | Unit <br> le in Car <br> pped <br> Norm ontrib | ransport <br> or Stalled in <br> uting Action |  | nit 3 |  | Unit 4 |


| OFFICER SKETCH | NARRATIVE <br> DRIVER OF VEHICLE \#2 (MR. BANUELOS) WAS STOPPED AT A RED LIGHT ON WESTBOUND LITTLE CANADA ROAD OVER 35E; HE STATED VEHICLE \#1 REAR-ENDED HIS VEHICLE, AND THE DRIVER FLED IN THE VEHICLE. DRIVER OF VEHICLE \#2 STATED THE REGISTRATION ON VEHICLE \#1 WAS DJU 684; HE ALSO STATED THE DRIVER (ONLY OCCUPANT) WAS AN AFRICAN AMERICAN MALE, THIRTY FIVE, OR THIRTY EIGHT YEARS OLD, WITH A FAT FACE, AND VERY SHORT HAIR. MR. BANUELOS STATED HIS BACK AND NECK WERE SORE, HOWEVER HE DID NOT WANT TO BE SEEN BY MEDICS. A STATE TROOPER IN THE MARSHALL DISTRICT SPOKE TO THE REGISTERED OWNER LISTED TO VEHICLE \#1; SHE ADVISED HIM SHE SOLD THE VEHICLE BUT DID NOT KNOW WHO THE VEHICLE WAS SOLD TO. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Not To Scale |  |

Crash Detail Report - Short Form

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { INCIDENT ID } \\ & 00811141 \end{aligned}$ | ROUTE SYS 05-MSAS | ROUTE NUM <br> 0101 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEASURE } \\ & 0000 \end{aligned}$ |  | ROUTE NAMECOUNTRY DR |  |  | ROUTE ID <br> 0500023957330101-I |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COUNTY } \\ & \text { 62-Ramsey } \end{aligned}$ | CITYLittle Canada |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT | H |  | \# VEH | \# KILL | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DATE } \\ & 05 / 21 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | TIME | DAY | LAT | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { LONG } \\ & -93.090862 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM X } \\ & 492842.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM Y } \\ & 4985529.0 \end{aligned}$ | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE Sideswipe S | Direction | CRASH SEVERITY <br> N - Prop Damage Only |  |  | FIRST HARMFULMotor Vehicle In Transport |  |  |  |  | LIGHT CONDITION Daylight |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Clear |


|  | Unit 1 | Unit 2 | Unit 3 | Unit 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Hit-And-Run Vehicle |  |  |
| Vehicle Type | Passenger Van (Seats Installı | Passenger Car |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Westbound | Westbound |  |  |
| Maneuver | Moving Forward | Changing Lanes |  |  |
| Age/Sex | 32 M |  |  |  |
| Physical Cond | Apparently Normal |  |  |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | No Clear Contributing Action |  |  |  |



## NARRATIVE

DRIVER 1 STATES HE WAS W/B ON LITTLE CANADA RD AT COUNTRY DRV IN THE LEFT LANE GOING STRAIGHT. VEH 2 IN THE RIGHT LANE WAS BEHIND OTHER VEHICLES STOPPED TO MAKE A RIGHT TURN ON COUNTRY DRV. VEH 2 SWERVED INTO THE LEFT LANE TO GET AROUND OTHER VEHICLES AND STRUCK VEH 1 IN THE PASSENGER SIDE DOOR. VEH 2 DID NOT STOP AND FLED W/B ON LITTLE CANADA RD DRIVER 1 WAS ABLE TO SNAP A PHOTO OF THE LICENSE PLATE OF VEH 2 AS IT WAS LEAVING. OWNER AH-GHAZALI STATES HE SOLD/GAVE THE VEHICLE TO VAN SAI LEE ON 04/15/20

| INCIDENT ID 01080997 | ROUTE SYS 05-MSAS | ROUTE NUM 0101 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEASURE } \\ & 0000 \end{aligned}$ |  | ROUTE NAME COUNTRY DR |  |  | ROUTE ID <br> 0500023957330101-I |  | COUNTY <br> 62-Ramsey | CITY <br> Little Canada |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT LITTLE CAN | DA RD |  | $\begin{aligned} & \# \text { VEH } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \# \text { KILL } \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DATE } \\ & 10 / 24 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TIME } \\ & \text { 06:45 } \end{aligned}$ | DAY <br> Mon | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAT } \\ & 45.023181 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { UTM X } \\ 492842.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM Y } \\ & 4985528.6 \end{aligned}$ | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE Bike |  | CRASH SEVERITY <br> A - Serious Injury |  |  | FIRST HARMFUL <br> Pedalcyclist (Bicyclist) |  |  |  |  | LIGHT CONDITIONDark (Str Lights On) |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Cloudy |


|  | Unit 1 | Unit 2 | Unit 3 | Unit 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Bicycle | Hit-And-Run Vehicle |  |  |
| Vehicle Type |  |  |  |  |
| Direction of Travel |  | Northbound |  |  |
| Maneuver | Walk/Cycle Across Traffic (X-i |  |  |  |
| Age/Sex | 31 |  |  |  |
| Physical Cond | Apparently Normal |  |  |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | Unknown |  |  |  |



Crash Detail Report - Short Form

Selection Filter:
WORK AREA: County('659507') - FILTER: Year('2020','2021','2022') - SPATIAL FILTER APPLIED

Analyst: Notes:
Bryan Nemeth

## Crash Detail Report - Short Form

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { INCIDENT ID } \\ & 00917925 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE SYS } \\ & \text { 04-CSAH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROUTE NUM } \\ & 0021 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { MEASURE } \\ & 0.198 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | ROUTE NAMELITTLE CANADA RD |  |  | ROUTE ID <br> O400006595070021-I |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COUNTY } \\ & \text { 62-Ramsey } \end{aligned}$ | CITYLittle Canada |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERSECT |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { \# VEH } \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \# \text { \# KILL } \\ 0 \end{array}$ | DATE 07/10/21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TIME } \\ & \text { 15:51 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { DAY } \\ \text { Sat } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LAT } \\ & 45.023001 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LONG } \\ & -93.090175 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM X } \\ & 492896.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UTM Y } \\ & 4985508.6 \end{aligned}$ | WORK ZONE TYPE NOT APPLICABLE |
| BASIC TYPE <br> Rear End |  | CRASH SEV <br> N - Prop D | EVERIT Damag | Only | FIRST Moto | HARMF <br> Vehicle | In Tra | sport |  | LIGHT CON Daylight |  | WEATHER PRIMARY Clear |


|  |  |  | Unit 3 | Unit 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Motor Vehicle in Transport | Motor Vehicle in Transport |  |  |
| Vehicle Type | Passenger Car | Sport Utility Vehicle |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Westbound | Westbound |  |  |
| Maneuver | Vehicle Stopped or Stalled in | Moving Forward |  |  |
| Age/Sex | 66 F | 31 F |  |  |
| Physical Cond | Apparently Normal | Apparently Normal |  |  |
| Contributing Factor 1 | No Clear Contributing Action | No Clear Contributing Action |  |  |



Selection Filter:
WORK AREA: County('659507') - FILTER: Year('2020','2021','2022'), Date('07/10/2021') - SPATIAL FILTER APPLIED

Analyst:
Notes:
$\square$
Bryan Nemeth


## - EXISTING TRAFFIC SIGNAL

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { MNDOT SIGNAL REPLACEMENT PROGRAMMED } \\
& \text { FOR } 2027
\end{aligned}
$$


 LITTLE CANADA ROAD AND
COUNTRY DRIVE IMPROVEMENT


## Streams

## Streams (Data through 12/31/2022)

## About Streams

## Search by Property Name or Address

Or Search by HUD, MN Housing, Public Housing, USDA/RD, or Tax Credit ID

## Or filter by:

## Funding Source

Federal
State
Local
Philanthropic Funding Categories
Project-Based Subsidy Public Housing
Tax Credit
Tax Credit (LIHTC 4\%)
Tax Credit (LIHTC 9\%)
Subsidized-Other Local 4d
Groups Served
Family
Elderly
Disabled

Obligation End Year
Start Year $\vee$
End Year $\checkmark$

Last Finance Year

| Start Year $\mathbf{V}$ |
| :--- |
| End Year $\mathbf{V}$ |

First Finance Year
Start Year $v$
End Year $v$New ConstructionOther

## Show Results

Clear All



## Properties found.

| Property Search Summary | Properties | Total Units | 30\% AMI* | 50\% AMI* | 60\% AMI* | 80\% AMI* | Total Aff Units* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7 | 465 | 64 | 188 | 41 | 172 | 465 |

* AMI level and units are estimated if not provided, set to least restrictive AMI for largest number of units.
** Obligation expiration dates are estimated based on program definition if not provided.
*** There may be other funders. This funder provided for reference.


## Property Detail

The Provinces Apts
Multiple addresses listed at bottom of page

## Funding Categories

Tax Credit
Subsidized-Other
Tax Credit (LIHTC 4\%)
Tax Credit (LIHTC 9\%)
Property Information
Year Built:
Building Type: Apartment
Groups Served:
Total Units: 118
Affordable Units: 118
Affordable Units by Bedroom
1 BR: 29
2 BR: 48
3 BR: 1
Units by Area Median Income
80\%: 118

About Streams


Housing+Transit Cost Walk Score ${ }^{\circledR}: 34 \quad$ Report a problem
Listing Summary

| BR Size | 1st Listing | Last Listing | Low Rent | High Rent | Last Rent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $07 / 31 / 2018$ | $12 / 12 / 2019$ | $\$ 875$ | $\$ 875$ | $\$ 955$ |
| 2 | $12 / 12 / 2019$ | $12 / 12 / 2019$ | $\$ 1,175$ | None | $\$ 1,175$ |

Known Property Addresses

| 1 | 153 Little Canada Rd E | Little Canada |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | 155 Little Canada Rd E | Minneapolis |
| 3 | 155 Little Canada Rd E | Little Canada |

## Funding Dates \& Programs

First known closing: 1/1/1996
Most recent closing: 7/1/2022
Earliest estimated expiration: 1/1/2026
Last Activity: Preservation

MHFA: Housing Tax Credits 9\%
Close Date: 1/1/1996
Estimated Expiration: 1/1/2026
MHFA: Housing Tax Credits 4\%
Close Date: 1/1/1997
Expiration: 1/1/2027

MHFA: Housing Tax Credits
Close Date: 1/1/1998
Expiration: 1/1/2028
City: City
Close Date: 7/1/2022
Expiration: 7/1/2052
Known Property Identifiers
HousingLink: 6457
MHFATC4: D3004
HUDLIHTC: MNA19989011
City: The Provinces Apts

## HousingLink

## Property Detail

Garden Terrace
2874 Market PI Dr
Little Canada, MN 55117

Funding Categories
Project-Based Subsidy
Tax Credit (LIHTC 4\%)
Property Information
Year Built: 2003
Building Type: Apartment Groups Served: Elderly Total Units: 41
Affordable Units: 41
Affordable Units by Bedroom
1 BR: 40
2 BR: 1
Units by Area Median Income 60\%: 41


Housing+Transit Cost Walk Score ${ }^{\circledR}: 69 \quad$ Report a problem
Listing Summary

| BR Size | 1st Listing | Last Listing | Low Rent | High Rent | Last Rent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $06 / 23 / 2010$ | $03 / 01 / 2018$ | Subsidized | Subsidized | Subsidized |

Known Property Addresses

| 1 | 2874 Market PI Dr | Little Canada |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |

Funding Dates \& Programs
First known closing: 1/1/2005
Most recent closing: 7/28/2020
Earliest expiration: 1/1/2035
Last Activity: Preservation

MHFA: Housing Tax Credits 4\%
Close Date: 1/1/2005
Estimated Expiration: 1/1/2035
HUD: Section 202
Close Date: 7/1/2015
Expiration: 6/30/2035
HUD: Section 202
Close Date: 7/1/2015
Expiration: 6/30/2035

Known Property Identifiers
HousingLink: 3547
MHFATC4: D3339
HUD: 800010925

## HousingLink

## Property Detail

Owasso Gardens
161 S Owasso Blvd W
Roseville, MN 55113

Funding Categories
Subsidized-Other
Tax Credit (LIHTC 4\%)
Property Information
Year Built:
Building Type: Apartment Groups Served: Elderly Total Units: 60
Affordable Units: 60
Affordable Units by Bedroom
1 BR: 40
2 BR: 20
Units by Area Median Income
30\%: 8
50\%: 52

About Streams


Housing+Transit Cost Walk Score ${ }^{\circledR}: 52 \quad$ Report a problem

Known Property Addresses

| 1 | 161 S Owasso Blvd W | Roseville |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |

Funding Dates \& Programs
First known closing: 1/1/2020
Most recent closing: 1/29/2021
Earliest expiration: 7/1/2040
Last Activity: New Construction

County: County
Close Date: 7/1/2020
Expiration: 7/1/2040
MHFA: Housing Tax Credits 4\%
Close Date: 1/1/2020
Estimated Expiration: 1/1/2050
MHFA: HIB
Close Date: 1/29/2021
Expiration: 3/1/2062
MHFA: LMIR
Close Date: 1/29/2021
Expiration: 3/1/2062

Known Property Identifiers
HousingLink: 15634
Ramsey Cnty: Owasso Gardens
MHFA: D8233
MHFATC4: D8233

## HousingLink

## Property Detail



Known Property Addresses

| 1 | 2880 Market PI Dr | Little Canada |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Funding Dates \& Programs
First known closing: 7/28/2020
Most recent closing: 7/28/2020
Earliest expiration: 7/27/2043
Last Activity: Preservation

MHFA: Housing Tax Credits 4\%
Close Date: 1/1/2006
Expiration: 1/1/2036
HUD: Section 202
Close Date: 7/28/2020
Expiration: 7/27/2043
Known Property Identifiers
HousingLink: 15632
HUD: 800215011

November 9, 2023

Attn: Elaine Koutsoukos<br>Transportation Advisory Board Coordinator<br>390 Robert Street North<br>St. Paul, MN. 55101

## Re: Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Metropolitan Council Regional Solicitation

Dear Ms. Koutsoukos,
On behalf of Ramsey County Public Works, I want to express my support for the City's Application to the Metropolitan Council's Regional Solicitation Program to fund the Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Project.

Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) is a vital regional corridor in the City of Little Canada. It provides a critical link to Interstate 35-E for the residents and business owners in the area. The County and City have been partnering for the last several years to scope and program improvements in this corridor to improve safety and mobility.

Specifically, the intersection of Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive is too close to the interchange ramps. This has resulted in unsafe conditions and a very poor level of service due to the unique configuration of traffic signals and lane geometry. As traffic continues to increase over time, the intersection conditions will continue to deteriorate. A significant infrastructure investment is required at this location in order to improve the safety and level of service. As such, Ramsey County has programmed this project in its 2024-2028 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) as a 2026 project. This project would complement other programmed improvements along the corridor:

- County-led 4-lane to 3-lane conversion (2026)
- County Road C, from Lexington Avenue to Little Canada Road
- City-led all-way stop to roundabout conversion (2026)
- Intersection of County Road C / Little Canada Road / Lakeshore Drive
- MnDOT-led replacement of the I-35E interchange signal system (2027)

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing the Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Project application.

Sincerely,


Brian Isaacson
Director of Public Works








November 9, 2023

Attn: Elaine Koutsoukos
Transportation Advisory Board Coordinator
390 Robert Street North
St. Paul, MN. 55101

## Re: Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Metropolitan Council Regional Solicitation

Dear Ms. Koutsoukos,

As Mayor of the City of Little Canada, I want to express my support for the City's Application to the Minnesota Department of Transportation's Local Road Improvement Program to fund the Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Project.

Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) is a vital regional corridor in the City of Little Canada. Its intersection with Country Drive and the l-35E interchange has been problematic during my entire tenure on the City Council and now as Mayor. The city's residents and business owners seek a safe and effective transportation system. As such, addressing the deficiencies at this intersection is a top priority for me and for the City Council.

This is a challenging intersection with multi-agency coordination required. The City Council recognizes those challenges and have authorized City staff to lead this project with collaboration and support from Ramsey County and MnDOT.

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing the Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Project application.

Sincerely,


Tom Fischer
Mayor
City of Little Canada

November 9, 2023

Attn: Elaine Koutsoukos<br>Transportation Advisory Board Coordinator<br>390 Robert Street North<br>St. Paul, MN. 55101

## Re: Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Metropolitan Council Regional Solicitation

Dear Ms. Koutsoukos,
On behalf of Ramsey County Public Works, I want to express my support for the City's Application to the Metropolitan Council's Regional Solicitation Program to fund the Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Project.

Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) is a vital regional corridor in the City of Little Canada. It provides a critical link to Interstate 35-E for the residents and business owners in the area. The County and City have been partnering for the last several years to scope and program improvements in this corridor to improve safety and mobility.

Specifically, the intersection of Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive is too close to the interchange ramps. This has resulted in unsafe conditions and a very poor level of service due to the unique configuration of traffic signals and lane geometry. As traffic continues to increase over time, the intersection conditions will continue to deteriorate. A significant infrastructure investment is required at this location in order to improve the safety and level of service. As such, Ramsey County has programmed this project in its 2024-2028 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) as a 2026 project. This project would complement other programmed improvements along the corridor:

- County-led 4-lane to 3-lane conversion (2026)
- County Road C, from Lexington Avenue to Little Canada Road
- City-led all-way stop to roundabout conversion (2026)
- Intersection of County Road C / Little Canada Road / Lakeshore Drive
- MnDOT-led replacement of the I-35E interchange signal system (2027)

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing the Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Project application.

Sincerely,


Brian Isaacson
Director of Public Works

MnDOT Metro District

12/11/2023

Bill Dircks
Public Works Director
2858 Centerville Road
Little Canada, MN 55117

## Re: MnDOT Letter for The City of Little Canada

 Metropolitan Council/Transportation Advisory Board 2024 Regional Solicitation Funding Request for Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements.Dear Bill Dircks,

This letter documents MnDOT Metro District's recognition for The City of Little Canada to pursue funding for the Metropolitan Council/Transportation Advisory Board's (TAB) 2024 Regional Solicitation for the for Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements.

The proposed project includes construction of two roundabouts on Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) at County Road C and Country Drive, with the realignment of County Road Drive and construction of a trail adjacent to I-35E. This project does not directly impact the Trunk Highway System but is adjacent to the I-35E Interchange with CSAH 23.

As the agency with jurisdiction over l-35E, MnDOT will allow the City of Little Canada to seek improvements proposed in the application. If funded, details of how the project is delivered and any future maintenance agreement with the City will need to be determined during the project's development to define how the improvements will be maintained for the project's useful life.

MnDOT does not anticipate partnering on local projects beyond current agreements. If your project receives funding, continue to work with MnDOT Area staff to coordinate and review needs and opportunities for cooperation.

MnDOT Metro District looks forward to continued cooperation with the City as this project moves forward and as we work together to improve safety and travel options within the Metro Area.

If you have questions or require additional information at this time, please reach out to your Area Manager at Molly.McCartney@state.mn.us or 651-775-0326.

Sincerely,

CC:
Molly McCartney, North Area Manager
Aaron Tag, Metro Program Director
Dan Erickson, Metro State Aid Engineer

November 9, 2023

Attn: Elaine Koutsoukos
Transportation Advisory Board Coordinator
390 Robert Street North
St. Paul, MN. 55101

## Re: Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements

 Metropolitan Councial Regional SolicitationDear Ms. Koutsoukos,
As a business owner in Little Canada, I am pleased to express my support for the Little Canada Road and Country Drive Improvements Project.

The Country Drive and Little Canada Road intersection acts as a gateway to the business district north of Little Canada Road. The proposed project will improve access, congestion, and safety in the area. Improvements to this intersection will surely have a positive impact on the daily operations of our business.

Investment in this area by the City, County, and MnDOT shows a positive commitment to the business owners who have also invested resources and who want their businesses to thrive in the community for years to come.

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing the Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Project application.

Sincerely,

Mang Chu-Yang-Heu
President

# North Star Estates 

## 3001 Country Drive I Little Canada, MN 55117 I (651) 484-8567 northstar@rhp-properties.com I BayshoreHomeSales.com

November<br>9, 2023<br>Attn: Elaine Koutsoukos<br>Transportation Advisory Board Coordinator 390 Robert Street North<br>St. Paul, MN. 55101

## Re: Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Metropolitan Council Regional Solicitation

Dear Ms. Koutsoukos,

As a high-density residential property with access from the Little Canada Road and Country Drive intersection, North Star Estates is pleased to express our support for the proposed intersection improvement project.

The Country Drive and Little Canada Road intersection acts as a gateway to our All-Age Manufactured Home Community just north of the intersection. The proposed project will improve access, congestion, and safety in the area. Improvements to this intersection will surely have a positive impact on the daily lives of our residents.

Improvements to the intersection will also improve the pedestrian experience for those who walk, run, or bike in the area, including our residents traveling to and from jobs or services.

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing the Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Project application.

Sincerely, Tom Sudden
Community Manager


Attn: Elaine Koutsoukos
Transportation Advisory Board Coordinator
390 Robert Street North
St. Paul, MN. 55101

Re: Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Metropolitan Council Regional Solicitation

Dear Ms. Koutsoukos,

As a high-density residential property with access from the Little Canada Road and Country Drive intersection, the Quebec Apartments is pleased to express our support for the proposed intersection improvement project.

The Country Drive and Little Canada Road intersection acts as a gateway to our apartment complex just north of the intersection. The proposed project will improve access, congestion, and safety in the area. Improvements to this intersection will surely have a positive impact on the daily lives of our residents.

Improvements to the intersection will also improve the pedestrian experience for those who walk, run, or bike in the area, including our residents traveling to and from jobs or services.

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing the Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Project application.

Sincerely,



Angie French
Vice President
Mid Continent Management Corporation

November 14, 2023

Attn: Elaine Koutsoukos
Transportation Advisory Board Coordinator
390 Robert Street North
St. Paul, MN. 55101

## Re: Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements

 Metropolitan Council Regional SolicitationDear Ms. Koutsoukos,
As a business owner in Little Canada, I am pleased to express my support for the Little Canada Road and Country Drive Improvements Project.

The Country Drive and Little Canada Road intersection acts as a gateway to the business district north of Little Canada Road. The proposed project will improve access, congestion, and safety in the area. Improvements to this intersection will surely have a positive impact on the daily operations of our business.

Investment in this area by the City, County, and MnDOT shows a positive commitment to the business owners who have also invested resources and who want their businesses to thrive in the community for years to come.

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing the Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Project application.

Sincerely,
Fra-Dor, Inc.


Tony Frattalone
President

November 14, 2023
Attn: Elaine Koutsoukos
Transportation Advisory Board Coordinator
390 Robert Street North
St. Paul, MN. 55101

## Re: Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Metropolitan Council Regional Solicitation

Dear Ms. Koutsoukos,
As a business owner in Little Canada, I am pleased to express my support for the Little Canada Road and Country Drive Improvements Project.

The Country Drive and Little Canada Road intersection acts as a gateway to the business district north of Little Canada Road. The proposed project will improve access, congestion, and safety in the area. Improvements to this intersection will surely have a positive impact on the daily operations of our business.

Investment in this area by the City, County, and MnDOT shows a positive commitment to the business owners who have also invested resources and who want their businesses to thrive in the community for years to come.

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing the Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Project application.

Sincerely,
Frattalone Companies, Inc.


Tony Frattalone
COO

Primoris
November 20, 2023

Attn: Elaine Koutsoukos
Transportation Advisory Board Coordinator
390 Robert Street North
St. Paul, MN. 55101

## Re: Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Metropolitan Council Regional Solicitation

Dear Ms. Koutsoukos,

As a representative of Q3 Contracting working in Little Canada, I am pleased to express my support for the Little Canada Road and Country Drive Improvements Project.

The Country Drive and Little Canada Road intersection acts as a gateway to the business district north of Little Canada Road. The proposed project will improve access, congestion, and safety in the area. Improvements to this intersection will surely have a positive impact on the daily operations of our business.

Investment in this area by the City, County, and MnDOT shows a positive commitment to the business owners who have also invested resources and who want their businesses to thrive in the community for years to come.

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing the Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements Project application.

Sincerely,

## Brandon Rumpca

Vice President of Operations


## LITTLE CANADA ROAD \& COUNTY DRIVE OPEN HOUSE SUMMARY

## Little Canada Road \& County Drive Intersection Improvements

The City of Little Canada and Bolton \& Menk hosted a public open house on Wednesday, November 29, 2023. The purpose of the meeting was to inform the public of current and projected traffic operations and introduce the proposed improvements for four intersections within the project area. Attendees were given an opportunity to review and respond to the improvements via comment cards. Residents were also invited to provide feedback via an online survey and interactive comment map on the project website.

Little Canada City Hall
5:30-7p.m.

10
$\sim 30$ attendees
46 survey responses
$\cdots$
5 comment cards

## What We Heard

- Signage and Signal Improvements: There is frustration around signage and traffic signals at this intersection. There were several comments that the signaling at the intersection is confusing and that many drivers make right turns on red despite adequate signage.
- Consider Roundabouts: Several people expressed interest in a roundabout at this intersection to improve congestion and confusion.
- Pedestrian and Bike Safety: Residents were in agreement that pedestrian safety is a priority for this intersection. Suggested improvements included a bike or bike and pedestrian lane, a pedestrian bridge, and connecting new paths to existing ones.
- Congestion: There were several locations identified as congested areas including the Caribou exit, the Little Canada Road and Lakeshore Drive intersection, and the Little Canada Road and County Drive intersection due to the lack of a left turn lane.



## Advertisement methods

\Postcard
Social media
$\sqrt{ }$ Website update

## Survey Results

The County Drive and Little Canda Road intersection feels safe for motorists.

4\%


Strongly Agree

19\%
Disagree
Agree

15\%
Neutral
47\%
Disagree

The County Drive and Little Canda Road intersection feels congested.
2\%
Strongly Disagree


The County Drive and Little Canda Road intersection feels safe for pedestrians.


The County Drive and Little Canda Road intersection feels confusing.


## Survey Results

I support the City's effort to improve safety and congestion at this intersection.


## INPUTiD Comment Map

There were 18 comments submitted on the interactive INPUTiD comment map. The comments were consistent with the feedback submitted via the survey.

Key themes included:

- Confusing traffic signals
- Unsafe intersection for pedestrians and bicyclists
- Consider construction and longterm impact to existing businesses
- Opportunity for more pedestrian connections and bike lanes


## Map Legend

(4) Concerns
(a) Dislike
(8) Ideas and Opportunities
(a) Other


# Little Canada Road and Country Drive Intersection Improvement City of Little Canada 

Project Name: Little Canada Road and Country Drive Intersection Improvement Project
Applicant: City of Little Canada Primary Contact:
Bill Dircks
Public Works Director
515 Little Canada Road East
651-776-4049
Bill.dircks@littlecanadamn.org

Location \& Route:
Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive intersection west of I-35 E

Application Category:
Spot Mobility and Safety

Funding Information:
Requested Award Amount: $\$ 3.5$ million
Local Match: \$5,414,000
Project Total: \$8,914,500


Additional Funding Sources:

- MSA and CSAH funding



## Corridor Fast Facts:

- Existing condition is a coordinated signal with the southbound I-35E ramp
- Solve a long-standing safety and congestion problem at this location via single-lane roundabout and realignment of intersection
- Significant improvement to pedestrian safety
- Project located in a regional Environmental Justice area



## Project Description

The proposed project in the City of Little Canada will reconfigure the Little Canada Road and Country Drive intersection from a traffic signal to a single-lane roundabout and realign Country Drive and the intersection with Little Canada Road approximately 600 feet west. Country Drive will be realigned to the west and include a dedicated pedestrian facility. Access to Little Canada Road from the existing Country Drive location will be removed, enhancing operations for the I-35E interchange ramp intersection currently separated by less than 100 feet with coordinated signals. The existing traffic signal serving the intersection, along with the existing access location, will be removed. The Waterworks Trail connection to Little Canada Road will be extended through the existing Country Drive right of way. The new location of the Little Canada Road and Country Drive intersection and conversion to a roundabout will work jointly with the programmed improvement for the Little Canada Road/Lake Shore Avenue/County Road C intersection, which will also be converted to a singlelane roundabout.

## Project Regional Significance

Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) is an A Minor Arterial Augmentor at this location just west of I-35E. The intersection and connection to Country Drive is important due to the parallel route serving I-35E and I-694 as it runs immediately adjacent west of where the two interstate corridors merge within the City of Little Canada.


## Project Benefits

The focus of this project is a safety and mobility improvement by implementation of a realigned intersection and conversion to a single-lane roundabout in place of a 4lane undivided highway and confusing coordinated dual intersection with l-35E southbound ramps. The project includes realignment a major emphasis on pedestrian safety and multimodal investment throughout the project corridor.

## Project Development

The City of Little Canada has been working for several years to develop possible improvement projects to address safety and congestion along Little Canada Road between Lakeshore Avenue and I-35E. This work has been done in coordination with Ramsey County, MnDOT and FHWA staff, all of which have jurisdictional authority on adjacent roadways. The proposed project is a result of on-going coordination and partnership with these agencies.


# CITY OF LITTLE CANADA <br> COUNTY OF RAMSEY <br> STATE OF MINNESOTA 

RESOLUTION 2023-152

## A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION OF A SPOT MOBILITY AND SAFETY APPLICATION TO THE 2024 REGIONAL SOLICITATION FOR THE LITTLE CANADA ROAD AND COUNTRY DRIVE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Council administers the Regional Solicitation grant program, intended to distribute Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program funds that meet regional transportation needs; and,

WHEREAS, the 2024 Regional Solicitation has approximately $\$ 250$ million in federal dollars available and up to $\$ 163$ million of which may be awarded to projects that improve roadways with multimodal elements including Spot Mobility and Safety projects, with a minimum award of $\$ 1,000,000$ and a cap of $\$ 3,500,000$ for Spot Mobility and Safety projects; and,

WHEREAS, these funds have been designated for standalone projects with the expectation that the executing agency will provide matching funds equal to or greater than $20 \%$ of the project cost; and,

WHEREAS, the City of Little Canada intends to apply for Metropolitan Council's regional solicitation Spot Mobility and Safety category to fund the Little Canada Road and Country Drive Intersection Improvement Project; and,

WHEREAS, the planned intersection improvements would improve safety, reduce congestion, and improve pedestrian connections through and adjacent to the Little Canada Road and Country Drive intersection; and

WHEREAS, the City of Little Canada has agreed to maintain the proposed improvements for the lifetime of such improvement; and,

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Little Canada; that

1. The City of Little Canada supports the Spot Mobility and Safety Regional Solicitation Grant Application for the Little Canada Road and Country Drive Intersection Improvement Project and authorizes staff to prepare and submit such application; and
2. The City Council hereby commits to funding project elements not eligible for Regional Solicitation grant funding and funding and ensuring the Project complies with Regional Solicitation funding requirements and timelines.

Adopted by the Council this $29^{\text {th }}$ day of November, 2023.


Thomas Fischer, Mayor

12/11/2023

Bill Dircks
Public Works Director
2858 Centerville Road
Little Canada, MN 55117

## Re: MnDOT Letter for The City of Little Canada Metropolitan Council/Transportation Advisory Board 2024 Regional Solicitation Funding Request for Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements.

Dear Bill Dircks,

This letter documents MnDOT Metro District's recognition for The City of Little Canada to pursue funding for the Metropolitan Council/Transportation Advisory Board's (TAB) 2024 Regional Solicitation for the for Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) and Country Drive Improvements.

The proposed project includes construction of two roundabouts on Little Canada Road (CSAH 21) at County Road C and Country Drive, with the realignment of County Road Drive and construction of a trail adjacent to I-35E. This project does not directly impact the Trunk Highway System but is adjacent to the I-35E Interchange with CSAH 23.

As the agency with jurisdiction over l-35E, MnDOT will allow the City of Little Canada to seek improvements proposed in the application. If funded, details of how the project is delivered and any future maintenance agreement with the City will need to be determined during the project's development to define how the improvements will be maintained for the project's useful life.

MnDOT does not anticipate partnering on local projects beyond current agreements. If your project receives funding, continue to work with MnDOT Area staff to coordinate and review needs and opportunities for cooperation.

MnDOT Metro District looks forward to continued cooperation with the City as this project moves forward and as we work together to improve safety and travel options within the Metro Area.

If you have questions or require additional information at this time, please reach out to your Area Manager at Molly.McCartney@state.mn.us or 651-775-0326.

Sincerely,

## Sheila <br> Digitally signed <br> by Sheila Kauppi <br> Kauppi <br> Date: 2023.12.11 <br> 22:56:05-06'00'

Sheila Kauppi, PE
Metro District Engineer

CC:
Molly McCartney, North Area Manager
Aaron Tag, Metro Program Director
Dan Erickson, Metro State Aid Engineer


## - EXISTING TRAFFIC SIGNAL

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { MNDOT SIGNAL REPLACEMENT PROGRAMMED } \\
& \text { FOR } 2027
\end{aligned}
$$
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