## SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING

October 16, 2019 at 6:30 PM
City Council Chambers, 16 Colomba Rd.
DeBary, Florida 32713

## AGENDA

## CALL TO ORDER

Invocation
Flag Salute

## ROLL CALL

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION FOR ANY ITEMS ON THE AGENDA (Citizen comments are limited to five (5) minutes per speaker. Speakers will be called when the item is introduced for discussion.)

## ADDITIONS, DELETIONS OR AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

 CONSENT AGENDA1. City Manager is requesting the Mayor and City Council to authorize the City Attorney and City Manager to approve Task Order No. 2015-35 with Pegasus Engineering, LLC and their Subconsultant (Environmental Research \& Design, Inc.) in order to perform the Lake Monitoring Program, in an amount not-to-exceed \$51,921.36.
2. City Manager is requesting City Council to award the Contract for Construction for Bid No. 13-19, Demolition Services, to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, ADVANCED DEMOLITION, LLC.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. The Applicants, Judy and Eric Mumford, are requesting approval of Resolution No. 2019-21 to vacate a portion of the Hawkcrest Court cul-de-sac right-of-way in the DeBary Plantation Residential Planned Unit Development.

## GROWTH MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

4. Staff is requesting the City Council to consider approval of a proposed TOD Joint Marketing Agreement between the City of DeBary and multiple property owners within the TOD core area.
5. Reader \& Partners, LLC, is requesting the City Council to approve a Proportionate Fair Share Agreement as part of the Rivington development project.

## COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS / COMMUNICATIONS

Member Reports/ Communications
A. Mayor and Council Members
B. City Manager
C. City Attorney

## DATE OF UPCOMING MEETING / WORKSHOP

- Regular City Council Meeting November 6, 2019 at 6:30 p.m.


## ADJOURN

If any person decides to appeal any decision made by the City Council with respect to any matter considered at this meeting or hearing he/she will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose he/she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based (FS 286.0105).

Individuals with disabilities needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact the City Clerk at least three (3) working days in advance of the meeting date and time at (386) 668-2040.

City Council Meeting City of DeBary

AGENDA ITEM

| Subject: Lake Monitoring Program Task Order | Attachments: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: | Carmen Rosamonda, City Manager | ( ) Ordinance <br> () Resolution |
| October 16, 2019 | October 16, 2019 | () Supporting Documents/ Contracts <br> (x) Other |

## REQUEST

City Manager is requesting the Mayor and City Council to authorize the City Attorney and City Manager to approve Task Order No. 2015-35 with Pegasus Engineering, LLC and their Subconsultant (Environmental Research \& Design, Inc.) in order to perform the Lake Monitoring Program, in an amount not-to-exceed \$51,921.36.

## PURPOSE

This agenda item is needed at this time to allow Environmental Research and Design, Inc. to continue to perform mandatory water quality monitoring as part of the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) permits for the City of DeBary. It is worth noting that this will be the fifth year the Lake Monitoring Program has been undertaken by Environmental Research and Design, Inc. The water quality monitoring program consists of quarterly water testing, data compilation, and reporting on fifteen (15) lakes within the City of DeBary.

## CONSIDERATIONS

The purpose of this Task Order is to allow Pegasus Engineering and their Subconsultant (Environmental Research \& Design, Inc.) to provide the following tasks as directed by the City for Lake Anna Marie, Lake Maud, Tropic Lagoon, James Pond, Lake Olivia, No Name Lake - West Side, No Name Lake - East Side, Lake Marie, Gem Lake, Lake Charles, Lake Lago Linda, Lake of the Woods, Lake Louise, Angeles Lake, and Half Moon Lake. Refer to the attached proposal by Environmental Research \& Design, Inc. which provides the specific scope of work.

## COST/FUNDING

The cost of the FY 2019 / 2020 Quarterly Lake Monitoring Program in the amount of $\$ 51,921.36$ will be paid for by the Stormwater Fund.

## RECOMMENDATION

It recommends that the City Council:

1. Authorize the City Attorney and City Manager to finalize the attached Task Order with Pegasus Engineering, LLC for the FY 2019 / 2020 Quarterly Lake Monitoring Program in an amount not-toexceed $\$ 51,921.36$.
2. Authorize the cost of the Task Order to be paid from the Stormwater Fund.

## IMPLEMENTATION

N/A

## ATTACHMENTS

Task Order No. 2015-35.

TASK ORDER NO.: 2015-35

PROJECT NAME: FY 2019 / 2020 Quarterly Lake Monitoring Program

CLIENT: $\quad \begin{array}{ll}\text { City of DeBary } \\ & 16 \text { Colomba Road } \\ & \text { DeBary, Florida } 32713\end{array}$

The vendor, Pegasus Engineering, LLC, located at 301 West State Road 434, Suite 309, Winter Springs, Florida 32708, is a Corporation authorized to do business in the state of Florida. As part of this Task Order, Pegasus Engineering, LLC, and their subconsultant (Environmental Research \& Design, Inc.) will continue to perform a Lake Monitoring Program in order for the City to meet their permit requirements (refer to the services outlined in the attached document).

The total Lump Sum Fee of this Task Order is Fifty-One Thousand Nine Hundred Twenty-One Dollars and Thirty-Six Cents ( $\$ 51,921.36$ ). The Client agrees to pay Pegasus Engineering, LLC for its services based on approved monthly invoices.

This Task Order shall be governed by the Continuing Consulting Contract for General Engineering Services agreement dated July 29, 2015.

| Client Signature: | Vendor Signature: |
| :---: | :---: |
| CITY OF DEBARY | PEGASUS ENGINEERING, LLC |
| By : | By: |
| Authorized Signature | Authorized Signature |
| Carmen Rosamonda | Fursan Munjed, P.E. |
| Printed Name | Printed Name |
| City Manager | Principal |
| Title | Title |

$\qquad$
Date

October 4, 2019
Date ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH \& DESIGN, INC.

Engineering • Science • Chemistry • Research

# CITY OF DEBARY ANNUAL LAKE MONITORING PROGRAM $4^{\text {th }}$ Quarter 2019-3 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter 2020 (October 2019-September 2020) 

## EXHIBIT A: SCOPE OF SERVICES

Prepared October 4, 2019

The Consultant (Environmental Research \& Design, Inc., ERD) shall, at a minimum, perform the following specific tasks for the City of DeBary and the Engineer (Pegasus Engineering, LLC):

## 1. Quarterly Monitoring Program

a. Sample Collection: Personnel from ERD will perform quarterly water quality monitoring within 15 lakes located within the City of DeBary. The specific lakes to be monitored are listed in Table 1.

TABLE 1
LAKES TO BE SAMPLED WITHIN THE CITY OF DEBARY

| NO. | LAKE | NO. | LAKE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Lake Anna Marie | 9 | Gem Lake |
| 2 | Lake Maud | 10 | Lake Charles |
| 3 | Tropic Lagoon | 11 | Lake Lago Linda |
| 4 | James Pond | 12 | Lake of the Woods |
| 5 | Lake Olivia | 13 | Lake Louise |
| 6 | No Name Lake - West Side | 14 | Angeles Lake |
| 7 | No Name Lake - East Side | 15 | Half Moon Lake |
| 8 | Lake Marie |  |  |

Each of the 15 lakes will be monitored on a quarterly basis at a single location near the geographic center of each lake. Physical-chemical profiles of temperature, pH , specific conductivity, dissolved oxygen, and oxidation/reduction potential (ORP) will be performed at each site, beginning at depths of 0.25 m and 0.5 m , and continuing at 0.5 m intervals from the water surface to the bottom. A measurement of Secchi disk depth will also be conducted at each site. A surface water sample will be collected from each site at a water depth equal to $50 \%$ of the measured Secchi disk depth. Each collected sample will be analyzed for the parameters outlined below. It is the responsibility of the City of DeBary to ensure that ERD personnel have proper authorization and adequate access to all listed lakes for monitoring purposes. A total of 4 quarterly events will be conducted over the 12month monitoring period.

Laboratory analyses will be performed on each collected lake sample for the parameters listed in Table 2

TABLE 2
ANALYTICAL METHODS / DETECTION LIMITS FOR SURFACE WATER ANALYSES

| PARAMETER | METHOD <br> OF ANALYSIS ${ }^{1}$ | METHOD <br> DETECTION <br> LIMITS (MDL) | ANALYSIS <br> FEE <br> (\$/sample) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alkalinity | SM-22, Sec. 2320 B | $0.6 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 10.00 |
| Ammonia | SM-22, Sec. 4500-NH3 G | $0.010 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 10.00 |
| $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ | SM-22, Sec. 4500-NO F | $0.002 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 15.00 |
| Total Nitrogen | SM-22, Sec. 4500-N C | $0.02 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 25.00 |
| Dissolved Total Nitrogen | SM-22, Sec. 4500-N C | $0.02 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 25.00 |
| Ortho-P (SRP) | SM-22, Sec. 4500-P F | $0.001 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 12.00 |
| Total Phosphorus | SM-22, Sec. 4500-P F (analysis) and Sec. 4500- | $0.002 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 20.00 |
| Pissolved Total | SM-22, Sec. 4500-P F (analysis) and Sec. 4500- | $0.002 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 20.00 |
| Phosphorus | P B.5 | $0.4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ | 30.00 |
| Chlorophyll-a | SM-22, Sec. 10200 H.3 | $1 \mathrm{cfu} / 100 \mathrm{ml}$ | 30.00 |
| E. Coli | SM-22, Sec. 9222 D | 0.3 NTU | 5.00 |
| Turbidity | SM-22, Sec. 2130 B | $1.2 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 10.00 |
| TSS | SM-22, Sec. 2540 D | 1.0 Pt-Co Units | 8.00 |
| Color | SM-22, Sec. 2120 C | TOTAL: | $\mathbf{\$ 2 2 0 . 0 0}$ |

1. Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, $22^{\text {nd }}$ Ed., 2012
2. MDLs are calculated based on the EPA method of determining detection limits
b. Data Compilation/Review: All field and laboratory data generated during the quarterly monitoring events will be compiled into an Excel database on a continuing basis. The field and laboratory data will be reviewed and evaluated with respect to accuracy and precision of the data. The finalized data set will be used to generate the quarterly and annual monitoring reports.
c. Prepare Quarterly Reports: A summary report will be prepared for each quarterly monitoring event which outlines the results of the water quality monitoring program. Each quarterly report will be forwarded to Pegasus approximately 30 days following completion of each quarterly monitoring event. The measured field and lab data will be compared with Class III (recreational) surface water quality criteria, Numeric Nutrient Criteria (NNC), and other applicable criteria.

## 2. Prepare Annual Water Quality Summary

ERD will prepare an annual water quality report which summarizes water quality during the previous calendar year and provides an analysis of long-term water quality characteristics and trends and evaluates NNC compliance. A digital PDF version of the Annual Report will be provided to Pegasus for review.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH \& DESIGN, INC.
Engineering • Science • Chemistry • Research 3419 Trentwood Blvd. • Suite 102• Belle Isle (Orlando), FL 32812-4864 Telephone: 407-855-9465 • Fax: 407-826-0419

CITY OF DEBARY ANNUAL LAKE MONITORING PROGRAM $4^{\text {th }}$ Quarter 2019 - $3^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter 2020 (October 2019-September 2020)

EXHIBIT B: MAN-HOURS / FEE SUMMARY
Prepared October 4, 2019


| *Man-Hours: | SYMBOL | PERSONNEL CLASSIFICATION | RATE <br> $\mathbf{( \$ / h r})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PD | Project Director- Harvey H. Harper, Ph.D., P.E. | 175.00 |
|  | LM | Limnologist | 73.75 |
| FT | Field Technician | 64.02 |  |
| CH | Chemist | 51.42 |  |
| CL | Clerical | 52.38 |  |

# City Council Meeting City of DeBary <br> AGENDA ITEM 

| Subject: | Demolition Services - Bid No. 13-19 - |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Award to Advanced Demolition, LLC | Attachments: |
| From: $\quad$ () Ordinance |  |  |
| Carmen Rosamonda, City Manager | () Resolution <br> () Supporting Documents/ Contracts |  |
| Meeting Hearing Date $\quad$ October 16, 2019 | (x) Other |  |

## REQUEST

City Manager is requesting City Council to award the Contract for Construction for Bid No. 13-19, Demolition Services, to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, ADVANCED DEMOLITION, LLC.

## PURPOSE

City Manager is requesting City Council to award the Contract for Construction for Bid No. 13-19, Demolition Services, to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, ADVANCED DEMOLITION, LLC.

## CONSIDERATIONS

Demolition Services are required for the removal of five (5) former residences that were purchased by the City of DeBary utilizing stormwater funds to eliminate the chronic flooding of the homes. One (1) additional site is added to Bid No. 13-19 to eliminate an obsolete commercial facility.

The address of the five (5) homes to be demolished for stormwater purposes are as follows: 142 DeLeon Road, 220 Acacia Road, 238 Agua Vista Street, 405 West Highbanks Road and 409 West Highbanks Road.

The commercial property at 546 S Shell Road was the former site of Discount Propane that was acquired by the City under a land exchange agreement. The facility currently has no viable use but the site may be suitable for future use as a stormwater retention facility.

At the direction of City Council and pursuant to the aforementioned issues, on August 4, 2019 the City of DeBary advertised Bid No. 13-19 in the Daytona Beach News-Journal and posted the Bid Documents on the City's web site and the Vendorlink web portal requesting proposals from Florida Contractors.

As advertised, on August 23, 2019 at 2:00 PM, the City of DeBary received seven (7) sealed bids for Bid No. 13-19 at City Hall. All bids were unsealed and read aloud at the public bid opening with representatives of the bidders and other witnesses present. The results of the bid are:

1. Advanced Demolition
2. SW Zinser
3. Samsula Waster, Inc.
4. Dietrich Quinn
5. Stokes Quality Service, LLC
6. Johnson's Excavation \& Services
7. Cross Construction Services, Inc.
\$35,700.00
\$42,940.00
\$43,931.00
\$52,000.00
\$56,613.00
\$63,230.00
\$76,850.00

Advanced Demolition, LLC is the lowest bidder, and has provided demolition services in the Central Florida region since 1978.

All bids received have been tabulated and checked for mathematic accuracy and responsiveness with the Advertisement for Bids.

## COST/FUNDING

- Funding for the project is budgeted from the Stormwater Fund.
- Advanced Demolition - \$35,700.00
- KHARE Construction Services, LLC. - \$3,712.50
- Total Cost - \$39,412.50


## RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation to Award the Contract for Construction of Bid No. 13-19, Demolition Services, to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, ADVANCED DEMOLITION, LLC for the low bid amount of $\$ 35,700.00$ and approve Task Order No. 1019-01 to KHARE Construction Services, LLC for the amount of $\$ 3,712.50$ for Construction Management Services.

## ATTACHMENTS

Work Order No. 1019-01

# Exhibit B <br> WORK ORDER <br> FOR 

MASTER AGREEMENT FOR PUBLIC WORK PROJECTS CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION SERVICES CONSTRUCTION COSTS LESS THAN $\$ 2,000,000$

WORK ORDER NO.:
PROJECT:

CITY:
COUNTY:
CONSTRUCTION MANAGER:
CONSULTANT'S ADDRESS:

Task Order No. 1019-01

# Construction Management Services for Bid No. 13-19-Demolition Services Six Home Demolition Project 

City of DeBary, Florida
Volusia County
KHARE Construction Services, LLC.
1457 Mt. Laurel Drive
Winter Springs, Florida 32708

Execution of the Work Order by CITY shall serve as authorization for the CONSTRUCTION MANAGER to provide for the above project, professional services as set out in the Scope of Services attached as Exhibit "A," to that certain Agreement of June 3, 2015 and its Addendum No. 1 dated May 16, 2018, between the CITY and the CONSTRUCTION MANAGER and further delineated in the specifications, conditions and requirements stated in the following listed documents which are attached hereto and made a part hereof.

## ATTACHMENTS:

[X] MEMORANDUM - Scope of Services
[] TASK ORDER BREAKDOWN
[] SPECIAL CONDITIONS
The CONSULTANT shall provide said services pursuant to this Work Order, its attachments and the above-referenced Agreement which is incorporated herein by reference as if it had been set out in its entirety. Whenever the Work Order conflicts with said Agreement, the Agreement shall prevail.

TIME FOR COMPLETION: The work authorized by this Work Order shall be commenced and completed as directed by the City Manager.

## METHOD OF COMPENSATION:

(a) This Work Order is issued on a:
[] FIXED FEE BASIS
[X] TIME BASIS METHOD WITH A NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT
[] TIME BASIS METHOD WITH A LIMITATION OF FUNDS AMOUNT
(b) If the compensation is based on a "Fixed. Fee Basis, then the CONSTRUCTION MANAGER shall perform all work required by this Work Order for the sum of $\qquad$ DOLLARS (\$ ). In no event shall the CONSTRUCTION MANAGER be paid more than the Fixed Fee Amount.
(c) If the compensation is based on a "Time- Basis Method" with a Not-to-Exceed Amount, then the CONSULTANT shall perform all work required by this Work Order for a sum not to exceed THREE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED TWELVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS (\$3,712.50). The CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION AND MANAGEMENT compensation shall be based on the actual work required by this Work Order as directed by the City Manager.
(d) If the compensation is based on a "Time Basis Method" with a Limitation of Funds Amount, then the CONSULTANT is not authorized to exceed the limitation of Funds amount of $\qquad$ DOLLARS (\$ $\qquad$ ) without prior written approval of the CITY. Such approval, if given by the CITY, shall indicate a new Limitation of Funds amount. The CONSTRUCTION MANAGER shall advise the CITY whenever the CONSTRUCTION MANAGER has incurred expenses on this Work Order that equals or exceeds eighty percent ( $80 \%$ ) of the Limitation of Funds amount. The City shall compensate the CONSTRUCTION MANAGER for the actual work performed under this Work Order.

Payment to the CONSTRUCTION MANAGER shall be made by the CITY in strict accordance with the payment terms of the above-referenced Agreement.

It is expressly understood by the CONSTRUCTION MANAGER that this Work Order, until executed by the CITY, does not authorize the performance of any services by the CONSTRUCTION MANAGER and that the CITY, prior to its execution of the Work Order, reserves the right to authorize a party other than the CONSTRUCTION MANAGER to perform the services called for under this Work Order if it is determined that to do so is in the best interest of the CITY.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have made and executed this Work Order for the purposes stated herein.

KHARE Construction Services, LLC

By: $\qquad$
Kevin J Hare, President
Date: $\qquad$
CITY OF DEBARY, FLORIDA

By: $\qquad$

Date: $\qquad$

City Council Meeting City of DeBary

AGENDA ITEM

| Subject: | Hawkcrest Ct. ROW Vacation | Attachments: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: $\quad$ Matt Boerger, Growth Management | () Ordinance <br> (X) Resolution |  |
| Meeting Hearing Date $\quad$ October 16, 2019 | () Supporting Documents/ Contracts <br> () Other |  |

## REQUEST

The Applicants, Judy and Eric Mumford, are requesting approval of Resolution No. 2019-21 to vacate a portion of the Hawkcrest Court cul-de-sac right-of-way in the DeBary Plantation Residential Planned Unit Development

## PURPOSE

The applicant requests a partial vacation of Hawkcrest Court right-of-way, adjacent and along the property frontages of addresses 181 and 185 Hawkcrest Court, for the purpose of landscaping and maintaining the area that is currently public right-of-way.

## CONSIDERATIONS

In 2018 the Applicants proposed landscaping the area in front of their home, which was determined to be City right-of-way. Upon review of the original plat it was determined that an unusual land configuration resulted in excessive right-of-way dedicated to the City. This was likely due to an error depicted on the original plat. Today, the City is responsible for maintenance of this right-of-way, the majority of which has not been utilized for public purposes and is not anticipated to be used for public purposes in the future. However, an easement will be preserved for existing utility uses.

Subsequently, the Applicant has requested the vacate as it will accomplish the following: (1) correct the excessive right-of-way dedicated on the original plat, (2) provide for consistency with other cul-de-sac right-of-way dedications in the DeBary Plantation Residential Planned Unit Development, (3) reserve utility and City rights to underlying easements, and (4) divest the portion of right-of-way currently maintained by the City.

Please Note: Approving the ROW Vacation will result in savings to the City as it will not have to maintain the public right of way.

## Finding of Fact

The following approvals have been authorized for the Hawkcrest Court Vacate:

- The Applicant has provided for all appropriate agreements and letters of no objection from associated stakeholders (utility companies).
- The Applicant's Homeowners Association has submitted letters of no objection
- The City Attorney has reviewed this request and determined it is consistent with all state and local requirements


## COST/FUNDING

$\$ 0.00$.

## RECOMMENDATION

Approve Resolution No. 2019-21

## IMPLEMENTATION

N/A

ATTACHMENTS
Resolution No. 2019-21 and associated Exhibits A \& B.

# A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DEBARY, FLORIDA, VACATING A PORTION OF HAWKCREST COURT CUL-DE-SAC RIGHT-OF-WAY DEDICATED BY THE DEBARY PLANTATION UNIT 16A-3, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED AT MAP BOOK 50, PAGES 31-32, PUBLIC RECORDS OF VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING FOR THE LOT COMBINATION OF THE VACATED RIGHT-OF-WAY WITH ADJACENT LOTS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, AN EFFECTIVE DATE AND RECORDING. 

WHEREAS, Jerry L. Willis and Linda L Willis and ("Willis") are the fee simple owners of a parcel of land with Volusia County Tax Parcel Identification \# 8028-14-00-0130 located at 185 Hawkcrest Ct, DeBary, Florida, and legally described in that certain deed recorded at Official Records Book 6857, Page 3011, Public Records of Volusia County, Florida ("Willis Property"); and

WHEREAS, Eric Mumford and Judy Mumford and ("Mumford") are the fee simple owners of a parcel of land with Volusia County Tax Parcel Identification \# 8028-14-00-0120 located at 181 Hawkcrest Ct, DeBary, Florida, and legally described in that certain deed recorded at Official Records Book 7371, Page 3675, Public Records of Volusia County, Florida ("Mumford Property"); and

WHEREAS, Mumford and Willis are herein referred to as "applicants;" and
WHEREAS, the applicants filed a petition requesting that the City of DeBary City Council vacate and abandon a portion of Hawcrest Court cul-de-sac right-of-way being adjacent to the and Willis Property and Mumford Property; such proposed vacated and abandoned right-of-way is more particularly described on the legal descriptions and sketches attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and Exhibit "B" (the "Vacated Right-of-Way"); and

WHEREAS, the petition to vacate the Vacated Right-of-Way was duly presented to the City Council at a regular meeting and a public hearing was conducted on such request; and

WHEREAS, the Vacated Right-of-Way is not needed for public use and its vacation and abandonment will not adversely impact the needs of the public for access and utilities; and

WHEREAS, it appears that all ad valorem taxes due and owing on said property have been paid, that due and proper notice of the applicant's right-of-way vacation request has been given as required by law, and proof of publication of said notice has been received by the City; and

WHEREAS, the City of DeBary is vested with home rule authority pursuant to Article VII, Section 2 of the Constitution of the State of Florida and Chapter 166, Florida Statutes, as well as the provisions of the City Charter and other law and therefore the City has the authority to vacate easements dedicated to the City and public.

## IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF DEBARY AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Recitals. The above recitals are true and accurate and are incorporated herein.

SECTION 2. Right-of-Way Vacation and Abandonment and drainage and utilities easement reservation. A portion of the Hawkcrest Court cul-de-sac right-of-way as more particularly described on the legal sketch and description attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and Exhibit "B" (the "Vacated Right-of-Way") is hereby vacated, abandoned and annulled subject to the reservation of a perpetual drainage easement and utilities easement in favor of the City of DeBary and the public as set forth herein. The City of DeBary reserves over, under and through the Vacated Right-of-Way a perpetual public drainage and utilities easement for the operation, control, regulation, construction, installation, repair, replacement, maintenance, use and modification of utilities, including but not limited to electricity, cable, telecommunications, stormwater drainage lines, sewer lines, water lines, reclaimed water lines, and other utilities and facilities of every type and appurtenances thereto (the "Utility Easement"). Such aforesaid Utility Easement reservation includes the right to keep in place any existing utilities and right of ingress and egress upon the easement area to carry out the purposes of said easement and the right of the City of DeBary to assign the its easement rights to Volusia County and other utility owners and operators. The City of DeBary shall only be responsible for the maintenance, repair and replacement of improvements within said Utility Easement area that the City of DeBary has constructed or constructs in the future or formerly accepts for maintenance. The property owner(s) shall maintain the surface improvements including pavement, sod and landscaping within the Utility Easement area at the property owner's(s') sole cost and expense.

SECTION 3. Lot Combination. The portion of the Vacated Right-of-Way described in Exhibit "A" shall become a part of the Willis Property and such combined property shall therefore be retained in single ownership, and shall remain as a single, integral parcel, and shall not be subdivided, severed, sold, leased, encumbered, or otherwise disposed of in lesser constituent parcels.

The portion of the Vacated Right-of-Way described in Exhibit "B" shall become a part of the Mumford Property and such combined property shall therefor be retained in single ownership, and shall remain as a single, integral parcel, and shall not be subdivided, severed, sold, leased, encumbered, or otherwise disposed of in lesser constituent parcels.

Any sale, subdivision, lease or other disposal of the in violation of this provision shall be null, void and of no legal effect whatsoever and give the City the right of reversion of the Vacated Right-ofWay (or the portion thereof in violation of this provision) back to being public right-of-way.

SECTION 4. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this Resolution, or application hereof, is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional by any
court of competent jurisdiction, such portion or application shall be deemed a separate, distinct, and independent provision of such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions thereof to the extent practicable.

SECTION 5. Effective Date. This Resolution shall take effect immediately.
SECTION 6. Recording. A certified copy of this Resolution shall be recorded in the public records of Volusia County, Florida by the City Clerk.

ADOPTED this $\qquad$ Day of $\qquad$ 2019.

City Council
City of DeBary, Florida

## ATTEST:

Karen Chasez, Mayor

[^0]
## EXHIBIT "A"


#### Abstract

"REAL PROPERTY DESCRPTION" BEGINNING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER LOT 13, DEBARY PLANTATION UNIT 16A-3, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF AS RECORDED IN MAP BOOK 50, PAGES 31 THROUGH 32, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA; THENCE RUN N. $62^{\prime} 0^{\prime} 0^{\prime} 55^{\prime \prime}$ W., 52.23 FEET TO A POINT ON A CURVE CONCAVE NORTHWESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 375.00 FEET A CHORD BEARING OF $\$ .28^{\prime} 19^{\prime} 03^{\prime \prime} W$., A CHORD DISTANCE OF 4.35 FEET, THENCE RUN SOUTHERLY ALONG CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 0.39'55" AN ARC DISTANCE OF 4.35 FEET TO A POINT ON A CURVE CONCAVE WESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 57.12 FEET A CHORD BEARING OF S. $11^{\prime} 44^{\prime} 13^{\prime \prime} E .$, A CHORD DISTANCE OF 80.87 FEET, THENCE RUN SOUTHERLY ALONG CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF $90^{\circ} 07^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime}$ AN ARC DISTANCE OF 89.85 FEET THENCE RUN $S .49^{\prime} 45^{\prime} 56^{\prime \prime}$ E, 26.41 FEET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 13; THENCE RUN N, $08^{\prime} 42^{\prime} 48^{\prime \prime}$. ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 13 A DISTANCE OF 76.44 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.




## EXHIBIT "B"

beginning at The Northwest Corner lot 12, DEBARY Plantation unit 16A-3, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF AS RECORDED IN MAP BOOK 50, PAGES 31 THROUGH 32, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA; THENCE RUN N. $49^{\prime} 45^{\prime} 56^{\prime \prime}$ W., 26.41 FEET TO A POINT ON A CURVE CONCAVE NORTHWESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 57.12 FEET A CHORD BEARING OF S. $677^{\prime \prime} 15^{\prime} 55^{\prime \prime}$ W., A CHORD DISTANCE OF 63.79 FEET, THENCE RUN SOUTHERLY ALONG CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF $67^{\prime} 52^{\prime} 56^{\prime \prime}$ AN ARC DISTANCE OF 67.67 FEET; THENCE RUN $5.45^{\prime} 18^{\prime} 34^{\prime \prime}$ E, 50.81 FEET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 12; THENCE RUN N, $44^{\prime} 41^{\prime} 2648^{\prime \prime}$ E. ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 12, A DISTANCE OF 60.95 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.


City Council Meeting City of DeBary
AGENDA ITEM

| Subject: TOD Joint Marketing Agreement | Attachments: <br> () Ordinance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: $\quad$ Matt Boerger, Growth Management | () Resolution <br> () Supporting Documents/ Contracts |
| Meeting Hearing Date October 16, 2019 | (x) Other |

## REQUEST

Staff is requesting the City Council to consider approval of a proposed TOD Joint Marketing Agreement between the City of DeBary and multiple property owners within the TOD core area.

## PURPOSE

The proposed Joint Marketing Agreement will allow the City to market a larger, single piece of property with approved preliminary plans in place, therefore making the area more valuable as well as to ensure consistent, compatible, and quality development is achieved.

## CONSIDERATIONS

The City of DeBary has a vision in place to see that the area around SunRail is developed as Transit Oriented Development (Please see the attached TOD Master Plan). Community feedback during the adoption of this plan, as well as a previous visioning exercise have shown a strong desire for a town square and city center in this area. Therefore, a village center style main street with a central gathering space would best fit this vision.

The TOD Master Plan provides a general vision for how the area should be developed over time. This provides an excellent guide to developers and the city administration for how the City would like to develop in this area. However, it does not act as a specific development plan and may not necessarily result in the creation of a town center style environment. In order to do that, the City needs to be the driving force to lead the way, rather than try to regulate it into place in the hopes that a developer will come and create the environment that the community wishes to see. To do this, a significant amount of land needs to be assembled to accommodate the town center style development and a specific Overall Development Plan should be created.

The City has strategically purchased three contiguous parcels of land in the heart of the TOD equaling approximately 9 acres. The largest of the three, around six acres, is adjacent to Ft. Florida Road and US 1792. This purchase has already been advantageous due to the fact that there are transportation improvement and expansion needs at Ft. Florida Road and US 17-92. For example, additional turn lanes and a traffic signal need to be added to Ft. Florida Road to accommodate existing SunRial ridership traffic
and future development traffic in the area. Since the city already owns the adjacent property, it is able to dedicate right of way to FDOT for the traffic signal mast arm as well as the land at the intersection for additional turn lanes. If the city did not own this land, it would have needed to purchase the property at an inflated cost or exercise eminent domain.

Staff has been coordinating with the adjacent property owners who have agreed that it is in the best interest of all the parties to establish a plan, and jointly market the area as a single developable project that is already entitled. By doing this, the following advantages will take place:

- Maximize return on investment by assembling enough land to accommodate a single large development project with much of the development plans in place.
- Maximize the usable area of land with just a few stormwater ponds, and a large, central pond doubling as a central gathering place and amenity. This may act as the "town square".
- Leverage the adjacent SunRail investment.
- Provides a unique opportunity for the City to design a more specific plan for the area of land at the core of the TOD, with input from the City Council and its residents, to ensure that the desired outcome of the built environment is more likely achieved.

Location: The properties, together, are generally located within the TOD Core area identified in green shade on the attached TOD Location Map, and also described as north of Ft. Florida Road, west of US 1792, east of the rail road tracks and south of the boundary between the TOD Core (green) and Outside Core (blue) areas.

Precedent: The Cities of Longwood, Oviedo and Maitland have all engaged in public private partnerships to ensure that they have quality developments that fit with their community's vision. Longwood partnered with a developer and Seminole county to construct a parking garage that would serve both SunRail riders and residents of the apartment complex next to their rail station in order to maximize the use of a relatively small area of developable land in that area. Maitland constructed a master stormwater pond in the area it envisioned to become its town center area in order to maximize the use of land and to incentivize redevelopment of the area. Oviedo also constructed a master stormwater pond and amenitized it as a central park (Oviedo on the Park) which encouraged high quality multifamily and single family development as well as commercial amenities to create its new town center.

These are all precedents and examples that DeBary could follow, and it needs to start with developing a more specific Overall Development Plan, which includes the desired main street style design components, a central gathering space complimented with a mix of residential and commercial amenities.

The first step outlined in the agreement is for the City to do its due diligence of the site. The area will be surveyed, analyzed for environmental contaminations, wetlands, any deed restrictions, easements, or other encumberances, threatened or endangered species, and to ensure appropriate soils are on site to accommodate land development. After the due diligence period, the staff will design a conceptual sketch plan consistent with the established vision for this area as discussed earlier in the report. The conceptual sketch plan will be vetted by the property owners and then brought to two (2) City Council workshops to
receive feedback. Once the conceptual sketch plan is established, it will be turned over to Pegasus engineering to formalize into an Overall Development Plan (preliminary engineering plan) consistent with the City's Land Development Code requirements. Then the ODP will go through the Development Review Committee Process with final approval by the City Manager.

Once the ODP is complete, the City and its partners will begin marketing the property and the associate plan to developers interested in acquiring a nearly development-ready site. The site and the associate ODP will be complimented by SunRail, Bicycle and pedestrian trails, River City Nature Park, Gemini Springs, and on-going near-by residential development necessary to support the desired commercial amenities within the new village center.

The cost and timeline associate with the proposed design of the project are as follows:

- Due Diligence; 90 days; $\$ 60,000.00$
- Design (Sketch Plan); 120 days; $\$ 0.00$
- Council Workshop 1; 30 days; $\$ 0.00$
- Council Workshop 2; 30 days; $\$ 0.00$
- Design (ODP); 30 days; $\$ 10,000.00$
- DRC approval; 30 days; $\$ 0.00$
- City Manager approval; 2 days; $\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0 0}$

Note: When the land is sold, proceeds will cover the costs associated with the due diligence and design of the project and reimbursed to the City pursuant to the contract.

## COST/FUNDING

- Total cost of planning $\$ 70,000$
- Funds are available in the FY 19-20 budget under Professional and Contract Services.


## RECOMMENDATION

Approve the proposed Joint Marketing Agreement and allocate the expenditure of $\$ 70,000$ by staff to develop an Overall Development Plan for the subject site.

## IMPLEMENTATION

Staff, along with input from City Council and applicable stakeholder, will develop an Overall Development Plan and market the all of the properties as a single plan to be developed.

## ATTACHMENTS

Proposed Joint Marketing Agreement
TOD Master Plan
TOD Location Map
Shell Road Potential Realignment

## JOINT MARKETING AGREEMENT

THIS JOINT MARKETING AGREEMENT (hereinafter "Agreement") is made and entered effective the 7 day of Sepfembeh , 2019 (hereinafter the "Effective Date") by and between the CITY OF DEBARY, a Florida municipal corporation, (hereinafter the "City"), DEBARY CENTRAL LLC, a Florida limited liability company (hereinafter "DCL"), STEPHANIE M. MILLER, TRUSTEE OF THE MILLER LAND TRUST AGREEMENT dated December 17, 2009 (hereinafter "Miller") and RAY SANDS and FRANK SLABODNIK (hereinafter collectively "S \&S");

WHEREAS, the City is the owner of the property described on the attached Exhibit "A" (hereinafter the "City Property").

WHEREAS, DCL is the owner of the property described on the attached Exhibit "B" (hereinafter the "DCL Property").

WHEREAS, Miller is the owner of the property described on the attached Exhibit "C" (hereinafter the "Miller Property").

WHEREAS, S \& S are the owners of the property described on the attached Exhibit "D" (hereinafter the "S \& S Property").

WHEREAS, the above referenced property owners are hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Owners" or "Parties" and individually as "Owner" or "Party".

WHEREAS, the property set forth on the attached Exhibits "A" through "D" inclusive is hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Properties" and separately as "Property.

WHEREAS, the Properties are all located within or adjacent to the City's Transit Oriented Development (hereinafter "TOD") Overlay District.

WHEREAS, the Owners desire to have the City modify the TOD Overlay District to add any portion of the Properties not currently within the TOD Overlay District.

WHEREAS, the Owners believe it is in their best interests to jointly create and obtain approval of a development plan for the Properties that creates a high density, mixed use project and then jointly market the Properties in the manner set forth hereinafter.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises herein and ten dollars and other valuable consideration, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, the Owners do hereby agree as follows:

1. Recitals. The above recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.
2. Delivery of Existing Materials. Within ten days from the Effective Date, each Owner shall deliver copies to the City of any existing due diligence materials relating to such Owner's Property in such Owner's possession or control including but not limited to title policies, title searches, surveys, Phase I environmental assessment reports, and Phase II environmental assessment reports.
3. Review of Existing Materials. The City shall review the existing due diligence materials received from the Owners and shall determine what additional due diligence work is needed for each Owner's Property. The City shall then notify each Owner of the estimated cost of the additional due diligence work for each Owner's Property. Within ten days from receiving such notice, each Owner shall deliver such amount to the City, which shall be used by the City to pay for the additional due diligence work. If the amount is not sufficient to pay for the additional due diligence work for an Owner's Property, the City shall notify the Owner of the deficit and the Owner shall pay the deficit to the City within ten days.
4. Additional Due Diligence Work. Within ninety days from the Effective Date or such shorter period of time that the City may require (hereinafter the "Due Diligence Period"), the City shall complete such of the following additional due diligence work that the City determines, in its discretion, is necessary to insure that the Properties are suitable for sale and development:
a. Title Work. The City shall obtain a title commitment or updated commitment for the Property owned by each Owner that reflects the condition of the title of each Owner's respective Property. The City shall provide copies of the title commitments to the Owners. If the title commitment for an Owner's Property discloses any defects, encumbrances, requirements or other matters that the City determines, in its discretion, should be removed or otherwise resolved, the respective Owner shall use diligent effort to remove or otherwise resolve the matter within a reasonable time unless all the other Owners agree that such action is not necessary. Each Owner agrees not to cause or allow any change to the condition of its title to its Property as reflected in the respective title commitment during the term of this Agreement. Without limitation, each Owner covenants, represents and agrees that each Owner has not and will not execute, record or deliver, nor allow the execution, recording or delivery of any sales contract, option, lease, mortgage, assignment, easement, lien, covenant, declaration, agreement, deed, encumbrance, or any modification or amendment to any documents listed in the respective title commitment other than documents contemplated by this Agreement.
b. Survey. The City shall have the Properties surveyed and certified by a registered Florida surveyor either in one combined survey of the Properties or individual surveys of each Property. The City shall provide copies of the survey or surveys to the Owners. If the survey or surveys disclose encroachments on a Property, encroachments by an Owner's
improvements on other lands, violations of deed restrictions or zoning violations or any other defects, encumbrances, requirements or other matters that the City determines, in its discretion, should be removed or otherwise resolved, the applicable Owner or Owners shall use diligent effort to remove or otherwise resolve the matter within a reasonable time unless all the other Owners agree that such action is not necessary. Each Owner agrees not to cause or allow any material change to the physical condition of its respective Property other than changes caused by normal wear and tear and Acts of God.
c. Phase I. The City shall have a Phase I environmental examination completed for the Properties and provide the Owners with a copy of the Phase I report. If the City determines, in the City's discretion, that a Phase II examination or other action should be undertaken for any portion of the Properties, the Owner or Owners of the portions of the Properties or Property affected, at such Owner's or Owners' sole cost, shall diligently take such action and thereafter remediate or otherwise resolve any contamination discovered by such examinations within 120 days.
5. Analysis of Due Diligence Materials. If the City determines, in its discretion, after receipt and review of the due diligence materials described above, that the development and marketing of the Properties is not in the best interest of the City, the City may, by providing notice to the other Owners, terminate this Agreement, at which time this Agreement shall terminate except that the Owners shall continue to be liable for costs as outlined above. Further, if one or more Property or portions of any Property are determined by the City not to be appropriate for the sale, development and marketing or the ODP, the City may exclude such from the ODP or this Agreement, or both, and this Agreement shall remain in full force and effect for all other portions of the Properties and for all other purposes under this Agreement.
6. Modification of TOD Overlay District. If the City does not terminate the Agreement pursuant to paragraph 5 above, the City shall prepare and process an application or request to the City to modify the TOD Overlay District to add any portion of the Properties not currently within the TOD Overlay District. By executing this Agreement, the Owners hereby consent to such modification and application, agree not to oppose the modification in any way and agree to execute documents to establish the same including but not limited to an application, joinder, consent, developer and development agreements, revised applications, rezoning and preliminary and final plat applications, and any and all other documents requested by the City consistent with, or to achieve the purposes of, this Agreement. In addition, each Owner hereby appoints the City as its attorney in fact and/or authorized agent to execute such documents.
7. Development Plans. If the City does not terminate the Agreement pursuant to paragraph 5 above, the City shall have the necessary development plans, agreements, and related documents (hereinafter the "Plans") prepared for use in conjunction with submitting an application to the City for the approval of an Overall Development Plan (hereinafter "ODP") for the Properties. Upon the City's preparation of the Plans and ODP application, the City shall provide the Plans and ODP application to the Owners for review and comment to be provided to the City within fifteen days of each Owner's receipt of the Plans and ODP application. After the City's receipt of any timely submitted comments from any Owners that elect to timely comment, the City Manager may make such modifications to the Plans and ODP application as the City Manager deems appropriate, in the City Manager's discretion. The Owners shall execute the ODP application (as it may be modified by the City Manager) and any other documents requested or required by the City Manager in conjunction with seeking approval of the ODP application, including but not limited to, any amendments to the ODP application proposed by
the City Manager. Each Owner hereby appoints the City as its attorney in fact and/or authorized agent for purposes of executing any applications, petitions, agreements, submittals, or other documents necessary or appropriate for approval of the ODP and for the marketing, sale and development of the Properties as contemplated herein. In the event the ODP application is not approved within twelve (12) months after the end of the Due Diligence Period (hereinafter the "Approval Period"), any Party may terminate this Agreement by providing written notice to the other Parties. However, the City may extend the Approval Period for an additional ninety (90) days by providing written notice to the Owners of such extension prior to the end of the Approval Period. If the ODP is approved within the Approval Period, this Agreement shall continue in full force and effect pursuant to this Agreement's provisions.
8. Plan Costs. The costs associated with preparing the Plans and related documents, submitting and processing the ODP application, and obtaining all services and materials related thereto, including but not limited to application fees, surveys, planning, engineering, architectural services, attorney's and experts' fees and other services (hereinafter the "Plan Costs") shall be advanced by the City and the City shall be reimbursed for the same from the sales proceeds in the manner set forth in Paragraph 10 herein. In the event there is no sale that results in the distribution of sale proceeds as contemplated by Paragraph 10 herein, the City shall be responsible for the Plan Costs.
9. Marketing Development and Purchase Option. The City shall have the right to advertise, market, and list for sale the Properties, and each Property, for sale and development, including without limitation, the right to enter into contracts and acquire services for such advertising, marketing, and sale (collectively "Overall Marketing/Sales Fees") and each Owner hereby consents and agrees to such. No other Owner shall have such right without the City's
written approval, provided, however, each Owner is encouraged to provide the City with contacts, leads and prospective buyers that may be interested in purchasing or developing the Properties or any portion thereof. If the ODP application is approved by the City, the parties agree that the Properties, and each Property, will only be developed in accordance therewith, which restriction shall run with the land for a period of 7 years from the date the ODP approval becomes final (hereinafter the "Development Restriction Period"). For a period of two years after the date that approval of the ODP application becomes final ("Option Term"), the City shall have the right and option ("Option") to purchase the DCL Property, the Miller Property and the S \& S Property at a price and pursuant to terms and conditions acceptable to a majority of the Owners or to cause DCL, Miller, S \& S and the City to sell the Properties to a buyer(s) selected by the City at a price and pursuant to terms and conditions acceptable to a majority of the Owners. The City's option may be exercised at any time during the Option Term, provided, however, that upon exercise of the Option, if the date of closing pursuant to a sales contract is to occur after the Option Term has expired, the Option Term shall be extended to such date of closing. The City may exercise the Option by having a majority of the Owners execute a sales contract that is also signed by the City, as buyer, or by a buyer selected by the City. Any Owner that is not part of the majority shall, upon the request of the City, execute said sales contract. In addition, each Owner that is not part of the majority hereby appoints the City Manager or other representative of the City as such Owner's attorney in fact for purposes of executing such contract and the deed and all other documents necessary to close the transaction.
10. Distribution of Sales Proceeds. The net proceeds from the sale(s) of the Properties shall be distributed in the following order:
a. Pay the Overall Marketing/Sales Fees;
b. Pay documentary stamp tax, title search, title insurance premiums, recording and other closing costs the seller is obligated to pay pursuant to the contract;
c. Reimburse the City for the Plan Costs:
d. Reimburse the City for its attorney's fees and costs related to preparation and administration of the Agreement;
e. Pay the remainder to the Owners so that each Owner receives a proportionate share of the remaining sales proceeds based upon the gross acreage of each Owner's Property to the total acreage of the Properties. Each Owner's proportionate share shall be reduced by the amount paid at closing to satisfy or release any mortgage, liens and other encumbrances on said Owner's Property and any and all other costs, fees, taxes, and penalties applicable or related to said Owner's Property, including, without limitation, any of such respective Owner's brokerage or realtor fees and commissions, and to the extent such payment would exceed that Owner's proportionate share, that Owner shall pay the shortage at closing.
11. Successors and Assigns. Unless otherwise provided herein, this Agreement shall run with the land and shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the Parties hereto and their respective buyers, heirs, personal representatives, successors and assigns.
12. Right of First Refusal. During the Development Restriction Period, if an Owner of any Property receives an offer to purchase all or a portion of such Owner's Property that such Owner intends to accept, such Owner shall deliver a copy of such offer to the City along with a ninety day option to purchase such Property ("Second Option") at the same price and upon the same terms and conditions as the offer. If the City fails to exercise the Second Option during the ninety day period, such Owner shall deliver a copy of such offer to all the other Owners along with a sixty day option to purchase such Owner's Property, which option
may be exercised either individually or collectively by such other Owners that elect, in writing, to exercise such option. If the City and/or other Owners do not exercise the option rights herein, such option rights shall terminate provided the transaction closes in accordance with the offer. If the transaction does not close in accordance with the offer, the option rights of the City and/or other Owners continue with respect to a subsequent offer made during the Development Restriction Period.
13. Modifications. This Agreement cannot be changed, modified or amended without the written consent of a majority of the Parties.
14. Entire Agreement. This Agreement contains the entire agreement between the Parties hereto pertaining to the subject matter herein and supersedes all prior written or oral agreements and understandings between the Parties pertaining to such subject matter.
15. Counterparts. The Agreement may be executed in counterparts, all of which executed counterparts shall constitute the same agreement, and the signature of any Party to any counterpart shall be deemed a signature to, and may be appended to, any other counterpart.
16. Facsimiles/Emails. The Parties may deliver this Agreement and all documents executed in connection therewith, electronically via facsimile or email except for original documents for any closing contemplated by this Agreement which are required to be delivered for closing shall be executed and delivered. The Parties intend to be bound by such electronically delivered Agreement and all documents executed in connection therewith as though each were an original, and hereby waive any defense to the enforcement of the terms of the Agreement and all documents executed by the Parties in connection therewith, based upon the electronic delivery of the same.

## 17. Miscellaneous Provisions.

a. To the extent an Owner has any obligation or agreement for any services related to an Owner's Property, including without limitation any real estate broker or relator agreement to pay any fee or commission related to that Owner's Property, such fees and commission shall be paid by the Owner of the Property subject to such fees or commissions and such shall be paid no later than the closing of any sale or disposition of the Properties where distributions of sale proceeds is to occur. Other than those contracts which exist as of the Effective Date, each Owner represents and warrants that such Owner will not enter into any obligation or contract after the Effective Date with any real estate broker or realtor for any commission or fee related to the Owner's Property and each Owner hereby indemnifies and holds the other Owners harmless from any claims, suits, fees, attorneys' fees and costs, judgments, and damages related to the indemnifying Owner's violation of any of the foregoing matters in this subparagraph 17.a.
b. The City is in no way bound to approve the Plans or the ODP and the City's decisions related to such shall be in accordance with all City Code and Florida Laws. Nothing in this Agreement exempts any Owner or development of the Properties or any Property from compliance with all applicable Codes and Laws and payment of all applicable fees and costs.
c. DCL, Miller and S \& S jointly and severally indemnify and hold harmless the City from and against all claims, disputes, attorneys' fees and costs at trial and appellate levels, interest, judgments, damages and other adverse matters in any way related to actions and inactions, and decisions of the City in any way relating to this Agreement and all matters contemplated in or by this Agreement.
d. A "majority of the Owners" or a "majority of the Parties" as used herein shall mean at least three of the four Owners.
e. The provisions of this Paragraph 17 survive the expiration and termination of this Agreement and the closing and closings contemplated herein.
18. Recordation. The Parties shall execute a Memorandum of this Agreement in the form attached hereto as Exhibit "E", which shall be recorded in the Public Records of Volusia County, Florida by the City.
19. Attorney's Fees and Costs. In the event suit or action is instituted to interpret or enforce the terms of this Agreement, or in connection with any arbitration or mediation of any dispute, the Parties shall each bear their own costs and fees associated therewith, including attorney's fees and court costs.
20. Notices. All notices provided for in this Agreement shall be sent by facsimile, overnight delivery, or delivered by registered or certified mail (provided a copy is also sent by U.S. First Class Mail) to the Parties at the addresses set forth below or at such other addresses as the parties shall designate to each other in writing:

City: City of DeBary c/o Carmen Rosamonda<br>City Manager 16 Columba Road DeBary, Florida 32713

With a copy to:

A. Kurt Andaman, Esquire<br>Fishback Dominick<br>1947 Lee Road<br>Winter Park, Florida 32789<br>Facsimile No.: 407-425-2863 3302 Clubside Drive<br>Longwood, Florida 32779

DCL: Debary Central LLC

Miller: $\quad$ Stephanie M. Miller, Trustee of the Miller Land Trust dated December 17, 2009
588 Orange Drive
\#132
Altamonte Springs, Florida 32701
$\underline{\text { S \& S : }} \quad$ Ray Sands and Frank Slabodnik
1161 S. Brickell Drive
Deltona, FL 32725
21. Severability. In any provision of this Agreement is determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this Agreement shall nonetheless remain in full force and effect; provided that the invalidity or unenforceability of such provision does not materially adversely affect the benefits accruing to any Party hereunder.
22. Applicable Law. The Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with Florida law, and venue shall lie in Volusia County, Florida.
23. Attorney Representation. Fishback Dominick is counsel for the City and does not represent nor has it provided legal advice to any of the other Owners. Each Owner has had their own attorney review and advise them regarding this Agreement and have entered into this Agreement voluntarily, willingly and with full understanding of its effects. Since all the Owners have participated in negotiating and drafting this Agreement, any ambiguity or question of intent
or interpretation shall be construed as if the Parties had jointly drafted this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned parties have signed and sealed these presents effective as of the day and year first above written.
\{SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGES\}

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:
(Witness Signature)
(Witness Print Name)

CITY OF DEBARY, a Florida municipal corporation

By:
Karen Chasez
Mayor
(Witness Signature)
(Witness Print Name)

STATE OF FLORIDA:
COUNTY OF ORANGE:
THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT was acknowledged before me this day of , 2019, by KAREN CHASEZ, Mayor of the CITY OF DEBARY, a Florida municipal corporation, on behalf of the corporation.

## Notary Public

Printed or stamped name
My Commission Expires:

Personally known $\qquad$ OR Produced Identification $\qquad$
Type of Identification Produced $\qquad$

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:

(Wines Signature)

(Witness\& Print Name)

DEBARY CENTRAL LLC, a
Florida limited liability company

By: EQUITITEC GROUP, LLC, a Florida limited liability company Its Manager

By: Index, LLC
a Florida limited liability
company
Its Manager
By:
Regan B. Bloss
Manager

## STATE OF FLORIDA:

## COUNTY OF ORANGE:

THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT was acknowledged before me this $10^{\text {th }}$ day of September, 2019, by REGAN B. BLOSS, as Manager of Index, LLC, as Manager of Equititec Group, LLC, as Manager of Debary Central, LLC, on behalf of the limited liability company.


Personally known $\qquad$ OR Produced Identification $\qquad$ FLD
Type of Identification Produced $\qquad$

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:

(Witness Print Name)

(vines Signature)
BIpinkumar Co Patel.
(Witness Print Name)

Stephanie M. Mueller
STEPHANIE M. MILLER, as Trustee of the Miller Land Trust Agreement dated December 17, 2009

## STATE OF FLORIDA:

COUNTY OF SEMINOLE.
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this $J^{\top H}$ day of SCPTEmiBcs , 2019, by STEPHANIE M. MILLER, as Trustee of the Miller Land Trust Agreement dated December 17, 2009.

(NotaryPubtic Signature)
thiliwavardifotr.
(Notary Public Print Name)
My Commission Expires: $02 /(3 / 2020$.
Personally Known OR Produced Identification $X$
Type of Identification: $\qquad$ FLD.


Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:


STATE OF FLORIDA:
COUNTY OF Volusia :
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this $13^{\text {th }}$ day of September, 2019, by RAY SANDS.


Personally Known $\qquad$ OR Produced Identification
 Type of Identification:


Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:

(Witness Signature)

(Witness Print Name)

(Witness Signature)

(Witness Print Name)

STATE OF FLORIDA:
COUNTY OF Volusia:
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this $1^{\text {th }}$ day of September, 2019, by FRANK SLABODNIK.


Annette M Hatch
(Notary Public Print Name) My Commission Expires:

Personally Known OR Produced Identification


Type of Identification: $\qquad$ FL DC

## EXHIBIT "A"

## (City Property)

That certain piece, parcel and tract of land located in Volusia County, Florida described as follows:
Beginning at the Southwest corner of the Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9 ,Township 19 South, Range 30 East, thence running East along the South line of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of Northeast $1 / 4$ to the center line of State Road No. 3, thence in a Northeasterly direction along the center line of said state road a distance of 600.00 feet; thence running West parallel to the said South line of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of Northeast $1 / 4$ to the West line of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of Northeast $1 / 4$; thence South along said West line of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of Northeast $1 / 4$ to the point of beginning; less the easterly 33.00 feet for State Road No. 3; less part in railroad right-of-way and less and except that portion described by that certain Order of Taking recorded in Official Records Book 4372, Page 4061, of the Public Records of Volusia County, Florida.


#### Abstract

AND A portion of the Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point 355.4 feet East and 300 feet South of the Northwest corner foot the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, run thence South 221.7 feet to a point, thence West 330.5 feet to a point on the Easterly right-of-way line of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, thence Northwesterly along said Easterly right-of-way line 114.3 feet to a point on the West line of said Northeast $1 / 4$, thence North 108.8 feet to a point, thence Easterly 355.4 feet to point of beginning. Less The East 15 feet for private road, together with an easement for ingress and egress over and across the East 15 feet of the North 742 feet of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, Volusia County, Florida


AND
A portion of the Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, bounded and described as follows:
Beginning at a point 355.4 feet East and 521.7 feet South of Northwest corner of Northwest $1 / 4$ of Northeast $1 / 4$ of said Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East; run thence West 330.5 feet to the Easterly right-of-way line of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, thence Southeasterly along said right-of-way line 223.95 feet to a point; thence East 300.75 feet to a point; thence North 221.3 feet to the place of beginning, except the East 15 feet thereof for private road; together with an easement for ingress and egress over and across the East 15 feet of the North 743 feet of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, Volusia County, Florida.

## EXHIBIT "B"

## (DCL Property)

Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 east, Volusia County, Florida; run thence N 89 degrees 49 minutes 10 seconds E, a distance of 355.40 feet to a point, also being the centerline of an 18 foot graded road; run thence S 00 degrees 00 minutes 50 seconds W a distance of 371.50 feet to the Point of Beginning; thence continue S 00 degrees 00 minutes 50 seconds W a distance of 371.50 feet along the centerline of the aforesaid graded road to a point; run thence N 89 degrees 49 minutes 10 seconds E a distance of 281.02 feet to a point on the Westerly Right-of-Way of US Highway 1792 , also being a point on a curve having a radius of 5779.59 feet and a delta of 03 degrees 57 minutes 33 seconds; run thence Northeasterly along the arc of said curve a distance of 399.38 feet also being the Westerly Right-of-Way of US Highway 17-92 to a point; run thence S 89 degrees 49 minutes 10 seconds W a distance of 426.14 feet to the Point of Beginning.

LESS AND EXCEPT PORTION LYING WITHIN State Road Right-of-Way.

## EXHIBIT "C"

(Miller Property)

## Parcel 2:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, Volusia County, Florida; run thence North $89^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 355.40 feet a point, also being the centerline of an 18 foot graded road; run thence South $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 50^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 150.00 feet to the Point of Beginning; thence continue South $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 50^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 221.50 feet; run thence North $89^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 426.14 feet to a point on the Westerly right-of-way of U.S. Highway 17-92, also being a point on a curve having a radius of 5779.59 feet and a delta of $00^{\circ} 52^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$; run thence Northwesterly along the arc of said curve also being the said Westerly right-of-way of Highway 17-92, a distance of 87.69 feet to the Point of Tangency; thence run North $24^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime}$ East along said right-of-way a distance of 155.13 feet; run thence South $89^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 524.89 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Less and Except that part of the foregoing conveyed to the State of Florida Department of Transportation by Deed recorded in Official Records Book 4275, Page 4328, Public Records of Volusia County, Florida.

## Parcel 3:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, Volusia County, Florida; run thence North $89^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 355.40 feet to the Point of Beginning, a point also being the centerline of an 18 foot graded road; run thence South $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 50^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 150.00 feet along the centerline of the aforesaid graded road to a point; run thence North $89^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 524.89 feet to a point on the Westerly right-of-way of U.S. Highway 17-92; run thence North $24^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime}$ East along said right-of-way a distance of 164.67 feet to a point being on the North line of said Section 9 , Township 19 South, Range 30 East; run thence South $89^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime \prime}$ West a distance of 592.32 feet along said North line to the Point of Beginning.

Less and Except that part of the foregoing conveyed to the State of Florida Department of Transportation by Deed recorded in Official Records Book 4275, Page 4328, Public Records of Volusia County, Florida.

## EXHIBIT "D"

(S \& S Property)
Beginning at a point 355.4 feet East and 150 feet South of the Northwest corner of the Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, Volusia County, Florida, run thence South 150 feet to a point, run thence West 355.4 feet to the Westerly line of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$, thence North 150 feet, thence East and parallel to the North line thereof 355.4 feet to the Point of Beginning, less the East 15 feet for private road.

# EXHIBIT "E" 

(Memorandum of Agreement)
THIS INSTRUMENT PREPARED BY
AND SHOULD BE RETURNED TO:
A. KURT ARDAMAN, ESQUIRE

FISHBACK DOMINICK
1947 LEE ROAD
WINTER PARK, FLORIDA 32789

## MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

THIS MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT ("Memorandum") is entered into this $\qquad$ day of
$\qquad$ , 2019, by and between the CITY OF DEBARY, a Florida municipal corporation, (hereinafter the "City"), DEBARY CENTRAL LLC, a Florida limited liability company (hereinafter "DCL"), STEPHANIE M. MILLER, TRUSTEE OF THE MILLER LAND TRUST AGREEMENT dated December 17, 2009 (hereinafter "Miller") and RAY SANDS and FRANK SLABODNIK (hereinafter collectively "S \&S");

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE there is an existing Joint Marketing Agreement by and between the above referenced parties relating to the property described on the attached Exhibits "A" through "D" (hereinafter collectively the "Property"), which agreement provides for the sale, purchase and development of the Property and includes a purchase option and provides for certain restrictions on the Property for the time periods specified therein.
\{SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGES\}

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:
(Witness Signature)

CITY OF DEBARY, a Florida municipal corporation

By:
Karen Chasez
Mayor
(Witness Print Name)
(Witness Signature)
(Witness Print Name)

STATE OF FLORIDA:
COUNTY OF ORANGE:
THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT was acknowledged before me this $\qquad$ day of , 2019, by KAREN CHASEZ, Mayor of the CITY OF DEBARY, a Florida municipal corporation, on behalf of the corporation.

Notary Public

Printed or stamped name
My Commission Expires:

Personally known $\qquad$ OR Produced Identification $\qquad$ Type of Identification Produced $\qquad$

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:


DEBARY CENTRAL LLC, a
Florida limited liability company

By: EQUITITEC GROUP, LLC, a Florida limited liability company Its Manager

By: Index, LLC
a Florida limited liability company
Its Manager
By:


STATE OF FLORIDA:

## COUNTY OF ORANGE:

THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT was acknowledged before me this $0^{\text {th }}$ day of September, 2019, by REGAN B. BLOSS, as Manager of Index, LLC, as Manager of Equititec Group, LLC, as Manager of Debary Central, LLC, on behalf of the limited liability company.


Printed or stamped name
My Commission Expires:

Persenally known $\qquad$ OR Produced Identification $\qquad$
Type of Identification Produced $\qquad$

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:

(Witness Signature)
aLAS PATEL.
(Witness Print Name)

Stephome m. rilled
STEPHANIE M. MILLER, as Trustee of the Miller Land Trust Agreement dated
December 17, 2009

(Witness Print Name)

## STATE OF FLORIDA:

COUNTY OF seminole:
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this $7^{\top \text { TH }}$ day of SEPTtmB62, 2019, by STEPHANIE M. MILLER, as Trustee of the Miller Land Trust Agreement dated December 17, 2009.

(Notary public Signature)

(Notary Public Print Name)
My Commission Expires: 02/13/2020
Personally Known $\qquad$ OR Produced Identification $\qquad$
Type of Identification: $\qquad$ FLD.

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:

(Witness Signature)
(Witness Print Name)

STATE OF FLORIDA: COUNTY OF ORANGE:

DEBARY CENTRAL LLC, a Florida limited liability company
 a Florida limited liability company Its Manager
 a Florida limited liability 30747 company Its Manager

By: $\qquad$
Ragan B. Bloss
Manager

THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT was acknowledged before me this $\qquad$ day of _ , 2019, by RÁGAN B. BLOSS, as Manager of Index, LLC, as Manager of Equititec Group, LLC, as Manager of Debary Central, LLC, on behalf of the limited liability company.

## Notary Public

Personally known $\qquad$ OR Produced Identification $\qquad$
Type of Identification Produced


Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:

(Witness Signature)


## STATE OF FLORIDA:

## COUNTY OF Volusia:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this $\qquad$ day of September, 2019, by RAY SANDS.

(Notary Public Print Name) My Commission Expires:

Personally Known
OR Produced Identification


Type of Identification: $\qquad$ FL D

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of:

(Witness Signature)


FRANK SLABODNIK

(Witness Print Name)

(Witness Signature)

(Witness Print Name)

## STATE OF FLORIDA:

COUNTY OF Volusia:
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this $13^{\text {th }}$ day of September, 2019, by FRANK SLABODNIK.

(Notary Public Print Name) My Commission Expires:

Personally Known $\qquad$ OR Produced Identification


Type of Identification: $\square$ FL DC

## EXHIBIT "A"

(City Property)
That certain piece, parcel and tract of land located in Volusia County, Florida described as follows:
Beginning at the Southwest corner of the Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9,Township 19 South, Range 30 East, thence running East along the South line of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of Northeast $1 / 4$ to the center line of State Road No. 3, thence in a Northeasterly direction along the center line of said state road a distance of 600.00 feet; thence running West parallel to the said South line of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of Northeast $1 / 4$ to the West line of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of Northeast $1 / 4$; thence South along said West line of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of Northeast $1 / 4$ to the point of beginning; less the easterly 33.00 feet for State Road No. 3; less part in railroad right-of-way and less and except that portion described by that certain Order of Taking recorded in Official Records Book 4372, Page 4061, of the Public Records of Volusia County, Florida.

## AND

A portion of the Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, bounded and described as follows:
Beginning at a point 355.4 feet East and 300 feet South of the Northwest corner foot the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, run thence South 221.7 feet to a point, thence West 330.5 feet to a point on the Easterly right-of-way line of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, thence Northwesterly along said Easterly right-of-way line 114.3 feet to a point on the West line of said Northeast $1 / 4$, thence North 108.8 feet to a point, thence Easterly 355.4 feet to point of beginning. Less The East 15 feet for private road, together with an easement for ingress and egress over and across the East 15 feet of the North 742 feet of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, Volusia County, Florida

AND

A portion of the Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, bounded and described as follows:
Beginning at a point 355.4 feet East and 521.7 feet South of Northwest corner of Northwest $1 / 4$ of Northeast $1 / 4$ of said Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East; run thence West 330.5 feet to the Easterly right-of-way line of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, thence Southeasterly along said right-of-way line 223.95 feet to a point; thence East 300.75 feet to a point; thence North 221.3 feet to the place of beginning, except the East 15 feet thereof for private road; together with an easement for ingress and egress over and across the East 15 feet of the North 743 feet of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, Volusia County, Florida.

## EXHIBIT "B" <br> (DCL Property)

Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 east, Volusia County, Florida; run thence N 89 degrees 49 minutes 10 seconds E, a distance of 355.40 feet to a point, also being the centerline of an 18 foot graded road; run thence S 00 degrees 00 minutes 50 seconds W a distance of 371.50 feet to the Point of Beginning; thence continue S 00 degrees 00 minutes 50 seconds W a distance of 371.50 feet along the centerline of the aforesaid graded road to a point; run thence N 89 degrees 49 minutes 10 seconds E a distance of 281.02 feet to a point on the Westerly Right-of-Way of US Highway 1792 , also being a point on a curve having a radius of 5779.59 feet and a delta of 03 degrees 57 minutes 33 seconds; run thence Northeasterly along the arc of said curve a distance of 399.38 feet also being the Westerly Right-of-Way of US Highway 17-92 to a point; run thence S 89 degrees 49 minutes 10 seconds W a distance of 426.14 feet to the Point of Beginning.

LESS AND EXCEPT PORTION LYING WITHIN State Road Right-of-Way.

## EXHIBIT "C"

(Miller Property)

## Parcel 2:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, Volusia County, Florida; run thence North $89^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 355.40 feet a point, also being the centerline of an 18 foot graded road; run thence South $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 50^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 150.00 feet to the Point of Beginning; thence continue South $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 50^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 221.50 feet; run thence North $89^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 426.14 feet to a point on the Westerly right-of-way of U.S. Highway 17-92, also being a point on a curve having a radius of 5779.59 feet and a delta of $00^{\circ} 52^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$; run thence Northwesterly along the arc of said curve also being the said Westerly right-of-way of Highway 17-92, a distance of 87.69 feet to the Point of Tangency; thence run North $24^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime}$ East along said right-of-way a distance of 155.13 feet; run thence South $89^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 524.89 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Less and Except that part of the foregoing conveyed to the State of Florida Department of Transportation by Deed recorded in Official Records Book 4275, Page 4328, Public Records of Volusia County, Florida.

Parcel 3:
Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, Volusia County, Florida; run thence North $89^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 355.40 feet to the Point of Beginning, a point also being the centerline of an 18 foot graded road; run thence South $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 50^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 150.00 feet along the centerline of the aforesaid graded road to a point; run thence North $89^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of 524.89 feet to a point on the Westerly right-of-way of U.S. Highway 17-92; run thence North $24^{\circ} 11^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime}$ East along said right-of-way a distance of 164.67 feet to a point being on the North line of said Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East; run thence South $89^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of 592.32 feet along said North line to the Point of Beginning.

Less and Except that part of the foregoing conveyed to the State of Florida Department of Transportation by Deed recorded in Official Records Book 4275, Page 4328, Public Records of Volusia County, Florida.

## EXHIBIT "D"

(S \& S Property)
Beginning at a point 355.4 feet East and 150 feet South of the Northwest corner of the Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 9, Township 19 South, Range 30 East, Volusia County, Florida, run thence South 150 feet to a point, run thence West 355.4 feet to the Westerly line of said Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$, thence North 150 feet, thence East and parallel to the North line thereof 355.4 feet to the Point of Beginning, less the East 15 feet for private road.
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# City Council Meeting City of DeBary AGENDA ITEM 

| Subject: | Rivington Proportionate Fair Share <br> Agreement | Attachments: <br> () Ordinance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| From: $\quad$Matt Boerger, Growth Management <br> () Resolution |  |  |
| Meeting Hearing Date October 16, 2019 | () Supporting Documents/ Contracts <br> (x) Other |  |

## REQUEST

Reader \& Partners, LLC, is requesting the City Council to approve a Proportionate Fair Share Agreement as part of the Rivington development project.

## PURPOSE

The proposed proportionate fair share agreement allows for the developer to meet the land development code requirements and transportation improvement needs of the City.

## CONSIDERATIONS

On October 3, 2018 the DeBary City Council adopted Ordinance No. 11-18, approving Reader \& Partners, LLC's, Mixed-Use Planned Unit Development Amendment (MPUD), known as the Rivington project. With this approval, City Council authorized the entitlements specified within the development agreement which included the development of up to 700 single family attached and detached residential units and up to 30,000 square feet of neighborhood commercial.

On April 2, 2019, the Development Review Committee approved the Rivington Overall Development Plan. The Overall Development Plan has met all of the requirements of the Land Development Code with the exception of the City's transportation concurrency requirements. The City's Proportionate Fair Share Section 2-8 of the Land Development Code requires that the proportionate fair-share program shall apply to any development project in the city where the project's traffic impact study or the city's traffic engineer determines that there is insufficient capacity on one or more segments to satisfy the development project's transportation concurrency requirements including transportation facilities maintained by FDOT or Volusia County that are relied upon for transportation concurrency determinations.

There has been a determination made that the proposed project would have impacts to the surrounding transportation network. Therefore, City Staff and the developer have drafted a proportionate fair share agreement. This agreement addresses the developer's transportation network impacts by committing them to improve a segment of Ft. Florida Road from the railroad tracks to US 17-92. The improvement includes reconstructing the road to include the following upgrades:
1.) widen the eastbound approach of Fort Florida Road at US 17-92 to include two left-turn lanes and one right-turn lane.
2.) Provide transition from the existing two-lane roadway at the railroad to the turn lanes.
3.) Roadway section shall be curb and gutter and include necessary drainage infrastructure.
4.) Provide all necessary signing and pavement marking modifications.
5.) Provide all necessary modifications to the signal at the Fort Florida/US 17-92 intersection, including but not limited to adjustments to pedestrian signalization as well as vehicular detection.
6.) Add 8 -foot-wide sidewalk on the south side of Fort Florida Road as depicted in the exhibit.

This upgrade will likely be done concurrently with the water and sewer installation by Volusia County at the time of construction commencement of the first phase of the Rivington development.

The road improvement project is estimated to cost approximately $\$ 800,000.00$. Often times, in a proportionate fair share agreement, the developer agrees to give the city the funds that would partially fund future improvements for transportation facilities and the city is then required to manage and complete the projects. In this case, the developer is agreeing to reconstruct a segment of Ft. Florida Road between US 1792 and the railroad tracks themselves. Regardless of the cost to the developer, they will be obligated to complete this project. They must also complete construction of the road prior to receiving an approval from the City Building Department for the $50^{\text {th }}$ home within the Rivington development.

Finding of Fact

- Transportation impacts resulting from the Project have been evaluated and studied by the Developer and the City and it has been concluded that certain transportation facilities are impacted by the Project and improvements to certain transportation facilities are needed to accommodate the transportation impacts to be generated by the Project.
- In order to accommodate the transportation impacts from the Project, the Developer improve a section of Ft. Florida Road as depicted in the attached agreement and Exhibit C
- The proposed agreement and associated development project meets the intent and requirements of the Land Development Code Sec 2-8 Proportionate Fair Share Program
- The proposed agreement and associated development project meets the intent and requirements of the Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element Policy 6.103 establishing a regulatory Level of Service.


## COST/FUNDING

## N/A

## RECOMMENDATION

Approve the proposed Proportionate Fair Share Agreement between Reader \& Partners, LLC and the City of DeBary.

## IMPLEMENTATION

The developer will be required to make the necessary improvements to the segment of Ft. Florida Road identified in the attached agreement.

## ATTACHMENTS

Proportionate Fair Share Agreement.

# RIVINGTON PROPORTIONATE FAIR SHARE AND MOBILITY MITIGATION AGREEMENT 

This PROPORTIONATE FAIR SHARE AND MOBILITY MITIGATION AGREEMENT (this "Agreement") is made by and between Reader \& Partners, LLC, a Florida limited liability company, its successors and assigns ("Developer"), Empire Cattle Company, a Florida corporation ("Owner") and the City of DeBary, a Florida municipal corporation ("City").

WHEREAS, Developer is the contract purchaser of that certain real property being approximately $296.2+/-$ acres in size, being a portion of Volusia County Parcel Identification Numbers 08-19-30-00-00-0010, and legally described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto (the "Property") and being that same property described in that certain Development Agreement recorded at Official Records Book 7729, Page 1566 of the Public Records of Volusia County, Florida (the "Rivington MPUD") which property is owned by the Owner; and

WHEREAS, The MPUD, subject to the provisions therein and City Code and Land Development Code requirements, allows for the development of the Property with up to 700 residential dwelling units and approximately 30,000 square feet of commercial development and related support, accessory and recreational amenities as more particularly described in the Rivington MPUD (the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, the Property is located within the City of DeBary along the south side of Ft. Florida Road, west of its intersection with U.S. Highway 17/92; and

WHEREAS, a final Traffic Impact Analysis (Revised-July 2019) was submitted to the City by the Developer from which offsite traffic project impacts were identified for total buildout of the Project, as more particularly shown on Exhibit "B", and certain offsite traffic improvements were mutually agreed upon by the Developer and City to mitigate the Project impacts; and

WHEREAS, due to the Developer's timing of the Project and the needed offsite infrastructure to support impacts from the development of the Project, the Developer has agreed to provide certain improvements to the road and trail network in the vicinity of the SunRail commuter rail station as more particularly described herein particularly in order to accommodate the transportation impacts from development of the Project and improve mobility within the City; and

WHEREAS, the costs of the construction of and/or payment for the Mobility Improvements, as defined in this Agreement, by the Developer are less than the proportionate share of the transportation and trail improvements necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development of the Project and are eligible for applicable City impact fee and mobility fee credits, as provided herein and in accordance with the City's Code of Ordinances; and

WHEREAS, the Developer and Owner acknowledge that the City is processing the adoption of a transportation mobility fee assessment method applicable to development in an area of the City within which the Project is located and they agree that the Project will be subject to such assessment method for which mobility fee payments for the Project will be required to which the Developer and Owner have no objection; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Joint Project Agreement between the County of Volusia and the City of DeBary for Engineering Services dated February 6, 2018 ("JPA"), the City is responsible for oversight of the analysis, design, and permitting of the Utility and Roadway Improvements as defined in the JPA and Volusia County intends to construct the Utility Improvements as defined in the JPA, all between the Property and U.S. 17-92; and

WHEREAS, this Agreement is not a statutory development agreement pursuant to Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, and is being entered into by the City pursuant to the City's home rule authority and as a condition of the development order approvals.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

1. Recitals. The above premises are true and correct and are incorporated herein as material provisions of this Agreement.
2. Developer Funding and Ft. Florida Road Improvements. In order to mitigate offsite traffic impacts for the Rivington MPUD, the Developer agrees to fund the full cost of constructing the roadway improvements between the railroad and U.S. 17/92 that are part of the Utility and Roadway Improvements designed and permitted by the City, as more particularly identified on attached Exhibit "C (the "Ft. Florida Road Improvements"). In addition, the Developer will pay the cost to design, permit, and construct public trail improvements identified within the Rivington MPUD, and associated public improvements more particularly detailed on attached Exhibit "D", that will be dedicated to the City, County of Volusia or Rivington Community Development District (the "Trail Improvements" and collectively with the Ft. Florida Road Improvements, the "Mobility Improvements"). The Developer shall request that the City coordinate relocating franchise utilities that must be relocated as part of the Ft. Florida Road Improvements and shall coordinate with the Developer to close Ft. Florida Road during construction of the Ft. Florida Road Improvements, subject to a maintenance of traffic plan acceptable to the City. Any cost associated with the relocation of the franchise utilities not borne by the franchise utility provider shall be the responsibility of the Developer. Construction of the Ft. Florida Road Improvements shall be completed by the Developer which includes coordination of construction of the Utility Improvements along Ft. Florida Road between US 17/92 and to Barwick Road. The Ft. Florida Road Improvements shall commence within 30 days of the 1.) the City's issuance of a development order to the initial
phase of the Project; 2.) the receipt of all permits necessary for construction of the Ft. Florida Road Improvements: 3.) the completion of the Utility Improvements between 17/19 and the railroad tracks; and 4.) the relocation of all franchise utilities in conflict with the Ft. Florida Road Improvements construction. The Ft. Florida Road Improvements shall be completed prior to the City's issuance of the 50th certificate of occupancy for a residential unit constructed in the Project, unless an extension of time is granted by the City Manager, which may be granted in the City Manager's sole discretion. Up to 25 model homes may be permitted by the City prior to the completion of the Ft. Florida Road Improvements. The Trail Improvements shall be constructed by the Developer in phases as approved by the City from time to time in connection with the approval of the preliminary plats for each phase of the Rivington MPUD provided, however that all of the Trail Improvements that connect Ft. Florida Road with River City Nature Park shall be completed no later than twenty-four (24) months after issuance of the initial certificate of occupancy for a residential unit in the initial phase of the Project. As a result of the Developer funding the Mobility Improvements, Developer shall be entitled to certain credits against the mobility fee the City intends to adopt following the execution of this Agreement. The mobility fee credits shall be for an amount equal to the actual cost of the Ft. Florida Road Improvements including the cost of any franchise utility locations if any (if such cost is reasonable and approved by the City) expended by the Developer. The credit against mobility fees provided herein is not intended to limit any additional mobility fee credits that may accrue under the terms of the Rivington MPUD for matters unrelated to the Ft. Florida Road Improvements. Any mobility fees paid prior to the completion of the Ft. Florida Road Improvements up to the amount the Developer has paid to fund the Ft. Florida Road Improvements will be refunded upon completion and the City's acceptance of the Ft. Florida Road Improvements. The amounts paid by the Developer for the Ft. Florida Road Improvements must be reasonable with proper documentation, and as approved by the City. Further, the credits against the mobility fee to which the Developer is entitled shall be in accordance with section 163.3180(5)(h)(2)(e). In addition to the credit provided against mobility fees for the Ft. Florida Road Improvements, the Developer shall be entitled to credits on a dollar-for-dollar basis against the City's park and recreation impact fees for the total cost of designing, permitting and constructing the Trail Improvements as provided by Section 2-230 of the City of DeBary Code of Ordinances and section $163.3180(5)(h)(2)(e)$, Florida Statutes. However, any impact fee and/or mobility fee credits in excess of the costs expended by the Developer for the Mobility Improvements shall only be transferable in accordance with the City's Code of Ordinances and shall not be available for, or subject to, any reimbursement by the City or other public agency.
3. Development Approvals \& Compliance. Developer and City agree that the provisions in this Agreement satisfy the statutory and City Code requirements for establishing and assessing the proportionate share and proportionate fair-share portion of the transportation and trail impacts from the development of the Project. Developer's agreement to construct the Mobility Improvements as provided in paragraph 2, above, shall satisfy the City's concurrency review for the full buildout of the Rivington MPUD as required by Sections 2.5 and 2.8 of the City of DeBary Land Development Code. Nothing in this Agreement shall allow, or be construed to allow the Developer or it's successors and/or assigns to avoid or delay compliance with any and all provisions of the City's Comprehensive Plan, the City Code of Ordinances, resolutions, conditions of development orders and other requirements pertaining to the use and development of the Property as provided in the Rivington MPUD. Nothing in this Agreement shall constitute or be deemed to constitute or require the City to issue any approval by the City of
any rezoning, comprehensive plan amendment, variance, special exception, final site plan, preliminary subdivision plan, final subdivision plan, final plat, construction plan approval, site plan approval, building permit, concurrency certificate, grading permit, stormwater drainage permit, access permit, or any other land use or development approval. This Agreement does not modify or amend any previously executed Rivington MPUD or any conditions of development orders or approval concerning the Property or the Project.
4. No Third-Party Beneficiaries. Nothing in this Agreement, express or implied, is intended to or will be construed to confer on any person, other than the parties of this Agreement, any right, remedy, or claim with respect to this Agreement.
5. Validity. If any portion of this Agreement is finally determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, unconstitutional, unenforceable or void, the balance of the Agreement shall continue in full force and effect.
6. Binding/Recording. This Agreement shall run with the Property and the rights and the obligations under this Agreement shall benefit, burden, and bind the successors, heirs and assigns of all parties to this Agreement. This Agreement shall be recorded in the Public Records of Volusia County at the Developer's expense.
7. Entire Agreement. This Agreement embodies the entire understanding of the parties with respect to the matters specifically enumerated herein, and all negotiations, representations, warranties and agreements made between the parties are merged herein. The making, execution and delivery of this Agreement by all parties has been induced by no representations, statements, warranties or agreements that are not expressed herein. There are no further or other agreements or understandings, written or oral, in effect between or among the parties related to the subject matter hereof.
8. Attorneys' Fees/Laws/Venue. In any lawsuit between the parties to this Agreement arising from this Agreement, each party shall bear their own attorney's fees and litigation costs. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of Florida. Exclusive venue in any action to construe or enforce the provisions of this Agreement shall be in the circuit court of and for Volusia County, Florida.
9. Independent Parties. City and Developer are not partners and this Agreement is not a joint venture, and nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to authorize the City or Developer to represent or bind the any other party to matters not expressly authorized or provided in this Agreement.
10. Non-Waiver of Sovereign Immunity and Indemnification. Nothing contained in this Agreement nor in any instruments executed pursuant to the terms of this Agreement shall be construed as a waiver or attempted waiver by the City of its home rule authority, police power, zoning authority and sovereign immunity under the Constitution and laws of the State of Florida or any other privilege, immunity or defense afforded to the City or the City's officers, employees and agents under the law. The Owner and the Developer shall jointly and severally indemnify and hold harmless the City and its respective officers, employees and agents from and against all claims, damages, injuries, lawsuits, liability, losses, expenses, including reasonable
attorneys' fees and costs, arising out of and/or related to the Developer's construction of improvements, Developer's performance under this Agreement, and disputes regarding the mobility fees, proportionate share provisions, and credits provided for in this Agreement.
11. Time is of the Essence. Time is of the essence as to the performance of all duties and obligations set forth in this Agreement.
12. Effective Date. The Effective Date of this Agreement shall be the date on which the last party has executed this Agreement.
13. Owner. The Owner joins in, consents to, and agrees to be bound to the provisions of this Agreement which are applicable to the Developer.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed under seal by their officers and agents, duly authorized, as to the City and Developer, on the day and year set forth hereinafter.

## Developer:

Reader \& Partners, LLC
Signature

Print Name:

By:<br>Dean Barberree, Manager

Signature
Print Name:

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF $\qquad$
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this ____ day of , 2019, by Dean Barberree as Manager of Reader \& Partners, LLC, on behalf of said limited liability company, who is personally known to me or who has produced as identification.

NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF FLORIDA
Type or Print Name
Commission No.
My Commission Expires:

## City:

## CITY OF DEBARY, FLORIDA

By:<br>Karen Chasez, Mayor

## ATTEST:

[^1]
## Owner:

## Signature

By:
$\qquad$
Print Name:

## Signature

Print Name:

## STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF $\qquad$
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this day of _ 2019, by , on behalf of said limited liability company, who is personally known to me or who has produced as identification.

NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF FLORIDA

Type or Print Name
Commission No.
My Commission Expires: $\qquad$

## Exhibit "A"

## Legal Description of the Rivington MPUD Property

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

```
THE SOUTH 1/2 OF THE NORTHEAST 1/4; THE SOUTH 1/2 OF THE NORTHWEST 1/4; GOVERNMENT
LOTS 1 AND 3; AND THE NORTH 1/2 OF GOVERNMENT LOT 6; ALL IN SECTION 8, TOWNSHIP 19
SOUTH, RANGE }30\mathrm{ EAST, LYING SOUTH OF FORT FLORIDA ROAD, VOLUSIA COUNTY, FLORIDA; EXCEPT
THE SOUTH 30 FEET OF SAID GOVERNMENT LOT 1 AND EXCEPT THE SOUTH 30 FEET OF THE NORTH
1/2 OF SAID GOVERNMENT LOT 6.
CONTAINS 296.2 ACRES, MORE OR LESS PER THE VOLUSIA COUNTY PROPERTY APPRAISER.
```


## Exhibit "B"

## Traffic Impact Analysis

## Exhibit "C"

## Fort Florida Road Improvements

## Exhibit "D"

## Public Trail Improvements

Rivington MDP
DeBary, Florida

## Traffic Impact Analysis

Prepared for: Reader Communities By: LTG, Inc. REVISED - July 2019



## PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that I am a Professional Engineer properly registered in the State of Florida practicing with LTG, Inc., a corporation authorized to operate as an engineering business, EB 0009227, by the State of Florida Department of Professional Regulation, Board of Professional Engineers, and that I have prepared or approved the evaluations, findings, opinions, conclusions, or technical advice attached hereto for:

PROJECT: Rivington MDP - Traffic Impact Analysis
LOCATION: DeBary, Florida
CLIENT: Reader Communities
JOB \#: 4628.12

I hereby acknowledge that the procedures and references used to develop the results contained in these computations are standard to the professional practice of Transportation Engineering as applied through professional judgment and experience.

Prepared by:
LTG, Inc.
1450 W. Granada Blvd, Suite 2
Ormond Beach, FL 32174
Certificate of Authorization 9227
386/257-2571

THIS ITEM HAS BEEN DIGITALLY
SIGNED AND SEALED BY:

ON THE DATE ADJACENT TO THE SEAL

PRINTED COPIES OF THIS DOCUMENT ARE
NOT CONSIDERED SIGNED AND SEALED AND
THE SIGNATURE MUST BE VERIFIED ON ANY ELECTRONIC COPIES.

LTG, Inc.
1450 W. GRANADA BLVD, SUITE 2
ORMOND BEACH, FL 32174
CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORIZATION 9227
KADY L. DEARING, P.E. NO. 84234
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## INTRODUCTION

LTG, Inc. (LTG) has been retained by Reader Communities to prepare a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed Rivington MDP development. The proposed development is on Fort Florida Road, east of US
17/92 in DeBary, Florida. Figure 1 shows the location of the project relative to the surrounding road network and a preliminary site plan is attached as Appendix A. Access to the development will be via two full access driveway connections with one on Fort Florida Road and one on Barwick Road, and a right-in/right-out driveway on Fort Florida Road. Build-Out of the proposed development is expected by 2022 and will consist of the following land uses:

- Single-Family Residential: 602 Dwelling Units
- Townhouses: 98 Dwelling Units
- Shopping Center:


## Study Procedures

Standard engineering and planning procedures were used to determine the impacts of the proposed project. Reference data was obtained from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), the Volusia County Traffic Engineering Department, the City of DeBary, the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), and the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (R2CTPO).

## Planned Roadway Improvements

Information on programmed or planned roadway improvements in the area of interest were obtained from the FDOT Five-Year Work Program, Volusia County, the River to Sea TPO Long Range Transportation Plan, and previously approved projects. Based on the information obtained, signalization at US 17/92 and Fort Florida Road intersection is currently in the preliminary engineering and design phase, with construction funded for year 2020.

## Study Area

The following roadway segments and intersections are included in the analysis per the approved methodology (Appendix B):

## Roadway Segments:

- Dirksen Drive (from US 17/92 to Sunrise Boulevard (Vested Near-Critical))
- Barwick Road (from Fort Florida Road to US 17/92)
- Fort Florida Road (from Highbanks Road to US 17/92)
- Highbanks Road (from Fort Florida Road to US 17/92)
- US 17/92 (from Dirksen Drive to Seminole/Volusia County Line (Vested Critical))


## Intersections:

1. Fort Florida Road at Barwick Road
2. Fort Florida Road at US 17/92
3. US 17/92 at Dirksen Drive
4. US 17/92 at Barwick Road
5. US 17/92 at Highbanks Road
6. Highbanks Road at Fort Florida Road
7. Project Driveway at Fort Florida Road (Future Conditions)
8. Project Driveway at Barwick Road (Future Conditions)


## EXISTING ROADWAY ANALYSIS

Turning movement counts (TMCs) were conducted during the a.m. and p.m. peak-hours on November 27, 2018 at the study area intersections (see Appendix C). The FDOT's Peak Season Correctional Factor (PSCF) for the date the TMCs were collected (1.04) was applied to the existing counts. The spreadsheet used to develop the existing, background and build-out traffic volumes is also located in Appendix C. The adjusted existing a.m. and p.m. peak-hour traffic volumes are depicted in Figures $2 a$ and $2 b$.

## Unsignalized Intersection Analysis

The existing conditions at the unsignalized intersections were analyzed using the Highway Capacity Software 7, Version 7.6 (HCS). This software utilizes the procedures outlined in Chapter 20 of the Highway Capacity Manual $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition, titled "Two-Way Stop-Controlled Intersections". Table 1 presents the existing a.m. and p.m. peak-hour LOS at the unsignalized intersections. The HCS summary sheets are located in Appendix D.

Table 1
Existing A.M. and P.M. Peak-Hour LOS - Unsignalized Intersections Rivington MDP

| Intersection | Adopted LOS | A.M. Peak-Hour |  |  | P.M. Peak-Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Critical Approach | Delay | LOS | Critical Approach | Delay | LOS |
| 1. Fort Florida Rd. at Barwick Rd. | D | NB | 9.3 | A | NB | 9.4 | A |
| 2. Fort Florida Rd. at US 17/92 | D | EB | 228.6 | F | EB | 49.6 | E |
| 4. US 17/92 at Barwick Rd. | D | EB | 29.8 | D | WB | 116.0 | F |
| 6. Highbanks Rd. at Fort Florida Rd. | D | NB | 8.9 | A | NB | 9.4 | A |

As indicated in Table 1, all unsignalized intersections currently operate within an acceptable LOS except for US 17/92 at Fort Florida Road and at Barwick Road. It is common that unsignalized intersections operate at higher levels of service with extended delays on minor street approaches during the peak-hours when conflicted with high major street volumes.

Signalization is planned and programmed for improvement by year 2020. The intersection was analyzed as a signalized intersection with optimized signal timings under 2022 background conditions to determine whether additional improvements are recommended. Please refer to the 2022 Background Analysis section of the report for the results.

The peak-hour volume thresholds outlined in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) were compared to the peak-hour volumes at the US 17/92 at Barwick Road intersection to consider whether a traffic signal would be warranted. Due to the low minor street volumes during the a.m. and p.m. peak-hours, the intersection does not meet warranting criteria. Therefore, mitigation at this location is not recommended at this time. It should be noted that the critical approach (westbound direction) is an existing business driveway, which provides room for on-site stacking, and delays during the peak-hours are expected.



## Signalized Intersection Analysis

The LOS at a signalized intersection is based on the average stop delay per vehicle for the various movements within the intersection. The operating conditions at the signalized intersections were analyzed using HCS, which utilizes the procedures outlined in Chapter 19 of the Highway Capacity Manual $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition, titled "Signalized Intersections." Table 2 shows the existing LOS and volume to capacity ratio (v/c) at the signalized intersections. The HCS summary sheets are provided in Appendix D and the signal timings are in Appendix E. As indicated, all signalized intersections are currently operating within an acceptable LOS and with a v/c ratio less than 1.0.

Table 2
Existing A.M. and P.M. Peak-Hour LOS - Signalized Intersections Rivington MDP

|  |  | A.M. Peak-Hour |  |  | P.M. Peak-Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Adopted <br> LOS | Delay <br> (sec.) | LOS | V/C greater <br> than 1.0? | Delay <br> (sec.) | LOS | V/C greater <br> than 1.0? |
| 3. US 17/92 at Dirksen Dr. | D | 43.7 | D | No | 31.3 | C | No |
| 5. US 17/92 at Highbanks Rd. | D | 32.3 | C | No | 38.0 | D | No |

## Roadway Segment Analysis

Roadway LOS describes the operating condition determined from the number of vehicles passing over a given section of roadway during a specified time period. It is a qualitative measure of several factors which include speed, travel time, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver, driver comfort, convenience, safety and vehicle operating costs. Six LOS categories have been established as standards by which to gauge roadway performance, designated by the letters A through $F$.

The existing LOS for the study area road segments during the p.m. peak-hour are shown in Table 3. As indicted, the roadway segment of Highbanks Road from Donald E Smith Boulevard to US 17/92 currently operates outside of an acceptable LOS. However, the planned future roadway improvement from Shell Road to US 17/92 is expected to increase the peak-hour two-way capacity from 960 vehicles per hour (vph) to $1,370 \mathrm{vph}$. Under the improved condition, the roadway segment operates with the adopted LOS. The improved roadway segment analysis is also provided in Table 3.

Table 3
Existing P.M. Peak-Hour LOS - Roadway Segments* Rivington MDP

| Roadway | Segment |  | No. of Lanes | Adopted LOS | Peak-Hour Two-Way Capacity | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { AADT } \end{gathered}$ | Existing Peak-Hour Two-Way Volume | Existing <br> Volume Exceed Adopted LOS? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dirksen Dr. | US 17/92 | Sunrise Blvd. | 2 | E | 1,440 | 8,050 | 858 | No |
| Barwick Rd. | Fort Florida Rd. | US 17/92 | 2 | D | 960 | 1,210 | 109 | No |
| Fort Florida Rd. | Highbanks Rd. | Ft. Florida Point Rd. | 2 | D | 1,020 | 1,450 | 131 | No |
|  | Ft. Florida Point Rd. | Barwick Rd. | 2 | D | 1,020 | 1,060 | 95 | No |
|  | Barwick Rd. | US 17/92 | 2 | D | 1,020 | 1,670 | 150 | No |
| Highbanks Rd. | Fort Florida Rd. | Donald E Smith Blvd. | 2 | D | 1,150 | 2,900 | 261 | No |
|  | Donald E Smith Blvd. | US 17/92 | 2 | D | 960 | 11,310 | 1,018 | Yes |
| US 17/92 | Dirksen Dr. | Fort Florida Rd. | 4 | D | 3,760 | 28,000 | 2,651 | No |
|  | Fort Florida Rd. | Barwick Rd. | 4 | D | 3,760 | 29,500 | 3,149 | No |
|  | Barwick Rd. | Seminole/Volusia Co. Line | 4 | D | 3,760 | 29,500 | 3,149 | No |
| Segments - Improved** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highbanks Rd. | Donald E Smith Blvd. | US 17/92 | 2 | D | 1,370 | 11,310 | 1,018 | No |

[^2]
## 2022 BACKGROUND ANALYSIS

Traffic in the area is expected to grow due to local government approvals. The following section documents the methods used to project future 2022 traffic conditions by using either historical growth rates or vested trip information and anticipated project traffic.

## 2022 Background Traffic

The 2022 background traffic was derived from growth rates or vested trips within the study area. The historical growth rates were determined by using the FDOT Traffic Trends software and Volusia County's 2017 Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) counts from the past five years. A comparison between historical growth rates and vested project trips was conducted along each segment. The higher of the two growth rates was applied. A minimum annual growth rate of two percent ( $2 \%$ ) was used.

The resulting historical growth rates are summarized in Table 4 and the Traffic Trends worksheets are provided in Appendix F. Vested traffic information for intersections and segments used in the study are located in Appendix G. Note that only where TIAs or traffic statement data was available for each project, the vested trips were applied to the associated intersections and roadway segments. As requested by City Staff, the pending mixeduse development known as DeBary Town Center has also been included in the analysis. The developments considered vested in the analysis are listed below:

- Integra/Hawthorn
- Riviera Bella East
- Springview Unit 8 Residential
- Wal-Mart (remaining two outparcels)
- DeBary Town Center

Table 4 2022 Historical Growth Rates Rivington MDP

| Roadway |  | Historical <br> Average <br> Annual <br> Growth Rate |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | US 17/92 | Sunrise Blvd. | $7.96 \%$ |
|  | Fort Florida Rd. | US 17/92 | $5.00 \%$ |
|  | Highbanks Rd. | Ft. Florida Point Rd. | $4.76 \%$ |
|  | Ft. Florida Point Rd. | Barwick Rd. | $8.33 \%$ |
|  | Barwick Rd. | US 17/92 | $5.21 \%$ |
| Highbanks Rd. | Fort Florida Rd. | Donald E Smith Blvd. | $16.33 \%$ |
|  | Donald E Smith Blvd. | US 17/92 | $1.02 \%$ |
| US 17/92 | Dirksen Dr. | Fort Florida Rd. | $5.18 \%$ |
|  | Fort Florida Rd. | Barwick Rd. | $6.76 \%$ |
|  | Barwick Rd. | Seminole/Volusia Co. Line | $6.76 \%$ |

The study area intersections and roadway segments were analyzed based on the future roadway conditions to determine potential impacts and to investigate mitigation requirements. Note that all improvements required to improve the existing intersection deficiencies and all planned roadway improvements are included in the future condition analyses.

## Background - Unsignalized Intersection Analysis

The unsignalized intersections were analyzed to determine the operating conditions under 2022 background conditions during the a.m. and p.m. peak-hours. The analysis results are presented in Table 5. The HCS summary sheets are included in Appendix H .

Table 5

## Background A.M. and P.M. Peak-Hour LOS - Unsignalized Intersections Rivington MDP

| Intersection | Adopted LOS | A.M. Peak-Hour |  |  | P.M. Peak-Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Critical Approach | Delay (sec.) | LOS | Critical Approach | Delay (sec.) | LOS |
| 1. Fort. Florida Rd. at Barwick Rd. | D | NB | 9.6 | A | NB | 9.7 | A |
| 4. US 17/92 at Barwick Rd. | D | EB | 60.1 | F | WB | 539.5 | F |
| 6. Highbanks Rd. at Fort Florida Rd. | D | NB | 9.0 | A | NB | 10.1 | B |

As shown in Table 5, the US 17/92 at Barwick Road intersection is not expected to operate within the adopted LOS under 2022 background conditions. The 2022 background volumes were compared against the MUTCD peak-hour volume thresholds to consider if a traffic signal would be warranted under background conditions. Due to the low minor street volumes during the a.m. and p.m. peak-hours, the intersection does not meet warranting criteria. Therefore, mitigation at this location is not recommended at this time.

## Background - Signalized Intersection Analysis

The signalized intersections were analyzed to determine the operating conditions under 2022 background conditions and the results are presented in Table 6. The HCS summary sheets are included in Appendix H.

Table 6
Background A.M. and P.M. Peak-Hour LOS - Signalized Intersections Rivington MDP

| Intersection | Adopted LOS | A.M. Peak-Hour |  |  | P.M. Peak-Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay (sec.) | LOS | V/C greater than 1.0? | Delay (sec.) | LOS | V/C greater than 1.0? |
| 2. Fort Florida Rd. at US 17/92 | D | 145.6 | F | Yes | 148.5 | F | Yes |
| 3. US 17/92 at Dirksen Dr. | D | 103.4 | F | Yes | 82.2 | F | Yes |
| 5. US 17/92 at Highbanks Rd. | D | 46.3 | D | Yes | 57.9 | E | Yes |

The following improvements are recommended in order to achieve acceptable levels of service and V/C ratios during the a.m. and p.m. peak-hours:

US 17/92 at Fort Florida Road:

- Add a southbound through lane,
- Add a northbound through lane,
- Optimize signal timings (a.m. and p.m. peak-hour).

US 17/92 at Dirksen Drive:

- Add a southbound through lane with a 1200 -foot receiving lane,
- Optimize signal timings (a.m. and p.m. peak-hour).

US 17/92 at Highbanks Road:

- Optimize signal timings (a.m. and p.m. peak-hour).

It should be noted that the improvements recommended for US 17/92 at Dirksen Drive are based on the improvements recommended in the Hawthorn Landing approved TIA. The analyses of the intersections with the proposed improvements are provided in Table 7. The HCS summary sheets are located in Appendix I.

Table 7
Background Signalized Intersections - Improved Rivington MDP

| Intersection | Adopted LOS | A.M. Peak-Hour |  |  | P.M. Peak-Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay <br> (sec.) | LOS | V/C greater than 1.0? | Delay (sec.) | LOS | V/C greater than 1.0? |
| 2. Fort Florida Rd. at US 17/92 | D | 42.2 | D | No | 44.1 | D | No |
| 3. US 17/92 at Dirksen Dr. | D | 30.2 | C | No | 48.0 | D | No |
| 5. US 17/92 at Highbanks Rd. | D | 41.8 | D | No | 49.4 | D | No |

## Background - Roadway Segment Analysis

The study area roadway segments were analyzed under 2022 background conditions to determine the expected LOS and the results are shown in Table 8. Note that a comparison between historical growth rates for each study area roadway segment and vested project trips was conducted and the higher of the two was applied. As indicted, two roadway segments are expected to not operate within an acceptable LOS. The following improvements are recommended in order to achieve acceptable levels of service at the failing roadway segments:

US 17/92 from Fort Florida Road to Barwick Road:

- Widen to 6 lanes

US 17/92 from Barwick Road to Seminole/Volusia County Line:

- Widen to 6 lanes

The improved roadway segment analysis is also provided in Table 8 for those segments listed above.

## Table 8

Background P.M. Peak-Hour LOS -Roadway Segments*

## Rivington MDP

| Roadway | Segment |  | No. of Lanes | Adopted LOS | PeakHour Two-Way Capacity | Existing PM PeakHour Two-Way Volume | Historical Annual Growth Rate | Historical Growth | Vested Trips | 2022 <br> Background Volume | Background Volume Exceed Adopted LOS? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dirksen Dr. | US 17/92 | Sunrise Blvd. | 2 | E | 1,440 | 858 | 7.96\% | 341 | 283 | 1,199 | No |
| Barwick Rd. | Fort Florida Rd. | US 17/92 | 2 | D | 960 | 109 | 5.00\% | 27 | 0 | 136 | No |
| Fort Florida Rd. | Highbanks Rd. | Ft. Florida Point Rd. | 2 | D | 1,020 | 131 | 4.76\% | 31 | 151 | 282 | No |
|  | Ft. Florida Point Rd. | Barwick Rd. | 2 | D | 1,020 | 95 | 8.33\% | 40 | 151 | 246 | No |
|  | Barwick Rd. | US 17/92 | 2 | D | 1,020 | 150 | 5.21\% | 39 | 191 | 341 | No |
| Highbanks Rd. | Fort Florida Rd. | Donald E Smith Blvd. | 2 | D | 1,150 | 261 | 16.33\% | 213 | 123 | 474 | No |
|  | Donald E Smith Blvd. | US 17/92 | 2 | D | 1,370 | 1,018 | 2.00\% | 102 | 164 | 1,182 | No |
| US 17/92 | Dirksen Dr. | Fort Florida Rd. | 4 | D | 3,760 | 2,651 | 5.18\% | 687 | 387 | 3,338 | No |
|  | Fort Florida Rd. | Barwick Rd. | 4 | D | 3,760 | 3,149 | 6.76\% | 1,064 | 614 | 4,213 | Yes |
|  | Barwick Rd. | Seminole/Volusia Co. Line | 4 | D | 3,760 | 3,149 | 6.76\% | 1,064 | 496 | 4,213 | Yes |
| Segments - Improved** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| US 17/92 | Fort Florida Rd. | Barwick Rd. | 6 | D | 5,390 | 3,149 | 6.76\% | 1,064 | 229 | 4,213 | No |
|  | Barwick Rd. | Seminole/Volusia Co. Line | 6 | D | 5,390 | 3,149 | 6.76\% | 1,064 | 123 | 4,213 | No |

*Includes improvements recommended in existing conditions (or planned for future improvement).
**Improved capacity based on FDOT Generalized Service Volume Tables \& approved Hawthorn TIA.
Note: The greater value between historical growth projections and vested trips were added to the existing peak-hour two-way volume to determine 2022 background volume.

## 2022 BUILD-OUT - FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

## Project Trip Generation

The 2022 build-out traffic was developed by the sum of the background traffic (derived from growth rates or vested trips within the study area) plus the project trips. The trip generation for the development was determined using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition of the Trip Generation Manual and the Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd Edition. The gross trip generation is presented in Table 9.

Table 9
Gross Project Trip Generation Rivington MDP

| Time Period | Land Use | Land Use Code | Trip Rate Equation | Quantity (X) | Units | Total Trips (T) | Percent <br> Entering | Percent Exiting | Trips Entering | Trips Exiting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Daily | Single-Family Residential | 210 | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.92 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+2.71$ | 602 | DU | 5,422 | 50\% | 50\% | 2,711 | 2,711 |
|  | Townhouses | 220 | T = 7.56(X)-40.86 | 98 | DU | 700 | 50\% | 50\% | 350 | 350 |
|  | Shopping Center | 820 | $\mathrm{T}=37.75$ (X) | 10 | KSF | 378 | 50\% | 50\% | 189 | 189 |
|  | Totals: |  |  |  |  | 6,500 |  |  | 3,250 | 3,250 |
| A.M. PeakHour | Single-Family Residential | 210 | $T=0.71(X)+4.80$ | 602 | DU | 432 | 25\% | 75\% | 108 | 324 |
|  | Townhouses | 220 | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.95 \mathrm{Ln}(\mathrm{X})-0.51$ | 98 | DU | 47 | 23\% | 77\% | 11 | 36 |
|  | Shopping Center | 820 | T = 0.94(X) | 10 | KSF | 9 | 62\% | 38\% | 6 | 3 |
|  | Totals: |  |  |  |  | 488 |  |  | 125 | 363 |
| P.M. PeakHour | Single-Family Residential | 210 | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.96 \mathrm{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+0.20$ | 602 | DU | 569 | 63\% | 37\% | 358 | 211 |
|  | Townhouses | 220 | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.89 \mathrm{Ln}(\mathrm{X})-0.02$ | 98 | DU | 58 | 63\% | 37\% | 37 | 21 |
|  | Shopping Center | 820 | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.74(\mathrm{X})+2.89$ | 10 | KSF | 99 | 48\% | 52\% | 48 | 51 |
|  | Totals: |  |  |  |  | 726 |  |  | 443 | 283 |

Due to the mixed-use nature of the proposed development, a certain portion of trips generated are expected to remain internal to the site. The National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 684 was used to calculate an internal capture of five percent (5\%) for the p.m. peak-hour.

Additionally, it is expected that a certain number of transit-oriented trips will utilize the DeBary SunRail Station located in the southwest quadrant of the US 17/92 at Fort Florida Road intersection. For a conservative analysis, $75 \%$ of the SunRail trips were considered to be vehicles and $25 \%$ were considered to be pedestrians or bicyclists.

Lastly, as requested by City Staff, the interaction between DeBary Town Center and the Rivington MDP is to be included in the analysis. Due to the close proximity of the two projects, the NCHRP Report 684 was used to determine the a.m. and p.m. peak-hour interaction. Access to the DeBary Town Center development is provided by the US 17/92 at Fort Florida Road intersection. The internal capture, SunRail Station trips and DeBary Town Center trips were deducted from the total trip generation to determine the new external project trips. The resulting external project trips are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

## Net New External Project Trip Generation <br> Rivington MDP

| Time Period | Land Use | Total Trips |  |  | Internal Trips* |  |  | DeBary Town Center |  |  | SunRail Trips** |  |  | New External Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| AM PeakHour | Single-Family Residential | 108 | 324 | 432 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 46 | 52 | 10 | 29 | 39 | 92 | 249 | 341 |
|  | Townhouses | 11 | 36 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 28 | 37 |
|  | Shopping Center | 6 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 9 |
|  | Totals: | 125 | 363 | 488 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 51 | 58 | 11 | 32 | 43 | 107 | 280 | 387 |
| PM <br> Peak- <br> Hour | Single-Family Residential | 358 | 211 | 569 | 11 | 4 | 15 | 60 | 34 | 94 | 31 | 19 | 50 | 256 | 154 | 410 |
|  | Townhouses | 37 | 21 | 58 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 26 | 14 | 40 |
|  | Shopping Center | 48 | 51 | 99 | 5 | 13 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 37 | 32 | 69 |
|  | Totals: | 443 | 283 | 726 | 18 | 18 | 36 | 66 | 38 | 104 | 40 | 27 | 67 | 319 | 200 | 519 |

*Internal Capture of 5\% for the P.M. peak-hour
**SunRail trips are estimated to include both pedestrian and vehicular traffic; $9 \%$ for residential and $15 \%$ for commercial

## Project Trip Distribution \& Assignment

The process of determining the directional flow of traffic associated with a new development is called trip distribution. The Central Florida Regional Planning Model (CFRPM), version 6.1 was used to determine the project trip distribution and is presented in Figure 3. Using the trip distribution, the a.m. and p.m. peak-hour project trips were assigned to the study area roadway network. It should be noted that the project trips assigned to the project driveways and along Fort Florida Road include 75\% of the SunRail trips (vehicles only) and the DeBary Town Center trips. Figures 4a and 4b graphically depict the 2022 total background traffic, project traffic and resulting 2022 build-out traffic for the a.m. and p.m. peak-hours, respectively.
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## 2022 BUILD-OUT ANALYSIS

The study area intersections were analyzed based on the roadway conditions at the time of project build-out to determine potential impacts of project-generated trips and investigate mitigation requirements. The improvements recommended for existing and 2022 background conditions have been included in the build-out analysis for those applicable intersections and roadway segments.

## Build-Out - Unsignalized Intersection Analysis

The unsignalized intersections were analyzed to determine the operating conditions under build-out conditions and the results are presented in Table 11. The HCS summary sheets are included in Appendix J.

Table 11
Build-Out A.M. and P.M. Peak-Hour LOS - Unsignalized Intersections
Rivington MDP

| Intersection | AdoptedLOS | A.M. Peak-Hour |  |  | P.M. Peak-Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Critical Approach | Delay (sec.) | LOS | Critical Approach | Delay <br> (sec.) | LOS |
| 1. Fort. Florida Rd. at Barwick Rd. | D | NB | 11.5 | B | NB | 13.0 | B |
| 4. US 17/92 at Barwick Rd. | D | EB | 99.9 | F | WB | - | F |
| 6. Highbanks Rd. at Fort Florida Rd. | D | NB | 9.1 | A | NB | 10.2 | B |
| 7. Project Driveway \#1 at Fort Florida Rd. | D | NB | 10.4 | B | NB | 10.4 | B |
| 8. Project Driveway \#2 at Fort Florida Rd. | D | NB | 10.0 | A | NB | 9.2 | A |
| 9. Project Driveway \#3 at Barwick Rd. | D | EB | 10.1 | B | EB | 11 | B |

As indicated, under build-out conditions, the unsignalized intersection of US 17/92 at Barwick Road is expected to continue to operate outside of an acceptable LOS. Due to the excessive delay, the peak-hour volume thresholds outlined in the MUTCD were compared to the peak-hour counts to consider whether a traffic signal would be warranted. The volume comparison to MUTCD warranting criteria is provided in Table 12 below.

Table 12
US 17/92 at Barwick Rd. - MUTCD Warranting Volumes
Rivington MDP

| Intersection | MUTCD Warranting Criteria* |  |  | 2022 Peak-Hour Minor Street Volumes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1A | 1B | 2 |  |  |
|  | Minor Street Volume |  |  | AM - EBL | PM - EBL |
| US 17/92 at Barwick Rd. | 140 | 70 | 80 | 7 | 12 |

*70\% criteria evaluated based on major street exceeding 40 mph .

## Build-Out - Signalized Intersection Analysis

The signalized intersections were analyzed to determine the operational LOS under build-out conditions, including the improvements identified during 2022 background conditions, and the results are presented in Table 13. The HCS summary sheets are also contained in Appendix J.

Table 13
Build-Out A.M. and P.M. Peak-Hour LOS - Signalized Intersections Rivington MDP

| Intersection | Adopted LOS | A.M. Peak-Hour |  |  | P.M. Peak-Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay (sec.) | LOS | V/C greater than 1.0? | Delay <br> (sec.) | LOS | V/C greater than 1.0? |
| 2. Fort Florida Rd. at US 17/92 | D | 80.1 | F | Yes | 73.1 | E | Yes |
| 3. US 17/92 at Dirksen Dr. | D | 31.0 | C | No | 50.7 | D | No |
| 5. US 17/92 at Highbanks Rd. | D | 43.3 | D | No | 53.8 | D | No |

As shown in Table 13, the Fort Florida Road at US 17/92 intersection is not expected to operate within the adopted LOS under 2022 build-out conditions. The following improvements are recommended to improve the delay and improve V/C ratios:

US 17/92 at Fort Florida Road:

- Add an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane,
- Optimize signal timings (a.m. and p.m. peak-hour).

The analysis of the intersection with the proposed improvements are provided in Table 14. The HCS summary sheets are located in Appendix K.

Table 14
Build-Out Signalized Intersections - Improved
Rivington MDP

| Intersection | Adopted LOS | A.M. Peak-Hour |  |  | P.M. Peak-Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay (sec.) | LOS | V/C greater than 1.0 ? | Delay <br> (sec.) | LOS | V/C greater than 1.0? |
| 2. Fort Florida Rd. at US 17/92 | D | 48.3 | D | No | 45.3 | D | No |

## Build-Out - Roadway Segment Analysis

The study area roadway segments were analyzed under build-out conditions, including the improvements identified during existing conditions, to determine the anticipated LOS and the results are presented in Table 16. As indicated, all of the study area roadway segments are expected to operate within the adopted LOS at the time of build-out.

## Site Access Analysis

Access to the development will be via two full access driveways, one on Fort Florida Road and one on Barwick Road. A right-in/right-out driveway on Fort Florida Road will also be provided. Based on recent revisions to the City's Land Development Code (LDC), the following driveway criteria was used to analyze the need for turn lanes at the project driveways.

Section 4-89 of the code states that a 12-ft. wide right-turn lane shall be provided at each driveway when the speed limit equals or exceeds 35 miles per hour ( mph ) or if the development will generate 100 or more right-turn movements during the peak hour. Therefore, an eastbound right-turn lane at the main Fort Florida Driveway (\#1) and a southbound right-turn lane at the full access driveway (\#3) on Barwick Road are required. The recommended turn lane lengths at each location are provided in Table 15.

Additionally, Section 4-89 of the code also states that a 12 -ft. wide left-turn lane shall be provided at each driveway when the average daily trip ends of the driveway is 1,000 vehicles or more and/or the average peak
hour inbound left-turn volume is 25 vehicles or more. Therefore, a westbound left-turn lane at the main Fort Florida driveway (\#1) and a northbound left-turn lane at the full access driveway on Barwick Road (\#3) are required. The recommended lane lengths at each location are provided in Table 15.

Table 15
Site Access Improvements - Recommended Turn Lanes
Rivington MDP

| Intersection | Posted <br> Speed <br> (mph) | Required <br> Deceleration <br> Length (ft.) | Turn <br> Lane | Peak Hour <br> Project <br> Trips | 95th <br> Percentile <br> Queue <br> Length (ft.)* | Total <br> Recommended <br> Turn Lane <br> Length (ft.)** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Driveway \#1 at Fort Florida Rd. | 35 | 155 | EBR | 25 | 0 | 155 |
|  |  |  | 147 | 0 | 155 |  |
| Project Driveway \#3 at Barwick Rd. | 30 | 145 | SBR | 131 | 0 | 145 |
|  |  |  | 103 | 0 | 145 |  |

*95th Percentile Queue obtained from build-out HCS results.
**Includes 50 ft. taper.

## Alternate Mode Analysis

An evaluation of present and programmed bike, pedestrian, and transit mobility options has been conducted. There are currently no sidewalks or bike lanes along either side of Fort Florida Road adjacent to the proposed development. Votran currently operates three (3) transit lines along US 17/92, each with a stop at the Sunrail station at Fort Florida Road. The transit routes are as follows:

- Route 31 - Deland to Sunrail (DeBary)
- Route 32 - Deltona Plaza to Sunrail (DeBary)
- Route 33 - DuPont Lakes to Sunrail (DeBary)


## Queue Length and Turn Lane Analysis

A queue length analysis was conducted to determine recommended storage lengths for existing turn lanes for those turn lanes that result in a $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile Queue Storage Ratio greater than one. The HCS results were used to obtain the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths for each exclusive turn lanes during the a.m. and p.m. peakhours. Only the peak-hour is analyzed. Turn lane requirements were evaluated using the Volusia County LDC Section 72-619, Table VI and FDOT Design Standards Index No. 301. The resulting recommended turn lane lengths for the intersections, under peak-hour conditions, is provided in Table 17. It should be noted that if an intersection is recommended for improvements, the improved scenario was used in the analysis for that specific condition (existing, background, build-out). Based on the results summarized in Table 17, there are no turn lane deficiencies caused by project traffic.

## Proportionate Share (PS)

Based on the current Florida Statue and procedures outlined in the R2CTPO TIA Guidelines, the proportionate share shall be calculated based upon the number of trips from the proposed development being approved. The project traffic is then divided by the change in roadway capacity resulting from the recommended improvements to result in a PS percentage. The total estimated construction cost for the improvement is multiplied by the PS percentage to determine the applicant's PS contribution.

The PS formula is only applied to those facilities that are determined to be significantly impacted by the project under review. The recommended improvements eligible for PS determination, the estimated improvements costs and PS calculation are to be negotiated once the TIA has been approved.

Table 16
Build-Out P.M. Peak-Hour LOS - Roadway Segments

| Rivington MDP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway | Segment |  | No. of Lanes | Adopted LOS | PeakHour Two-Way Capacity | Existing PM PeakHour Two-Way Volume | 2022 <br> Background Volume | Project Trip Distribution | Project Trips | $\begin{gathered} 2022 \\ \text { Build-Out } \\ \text { Volume } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Build-Out Volume Exceed Adopted LOS? |
| Dirksen Dr. | US 17/92 | Sunrise Blvd. | 2 | E | 1,440 | 858 | 1,199 | 10.1\% | 52 | 1,251 | No |
| Barwick Rd. | Fort Florida Rd. | US 17/92 | 2 | D | 960 | 109 | 136 | 32.3\% | 189 | 325 | No |
| Fort Florida Rd. | Highbanks Rd. | Ft. Florida Point Rd. | 2 | D | 1,020 | 131 | 282 | 9.0\% | 47 | 329 | No |
|  | Ft. Florida Point Rd. | Barwick Rd. | 2 | D | 1,020 | 95 | 246 | 10.3\% | 265 | 511 | No |
|  | Barwick Rd. | US 17/92 | 2 | D | 1,020 | 150 | 341 | 57.3\% | 454 | 795 | No |
| Highbanks Rd. | Fort Florida Rd. | Donald E Smith Blvd. | 2 | D | 1,150 | 261 | 474 | 8.0\% | 42 | 516 | No |
|  | Donald E Smith Blvd. | US 17/92 | 2 | D | 1,370 | 1,018 | 1,182 | 6.6\% | 34 | 1,216 | No |
| US 17/92 | Dirksen Dr. | Fort Florida Rd. | 4 | D | 3,760 | 2,651 | 3,338 | 26.1\% | 136 | 3,474 | No |
|  | Fort Florida Rd. | Barwick Rd. | 6 | D | 5,390 | 3,149 | 4,213 | 30.1\% | 156 | 4,369 | No |
|  | Barwick Rd. | Seminole/Volusia Co. Line | 6 | D | 5,390 | 3,149 | 4,213 | 58.3\% | 303 | 4,516 | No |

Note: The greater value between historical growth projections and vested trips were added to the existing peak-hour two-way volume to determine 2022 background volume.

Table 17
Queue Length \& Turn Lane Analysis

| Intersection | Turn Lane | Posted Speed Limit (mph) | Existing Lane Length (ft.)* | Maintaining Agency | $\begin{gathered} \text { Required } \\ \text { Deceleration } \end{gathered}$$(\mathrm{ft})^{*}$ | PeakHour Period | 95th Percentile Queue Length (ft) |  |  | Total Recommended Turn Lane Length (ft.)* at Build-Out | Lane Length Deficiency (ft.) | Deficient Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Existing | Background | Build-Out |  |  |  |
| 2. Fort Florida Road at US 17/92 | NBL | 50 | 450 | FDOT | 240 | PM | 50 | 250 | 375 | 615 | 165 | Background |
|  | SBL | 50 | 215 | FDOT | 240 | PM | 25 | 50 | 50 | 290 | 75 | Existing |
| 3. US 17/92 at Dirksen Drive | EBL | 45 | 205 | County | 240 | PM | 225 | 375 | 375 | 615 | 410 | Existing |
|  | NBR | 50 | 215 | FDOT | 240 | PM | 275 | 300 | 325 | 565 | 350 | Existing |
|  | SBL | 50 | 350 | FDOT | 240 | PM | 100 | 375 | 375 | 615 | 265 | Background |
| 4. US 17/92 at Barwick Road | EBL | 30 | 190 | City | N/A | AM | 25 | 25 | 50 | 50 | None | None |
|  | NBL | 50 | 340 | FDOT | 240 | AM | 25 | 25 | 75 | 315 | None | None |
|  | SBL | 50 | 310 | FDOT | 240 | PM | 25 | 25 | 25 | 265 | None | None |
| 5. US 17/92 at Highbanks Road | EBL | 30 | 310 | City | N/A | PM | 325 | 200 | 425 | 425 | 115 | Existing |
|  | WBL | 35 | 235 | City | 145 | PM | 250 | 275 | 250 | 395 | 160 | Existing |
|  | SBL | 40 | 280 | FDOT | 155 | PM | 125 | 250 | 250 | 405 | 125 | Background |
|  | SBR | 40 | 190 | FDOT | 155 | PM | 75 | 25 | 125 | 280 | 90 | Existing |

*Includes 50 ft. taper

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was conducted to evaluate the impact the proposed Rivington MDP development would have on the surrounding roadway network in DeBary, Florida. The development will generate a net total of 445 a.m. peakhour and 623 p.m. peak-hour trips. The results of the roadway segment and intersection analyses are summarized in Tables 18 and 19, below.

Table 18
Recommended Improvements - Roadway Segments Rivington MDP

| Roadway | Segment |  |  | Improvement Required with |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | To | From | Existing <br> Volume | Background <br> Volume | Build-Out <br> Volume |  |
|  | Donald E Smith Blvd | US 17/92 | 4 L |  |  |  |
| US 17/92 | Fort Florida Rd | Barwick Rd |  | 6 L |  |  |
|  | Barwick Rd | Seminole/Volusia Co. Line |  | 6 L |  |  |

Table 19
Recommended Improvements - Intersections
Rivington MDP

| Intersection | Improvement Required with |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing Volume | Background Volume | Build-Out Volume |
| 2. Fort Florida Road at US 17/92 | - Add exclusive eastbound left-turn lane for dual lane approach. | - Add a southbound through lane, <br> - Add a northbound through lane, <br> - Optimize signal timings (a.m. and <br> p.m. peak-hours). | - Add an exclusive eastbound leftturn lane, <br> - Optimize signal timings (a.m. and p.m. peak-hours). |
| 3. US 17/92 at Dirksen Drive |  | - Add a southbound through lane with a 1,200-ft. receiving lane, <br> - Optimize signal timings (a.m. and p.m. peak-hours) |  |
| 5. US 17/92 at Highbanks Road |  | - Optimize signal timings (a.m. and p.m. peak-hours) |  |

Under 2022 build-out conditions, the Fort Florida Road at US 17/92 intersection recommended for an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane under 2022 build-out conditions. This improvement is eligible to be included in the proportionate share calculation. Based on the results of the impact analysis and the recommendations provided, the project is recommended for approval.

APPENDIX

## APPENDIX A PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN



## APPENDIX B METHODOLOGY

## Via Email: (LDodd@DeBary.org)

Ref: 4628.11
November 13, 2018
Laura Dodd
Planning \& Growth Management
City of DeBary
6 Colomba Road
DeBary, FL 32713

## Re: Rivington MDP - Concurrency Traffic Impact Analysis Methodology Letter - Revised

## Dear Ms. Dodd:

LTG, Inc. (LTG) has been retained by Reader Communities to prepare a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed Rivington MDP. The proposed development is located on Fort Florida Road, east of US 17/92 in DeBary, Florida. The location is graphically presented in Figure 1. The proposed development will consist of the following land-uses:

- Single-Family Residential:
- Townhouses:
- Shopping Center:

602 Dwelling Units
98 Dwelling Units
10 KSF

The purpose of performing the TIA is to obtain transportation concurrency for the proposed development which is expected to be completed by 2022. Access to the development will be via two full access driveway connection with one on Fort Florida Road and one on Barwick Road, and a right-in/right-out driveway on Fort Florida Road. A preliminary site plan is attached.

The City of DeBary has adopted the River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (R2CTPO) TIA guidelines. In accordance with these guidelines, this letter outlines the proposed methodology by which the analysis will be conducted.

The analysis will be based on the latest concurrency information as obtained from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), the Volusia County Traffic Engineering Department and the City of DeBary.

## Analysis Period

Roadway segments will be analyzed based on p.m. peak-hour two-way traffic and intersections will be analyzed based on a.m. and p.m. peak-hour traffic volumes. The analysis will be conducted under 2018 existing conditions and 2022 build-out conditions.

## Project Trip Generation

The Daily, a.m. and p.m. peak-hour trip generation for the development was determined using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition of the Trip Generation Manual. The trip generation shown in Table 1 shows the new gross external daily, a.m. and p.m. peak-hour trips that the proposed development will add to the roadway network at build-out.


Table 1
Gross Project Trip Generation
Rivington MDP

| Time Period | Land Use | Land Use Code | Trip Rate Equation | Quantity | Units | Total Trips (T) | Percent Entering | Percent Exiting | Trips Entering | Trips Exiting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Daily | Single-Family Residential | 210 | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.92 \operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+2.71$ | 602 | DU | 5,422 | 50\% | 50\% | 2,711 | 2,711 |
|  | Townhouses | 220 | $\mathrm{T}=7.56$ (X) - 40.86 | 98 | DU | 700 | 50\% | 50\% | 350 | 350 |
|  | Shopping Center | 820 | $\mathrm{T}=37.75(\mathrm{X})$ | 10 | KSF | 378 | 50\% | 50\% | 189 | 189 |
|  | Totals: |  |  |  |  | 6,500 |  |  | 3,250 | 3,250 |
| A.M. <br> Peak- <br> Hour | Single-Family Residential | 210 | $\mathrm{T}=0.71(\mathrm{X})+4.80$ | 602 | DU | 432 | 25\% | 75\% | 108 | 324 |
|  | Townhouses | 220 | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.95 \mathrm{Ln}(\mathrm{X})-0.51$ | 98 | DU | 47 | 23\% | 77\% | 11 | 36 |
|  | Shopping Center | 820 | $\mathrm{T}=0.94(\mathrm{X})$ | 10 | KSF | 9 | 62\% | 38\% | 6 | 3 |
|  | Totals: |  |  |  |  | 488 |  |  | 125 | 363 |
| P.M. PeakHour | Single-Family Residential | 210 | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.96 \mathrm{Ln}(\mathrm{X})+0.20$ | 602 | DU | 569 | 63\% | 37\% | 358 | 211 |
|  | Townhouses | 220 | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.89 \mathrm{Ln}(\mathrm{X})-0.02$ | 98 | DU | 58 | 63\% | 37\% | 37 | 21 |
|  | Shopping Center | 820 | $\operatorname{Ln}(\mathrm{T})=0.74(\mathrm{X})+2.89$ | 10 | KSF | 99 | 48\% | 52\% | 48 | 51 |
|  | Totals: |  |  |  |  | 726 |  |  | 443 | 283 |

Due to the mixed-use nature of the land uses, a certain portion of the project trips generated are expected to be attracted from within the development, known as internal capture. The National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 684 was used to calculate an internal capture of five percent (5\%) for the p.m. peak-hour. Additionally, due to the proximity of the proposed development to the DeBary SunRail Station, a certain number of transit-oriented trips are expected. These trips were deducted from the total trip generation to determine the new external project trips. The resulting net external internal project trips are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Net New External Project Trip Generation
Rivington MDP

| Time Period | Land Use | Total Trips |  |  | Internal Trips |  |  | SunRail Trips* |  |  | New External Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Daily | Single-Family Residential | 2,711 | 2,711 | 5,422 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,711 | 2,711 | 5,422 |
|  | Townhouses | 350 | 350 | 700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 350 | 350 | 700 |
|  | Shopping Center | 189 | 189 | 378 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 189 | 378 |
|  | Totals: | 3,250 | 3,250 | 6,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,250 | 3,250 | 6,500 |
| A.M. PeakHour | Single-Family Residential | 108 | 324 | 432 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 29 | 39 | 98 | 295 | 393 |
|  | Townhouses | 11 | 36 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 33 | 43 |
|  | Shopping Center | 6 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 9 |
|  | Totals: | 125 | 363 | 488 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 32 | 43 | 114 | 331 | 445 |
| P.M. PeakHour | Single-Family Residential | 358 | 211 | 569 | 11 | 4 | 15 | 31 | 19 | 50 | 316 | 188 | 504 |
|  | Townhouses | 37 | 21 | 58 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 32 | 18 | 50 |
|  | Shopping Center | 48 | 51 | 99 | 5 | 13 | 18 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 37 | 32 | 69 |
|  | Totals: | 443 | 283 | 726 | 18 | 18 | 36 | 40 | 27 | 67 | 385 | 238 | 623 |

*SunRail trips are estimated to include both pedestrian and vehicular traffic; $9 \%$ for residential and $15 \%$ for commercial
Please note that a portion of new trips, known as pass-by trips, will be attracted to the project from the existing traffic on the adjacent roadways. Based on the R2CPO TIA guidelines, pass-by capture shall not exceed fourteen percent (14\%) of the total background traffic on the adjacent roadways. The pass-by rate provided in the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, $3^{r d}$ Edition are expected to exceed the fourteen percent threshold. Therefore, the pass-by trip reduction will be addressed and applied to the total trip generation once traffic count data is collected in the immediate study area.

Engineering \& Planning

Laura Dodd
November 13, 2018
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## Project Trip Distribution

The process of determining the directional flow of traffic associated with a new development is called trip distribution. The Central Florida Regional Planning Model (CFRPM), version 6.1, was used to determine project trip distribution for the proposed development. The model roadway network and socioeconomic (S/E) data was modified to include Fort Florida Road, as well as River Bend and Riviera Bella residential developments. Additionally, due to planned developments and improvements within the study area, the Town Center mixed-use development was also included in the model network. The resultant project trip distribution is presented in Figure 2.

## Study Area Determination

Per the R2CTPO guidelines, projects which generate more than 100 p.m. peak-hour two-way trips must include all roadway segments that are impacted by the proposed project to within three percent (3\%) or greater of the peak-hour two-way adopted level of service (LOS) capacity, major intersections along the significant segments, and roadway segments that have been designated as "critical" or "near critical" within a three-mile travel distance of the site. Critical and near critical roadways are defined by Volusia County as roadways with a volume to capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) ratio that is equal to or greater than 1.0 and 0.90 , respectively. Figure 3, obtained from the Volusia County Traffic Engineering Division, depicts the critical and near-critical roadway segments within the area.

Using the project trip distribution from the CFRPM, the p.m. peak-hour project trips were assigned to the roadway network to determine the roadway segments that are impacted by the proposed development within three percent or greater of the peak-hour two-way adopted LOS capacity. Table 3 presents the significance test and the critical or near-critical roadway segments to be included in the analysis.

Table 3
Significance Testing Rivington MDP

${ }^{1}$ Per Comprehensive Plan of Jurisdiction
${ }^{2}$ Per 2017 VC AADT Spreadsheet

|  | Critical |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Near Critical |
|  | Vested Critical |
|  | Vested Near Critical |
|  | Significant Segments |
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Based on the critical/near critical designations and the significance test, the intersections and roadway segments proposed for inclusion in the TIA are as follows:

## Intersections:

1. Fort Florida Road at Barwick Road
2. Fort Florida Road at US 17/92
3. US $17 / 92$ at Dirksen Drive
4. US 17/92 at Barwick Road
5. US 17/92 at Highbanks Road
6. Highbanks Road at Fort Florida Road
7. Project Driveway at Fort Florida Road (build-out conditions)
8. Project Driveway at Barwick Road (build-out conditions)

## Segments (including Critical/Near-Critical):

- Dirksen Drive from US 17/92 to Sunrise Boulevard (Vested Near-Critical)
- Barwick Road from Fort Florida Road to US 17/92
- Fort Florida Road from Highbanks Road to Fort Florida Pointe Road
- Fort Florida Road from Fort Florida Pointe Road to Barwick Road
- Fort Florida Road from Barwick Road to US 17/92
- Highbanks Road from Fort Florida Road to Donald E Smith Boulevard
- Highbanks Road from Donald E Smith Boulevard to US 17/92
- US 17/92 from Dirksen Drive to Fort Florida Road
- US 17/92 from Fort Florida Road to Barwick Road
- US 17/92 from Barwick Road to Seminole/Volusia County Line (Vested Critical)


## Build-Out Traffic

The build-out traffic will be developed by the sum of the background traffic (derived from growth rates or vested trips within the study area) plus the project trips. A comparison between historical growth rates for each study area roadway segment, determined by historic growth trends calculated based upon five (5) years of historic count data, and vested project trips will be conducted and the higher of the two will be applied. A minimum annual growth rate of two percent ( $2 \%$ ) shall be used, unless otherwise documented. In no case shall the growth be negative. All improvements funded for construction within the first three years of the FDOT five-year work program will be considered in the future analysis.

Traffic from the following approve vested projects shall be considered:

- Integra/Hawthorn
- Riviera Bella East
- Springview Unit 8 Residential
- Wal-Mart (remaining two outparcels)


## Segment Analysis - P.M. Peak-Hour Existing and Build-Out Conditions

If the future projected volume is expected to exceed the maximum service volume of a roadway segment, a transportation analysis may be conducted to determine service volume specific to that segment, if authorized by the applicant and the local road maintaining agency. The procedures documented in the latest version of the FDOT Quality/Level of Service Handbook will be used to determine specific capacity, if necessary.

## Intersection Analysis - A.M. and P.M. Peak-Hour Existing and Build-Out Conditions

The operating conditions for both the existing and future conditions at the unsignalized intersections will be analyzed using the Highway Capacity Software 7, Version 7.6 (HCS) or Synchro 10. HCS utilizes the procedures outlined in Chapter 20 of the HCM $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition Highway Capacity Manual, titled "Two-Way Stop Control Intersections".
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The operating conditions for both the existing and future conditions at the signalized intersections will be evaluated using the Highway Capacity Software 7, Version 7.6 (HCS) or Synchro 10. This software utilizes the methodology outlined in Chapter 19 of the HCM 6 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition Highway Capacity Manual, titled "Signalized Intersections".

The a.m. and p.m. peak-hour turning movement counts will be collected on a typical weekday (Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday) between the hours of 7:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. $-6: 00$ p.m. The raw data will be seasonally adjusted using FDOT Peak Season Conversion Factors.

## Multi-Modal Analysis

A multi-modal analysis will be conducted which will evaluate present and programmed bike, pedestrian and transit mobility options, inclusive of Votran.

## Improvements

If warranted, appropriate roadway and intersection improvements will be identified.
Please review and advise if the City is in agreement with this proposed methodology or provide comments relating to preferred revisions. If you have any questions, please contact me at 386.257.2571.

Sincerely,
LTG, INC.


Kady Bearing, PE
Project Engineer
Attachments: Preliminary Site Plan
c: Dean Barberree - Reader Communities (Dean@readercommunities.com)
Mark Watts - Cobb Cole (Mark.Watts@cobbcole.com)
Matt Boerger, AICP, LEED AP - City of DeBary (MBoeger@DeBary.org)
Chris Walsh, P.E. - TEDS (CWalsh@teds-fl.com)


## APPENDIX C TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT DATA

## AM Peak-Hour Factored Volumes

| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Existing Traffic |  |  |  |  | Background Traffic |  |  |  | \% Model Distribution | Trip Direction | Build-Out |  | Peak-Hour Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count | $\begin{gathered} \text { Raw Truck } \\ \text { Count } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Seasonal Factor | TMC Volume | \% Heavy Vehicles | Approach Growth Rate | Growth (trips) | Vested Traffic | Total Background Volume |  |  | Project Trips | Total BuildOut Volume |  |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  | 1.04 | 0 | 0\% | 8.33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0.89 |
|  |  | Left | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 75 | 3 |  | 78 | 4\% |  | 26 | 0 | 104 | 28.0\% | out | 93 | 197 |  |
|  |  | Right | 15 | 0 |  | 16 | 0\% |  | 5 | 0 | 21 |  |  | 0 | 21 |  |
|  | Westbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 5.21\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 12 | 0 |  | 12 | 0\% |  | 3 | 0 | 15 | 29.3\% | in | 33 | 48 |  |
|  |  | Through | 41 | 6 |  | 43 | 15\% |  | 9 | 0 | 52 | 28.0\% | in | 32 | 83 |  |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Northbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 5.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 7 | 3 |  | 7 | 43\% |  | 1 | 0 | 9 |  |  | 0 | 9 |  |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right | 21 | 3 |  | 22 | 14\% |  | 4 | 0 | 26 | 29.3\% | out | 97 | 123 |  |
|  | Southbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | xisting Traf |  |  |  | Backgroun | raffic |  |  |  |  | d-Out |  |
| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Raw Count | Raw Truck Count | Seasonal Factor | TMC Volume | \% Heavy Vehicles | Approach Growth Rate | Growth (trips) | Vested Traffic | Total Background Volume | \% Model Distribution | Trip Direction | Project Trips | Total BuildOut Volume | Peak-Hour Factor |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  | 1.04 | 0 | 0\% | 5.21\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0.92 |
|  |  | Left | 24 | 2 |  | 25 | 8\% |  | 5 | 0 | 30 | 28.0\% | out | 93 | 123 |  |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right | 86 | 4 |  | 89 | 5\% |  | 19 | 0 | 108 | 29.3\% | out | 97 | 205 |  |
|  | Westbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Northbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 6.76\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 53 | 4 |  | 55 | 8\% |  | 15 | 0 | 70 | 29.3\% | in | 33 | 103 |  |
|  |  | Through | 468 | 29 |  | 487 | 6\% |  | 132 | 0 | 618 | 0.2\% | out | 1 | 619 |  |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Southbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 5.18\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 2 | 0 |  | 2 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  |  | 0 | 3 |  |
|  |  | Through | 1907 | 61 |  | 1983 | 3\% |  | 411 | 0 | 2,394 | 0.2\% | in | 0 | 2,394 |  |
|  |  | Right | 30 | 4 |  | 31 | 13\% |  | 6 | 0 | 38 | 28.0\% | in | 32 | 70 |  |




| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Existing Traffic |  |  |  |  | Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  | Build-Out |  | Peak-Hour Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count | Raw Truck Count | Seasonal Factor | TMC Volume | \% Heavy <br> Vehicles | Approach Growth Rate | Growth (trips) | Vested <br> Traffic | Total Background Volume | \% Model Distribution | Trip Direction | Project Trips | Total BuildOut Volume |  |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  | 1.04 | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0.88 |
|  |  | Left | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 16 | 1 |  | 17 | 6\% |  | 1 | 0 | 18 |  |  | 0 | 18 |  |
|  |  | Right | 8 | 0 |  | 8 | 0\% |  | 1 | 0 | 9 |  |  | 0 | 9 |  |
|  | Westbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 16.33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 63 | 4 |  | 66 | 6\% |  | 43 | 0 | 108 | 8.0\% | in | 9 | 117 |  |
|  |  | Through | 10 | 3 |  | 10 | 30\% |  | 7 | 0 | 17 |  |  | 0 | 17 |  |
|  |  | Right | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Northbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 4.76\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 2 | 1 |  | 2 | 50\% |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |  | 0 | 2 |  |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right | 83 | 5 |  | 86 | 6\% |  | 16 | 0 | 103 | 8.0\% | out | 26 | 129 |  |
|  | Southbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |


| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Existing Traffic |  |  |  |  | Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  | Build-Out |  | Peak-Hour Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count | Raw Truck Count | Seasonal Factor | TMC Volume | \% Heavy Vehicles | Approach Growth Rate | Growth (trips) | Vested Traffic | Total Background Volume | \% Model Distribution | Trip Direction | Project Trips | Total BuildOut Volume |  |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  | 1.04 | 0 | 0\% | 8.33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0.89 |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 90 | 3 |  | 94 | 3\% |  | 31 | 0 | 125 | 2.6\% | In | 3 | 128 |  |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.7\% | In | 9 | 9 |  |
|  | Westbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 8.33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28.0\% | In | 32 | 32 |  |
|  |  | Through | 48 | 9 |  | 50 | 19\% |  | 17 | 0 | 67 |  | out | 0 | 67 |  |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Northbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10.3\% | out | 34 | 34 |  |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21.0\% | out | 70 | 70 |  |
|  | Southbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |


| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Existing Traffic |  |  |  |  | Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  | Build-Out |  | Peak-HourFactor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count | Raw Truck Count | Seasonal Factor | TMC <br> Volume | \% Heavy <br> Vehicles | Approach Growth Rate | Growth (trips) | Vested Traffic | Total Background Volume | \% Model Distribution | Trip Direction | Project Trips | Total BuildOut Volume |  |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  | 1.04 | 0 | 0\% | 8.33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0.89 |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 90 | 3 |  | 94 | 3\% |  | 31 | 0 | 125 | 21.0\% | Out | 70 | 195 |  |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.6\% | In | 3 | 3 |  |
|  | Westbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 5.21\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 48 | 9 |  | 50 | 19\% |  | 10 | 0 | 60 | 28.0\% | In | 32 | 92 |  |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Northbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.0\% | Out | 23 | 23 |  |
|  | Southbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |


| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Existing Traffic |  |  |  |  | Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  | Build-Out |  | Peak-Hour Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count | Raw Truck Count | Seasonal Factor | TMC Volume | \% Heavy <br> Vehicles | Approach Growth Rate | Growth (trips) | Vested Traffic | Total Background Volume | \% Model Distribution | Trip Direction | Project Trips | Total BuildOut Volume |  |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  | 1.04 | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0.89 |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29.3\% | out | 97 | 97 |  |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32.3\% | out | 107 | 101 |  |
|  |  | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Westbound | Through |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Northbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32.3\% | in | 37 | 37 |  |
|  |  | Through | 28 | 6 |  | 29 | 21\% |  | 2 | 0 | 31 |  |  | 0 | 31 |  |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Southbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 27 | 0 |  | 28 | 0\% |  | 2 | 0 | 30 |  |  | 0 | 30 |  |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29.3\% | in | 33 | 33 |  |

PM Peak-Hour Factored Volumes

| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Existing Traffic |  |  |  |  | Background Traffic |  |  |  | Build-Out |  |  |  | Peak-Hour Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count | $\begin{gathered} \text { Raw Truck } \\ \text { Count } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Seasonal Factor | TMC Volume | \% Heavy Vehicles | Approach Growth Rate | Growth (trips) | Vested Traffic | Total Background Volume | \% Model <br> Distribution | Project Trip Direction | Project Trips | Total BuildOut Volume |  |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  | 1.04 | 0 | 0\% | 8.33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.91 |
|  |  | Left | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 32 | 4 |  | 33 | 13\% |  | 11 | 0 | 44 | 28\% | out | 67 | 111 |  |
|  |  | Right | 8 | 0 |  | 8 | 0\% |  | 3 | 0 | 11 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 11 |  |
|  | Westbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 5.21\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 14 | 1 |  | 15 | 7\% |  | 3 | 0 | 18 | 29\% | in | 113 | 130 |  |
|  |  | Through | 97 | 4 |  | 101 | 4\% |  | 21 | 0 | 122 | 28\% | in | 108 | 230 |  |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Northbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 5.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 21 | 0 |  | 22 | 0\% |  | 4 | 0 | 26 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 26 |  |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right | 10 | 2 |  | 10 | 20\% |  | 2 | 0 | 12 | 29\% | out | 70 | 82 |  |
|  | Southbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Existing Traffic |  |  |  |  | Background Traffic |  |  |  | Build-Out |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Raw Count | Raw Truck Count | Seasonal Factor | TMC Volume | \% Heavy Vehicles | Approach Growth Rate | Growth (trips) | Vested Traffic | Total Background Volume | \% Model Distribution | Project Trip Direction | Project Trips | Total BuildOut Volume | Peak-Hour Factor |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  | 1.04 | 0 | 0\% | 5.21\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.95 |
|  |  | Left | 26 | 1 |  | 27 | 4\% |  | 6 | 10 | 37 | 28\% | out | 67 | 104 |  |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right | 53 | 3 |  | 55 | 6\% |  | 11 | 46 | 101 | 29\% | out | 70 | 171 |  |
|  | Westbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Northbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 6.76\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 196 | 4 |  | 204 | 2\% |  | 55 | 78 | 282 | 29\% | in | 113 | 395 |  |
|  |  | Through | 1992 | 38 |  | 2072 | 2\% |  | 560 | 0 | 2,632 | 0\% | out | 0 | 2,632 |  |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Southbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 5.18\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 3 | 0 |  | 3 | 0\% |  | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 4 |  |
|  |  | Through | 703 | 15 |  | 731 | 2\% |  | 151 | 0 | 883 | 0\% | in | 1 | 884 |  |
|  |  | Right | 52 | 5 |  | 54 | 10\% |  | 11 | 17 | 71 | 28\% | in | 108 | 179 |  |


| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Existing Traffic |  |  |  |  | Background Traffic |  |  |  | Build-Out |  |  |  | Peak-Hour Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count | Raw Truck Count | Seasonal Factor | TMC Volume | \% Heavy Vehicles | Approach Growth Rate | Growth (trips) | Vested Traffic | Total <br> Background Volume | \% Model Distribution | Project Trip Direction | Project Trips | Total BuildOut Volume |  |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  | 1.04 | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.95 |
|  |  | Left | 127 | 4 |  | 132 | 3\% |  | 11 | 1 | 143 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 143 |  |
|  |  | Through | 136 | 2 |  | 141 | 1\% |  | 11 | 0 | 153 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 153 |  |
|  |  | Right | 82 | 3 |  | 85 | 4\% |  | 7 | 0 | 92 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 92 |  |
|  | Westbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 7.96\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 109 | 1 |  | 113 | 1\% |  | 36 | 18 | 149 | 10\% | in | 39 | 188 |  |
|  |  | Through | 24 | 4 |  | 25 | 17\% |  | 8 | 0 | 33 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 33 |  |
|  |  | Right | 108 | 5 |  | 112 | 5\% |  | 36 | 17 | 148 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 148 |  |
|  | Northbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 5.18\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 53 | 6 |  | 55 | 11\% |  | 11 | 38 | 93 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 93 |  |
|  |  | Through | 1539 | 30 |  | 1601 | 2\% |  | 332 | 59 | 1,932 | 15\% | out | 37 | 1,969 |  |
|  |  | Right | 352 | 4 |  | 366 | 1\% |  | 76 | 10 | 442 | 10\% | out | 24 | 466 |  |
|  | Southbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 5.56\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 100 | 4 |  | 104 | 4\% |  | 23 | 7 | 127 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 127 |  |
|  |  | Through | 673 | 20 |  | 700 | 3\% |  | 156 | 56 | 856 | 15\% | in | 59 | 915 |  |
|  |  | Right | 52 | 9 |  | 54 | 17\% |  | 12 | 1 | 66 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 66 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | xisting Traf |  |  |  | Background | Traffic |  |  | Build |  |  |  |
| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Raw Count | $\begin{gathered} \text { Raw Truck } \\ \text { Count } \end{gathered}$ | Seasonal Factor | TMC Volume | \% Heavy <br> Vehicles | Approach Growth Rate | Growth (trips) | Vested <br> Traffic | Total Background Volume | \% Model Distribution | Project Trip Direction | Project Trips | Total BuildOut Volume | Peak-Hour |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  | 1.04 | 0 | 0\% | 5.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.94 |
|  |  | Left | 8 | 0 |  | 8 | 0\% |  | 2 | 0 | 10 | 1\% | out | 2 | 12 |  |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right | 27 | 0 |  | 28 | 0\% |  | 6 | 0 | 34 | 29\% | out | 70 | 103 |  |
|  | Westbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 5 | 1 |  | 5 | 20\% |  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 6 |  |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Right | 11 | 0 |  | 11 | 0\% |  | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 12 |  |
|  | Northbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 6.76\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 50 | 3 |  | 52 | 6\% |  | 14 | 0 | 66 | 29\% | in | 113 | 179 |  |
|  |  | Through | 2180 | 47 |  | 2267 | 2\% |  | 613 | 0 | 2,880 | 29\% | in | 113 | 2,993 |  |
|  |  | Right | 5 | 2 |  | 5 | 40\% |  | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
|  | Southbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 6.76\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left | 9 | 1 |  | 9 | 11\% |  | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 12 |  |
|  |  | Through | 990 | 28 |  | 1030 | 3\% |  | 278 | 0 | 1,308 | 29\% | out | 70 | 1,378 |  |
|  |  | Right | 9 | 1 |  | 9 | 11\% |  | 3 | 0 | 12 | 1\% | in | 3 | 15 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | ing Traf |  |  |  | Background | Trafic |  |  | Build |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Raw Count | Raw Truck Count | Seasonal Factor | $\begin{gathered} \text { TMC } \\ \text { volume } \end{gathered}$ | \% Heavy vehicles | Approach Growth Rate | Growth (trips) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vested } \\ & \text { Trafic } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Background } \\ \text { Volume } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Model } \\ \text { Distribution } \end{gathered}$ | Project Trip Direction | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projet } \\ & \hline \text { Trips } \end{aligned}$ | Total Build- Out Volume | Peak-Hour Factor |
|  | Eastound | U-Tunt |  |  | 1.04 | $\frac{0}{212}$ | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | ${ }_{2}$ | 0.95 |
|  |  | Left | ${ }^{204}$ |  |  | ${ }^{212}$ | 1\% |  | ${ }^{17}$ | ${ }^{27}$ | 239 | 1\% | out | 1 | ${ }^{240}$ |  |
|  |  | Through | ${ }^{115}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{120}{85}$ | ${ }_{\text {1\% }}{ }^{1 \%}$ |  | $\frac{10}{7}$ | ${ }^{16}$ | ${ }_{136}^{136}$ | 4\% | out | 10 | ${ }_{92}^{146}$ |  |
|  |  | U-Tum |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 3.05 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{92}{0}$ | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Westbound | Lett | 154 |  |  | 160 | 2\% |  | 20 | 4 | 180 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 180 |  |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  | ${ }_{9}^{93}$ | 3\% |  | 11 | 27 | 120 | 4\% | in | 16 | ${ }^{136}$ |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {Right }}$ | 81 |  |  | 84 | 6\% |  | 10 | 5 | 95 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 95 |  |
|  |  | U-Tum |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 |  | 0 |  |
|  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{105}{1434}$ | 5\% | 4.30\% | ${ }_{24}^{18}$ | ${ }^{9} 9$ | ${ }_{1}^{12631}$ | - $11 \%$ | out | ${ }_{26}$ | $\stackrel{123}{1,707}$ |  |
|  |  | $\xrightarrow{\text { Right }}$ | ${ }_{84}$ |  |  | ${ }^{81}$ | 6\% |  | 15 | 24 | 102 | 0\% | 0 | $\stackrel{1}{0}$ | 102 |  |
|  |  | 0-Tum |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Southbound | Left | 105 |  |  | 109 | 5\% | 3.35\% | 15 | 5 | 124 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 124 |  |
|  |  | Through | $\begin{array}{r}614 \\ 80 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 20 5 |  |  | - ${ }^{\text {3\% }}$ |  | ${ }_{11}^{86}$ | $\begin{array}{r}34 \\ 56 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 724 139 | 11\% | in | 42 | ${ }_{171}^{766}$ |  |


| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Exising Trafic |  |  |  |  | Background Traftic |  |  |  |  |  | Build-Out |  | Peak-Hour Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count | Raw Truck Count | $\begin{gathered} \text { Seasonalal } \\ \text { Factor } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TMC } \\ \text { Volume } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Heavy } \\ & \text { Vehicles } \end{aligned}$ | Approach Growth Rate | Growt (trips) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Vested } \\ \text { Trafic } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Background } \\ \text { Volume } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Model } \\ & \text { Distribution } \end{aligned}$ | Trip Direction | Project <br> Trios | Total BuildOut Volume |  |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  | 1.04 | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | , | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.86 |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | $\xrightarrow{\text { Through }}$ Right | - 6 |  |  | ${ }^{23}$ | $\frac{14 \% \%}{17 \%}$ |  | $\frac{2}{0}$ | 0 | ${ }^{25}$ | 0\% | 0 | 0 | $\stackrel{25}{7}$ |  |
|  |  | U-Tum |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 16.33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Westbound | Left | 74 |  |  | 77 | 0\% |  | 50 | 0 | 127 | 8\% | in | 31 | 158 |  |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  | ${ }^{33}$ | 13\% |  | ${ }^{22}$ | 0 | 55 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | ${ }_{5}^{55}$ |  |
|  | Northbound | U-Tumm |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Lett | 21 |  |  | 22 | 0\% | 4.76\% | 4 | 0 | 26 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 26 |  |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0\% | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  |  | $\frac{\text { Right }}{\text { U.Turn }}$ | 41 |  |  | 43 | 0\% |  | 8 | 0 | 51 | $\frac{8 \%}{0 \%}$ | $\frac{\text { out }}{0}$ | 19 | 10 |  |
|  | Southbound |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Exising Trafic |  |  |  |  | Background Traftic |  |  |  |  |  | Build-Out |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count | Raw Truck Count | Seasonal Factor | $\begin{gathered} \text { TMC } \\ \text { volume } \end{gathered}$ | \% Heavy Vehicles | Approach Growth Rate | Growth (trips) | Vested Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { Background } \\ & \text { Volume } \end{aligned}$ | \% Model Distribution | Trip Direction | Project <br> Trios | Total BuildOut Volume | Peak-Hour Factor |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  | 1.04 | 0 | 0\% | 8.33\% | , | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.91 |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 40 |  |  | ${ }_{0}^{42}$ | 10\% |  | ${ }^{14}$ | 0 | 55 | 21\% | Out | 50 | ${ }_{105}^{105}$ |  |
|  | Westbound | U-Turn |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 5.21\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | In | 10 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through | 118 |  |  | ${ }_{0}^{123}$ | 3\% |  | ${ }^{26}$ | 0 | 148 | 28\% | ${ }^{\text {In }}$ | 108 | ${ }_{2}^{256}$ |  |
|  | Northbund | U-Tum |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | , | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | R.ight |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\frac{7 \%}{0 \%}$ | Out | ${ }^{17}$ | 17 |  |
|  | Southbound |  |  |  |  | 0 | $0 \%$ | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Through Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Existing Trafic |  |  |  |  | Background Trafic |  |  |  | Build-Out |  |  |  | Peak-Hour Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count | Raw Truck Count | Seasonal Factor | $\begin{gathered} \text { TMC } \\ \text { Volume } \end{gathered}$ | \% Heavy Vehicles | Approach Growth Rate | Growth (trips) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vested } \\ & \text { Traficic } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Background } \\ \text { Volume } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \% Model Distribution | Trip Direction | Project <br> Trips | Total BuildOut Volume |  |
|  | Eastound | U-Tum |  |  | 1.04 | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0.91 |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29\% | out | 70 | 70 |  |
|  |  | $\frac{\text { Through }}{\text { Right }}$ |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32\% | Out | ${ }_{77}$ | IT |  |
| \% | Westbound | U-Tum |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 旡 |  | Leff |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ |  | $\xrightarrow{\text { Through }}$ Right |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| \# | Northbound | U-Tum |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32\% | in | 124 | 124 |  |
| - |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { Through } \\ \text { Right }}}{ }$ | 31 |  |  | $0_{0}^{32}$ | 6\% |  | 0 | 0 | ${ }^{35}$ | 0\% | 0 | 0 | ${ }_{0}^{35}$ |  |
| - | Southbound | U.Tum |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% | 2.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| - |  | Left |  |  |  | 0 | 0\% |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | , | , |  |
|  |  | $\xrightarrow{\text { Through }}$ Right |  |  |  | ${ }_{0}^{23}$ | 5\% |  |  | 0 | $\frac{25}{0}$ | 20\% | $\stackrel{0}{\mathrm{in}}$ | $\frac{0}{113}$ | ${ }_{113}^{25}$ |  |
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|  | N/A <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Westbound |  |  |  | Barwick Rd Northbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 2 | 25 | 31 |
| 07:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 19 | 35 |
| 07:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 23 | 3 | 26 | 42 |
| 07:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 19 | 3 | 22 | 46 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 33 | 0 | 40 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 22 | 0 | 79 | 13 | 92 | 154 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 19 | 4 | 23 | 48 |
| 08:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 19 | 32 |
| 08:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 19 | 28 |
| 08:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 18 | 36 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 25 | 0 | 36 | 4 | 0 | 25 | 29 | 0 | 70 | 9 | 79 | 144 |


| 04:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 31 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 24 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 38 |
| 04:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 0 | 28 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 45 |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 27 | 0 | 29 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 11 | 49 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 88 | 0 | 99 | 20 | 0 | 11 | 31 | 0 | 27 | 6 | 33 | 163 |


| 05:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 30 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 37 |
| 05:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 40 |
| 05:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 0 | 26 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 36 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 82 | 0 | 99 | 20 | 0 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 28 | 6 | 34 | 163 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 228 | 0 | 274 | 48 | 0 | 64 | 112 | 0 | 204 | 34 | 238 | 624 |
| Apprch \% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 16.8 | 83.2 | 0 |  | 42.9 | 0 | 57.1 |  | 0 | 85.7 | 14.3 |  |  |
| Total \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.4 | 36.5 | 0 | 43.9 | 7.7 | 0 | 10.3 | 17.9 | 0 | 32.7 | 5.4 | 38.1 |  |
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|  | N/A <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Westbound |  |  |  | Barwick Rd Northbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Automobiles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 213 | 0 | 257 | 44 | 0 | 56 | 100 | 0 | 190 | 33 | 223 | 580 |
| \% Automobiles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95.7 | 93.4 | 0 | 93.8 | 91.7 | 0 | 87.5 | 89.3 | 0 | 93.1 | 97.1 | 93.7 | 92.9 |
| Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 15 | 44 |
| \% Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.3 | 6.6 | 0 | 6.2 | 8.3 | 0 | 12.5 | 10.7 | 0 | 6.9 | 2.9 | 6.3 | 7.1 |
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|  | N/A Southbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Westbound |  |  |  | Barwick Rd Northbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for En | Inter | ction | gins at | 07:15 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 19 | 35 |
| 07:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 23 | 3 | 26 | 42 |
| 07:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 19 | 3 | 22 | 46 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 19 | 4 | 23 | 48 |
| Total Volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 41 | 0 | 53 | 7 | 0 | 21 | 28 | 0 | 75 | 15 | 90 | 171 |
| \% App. Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 22.6 | 77.4 | 0 |  | 25 | 0 | 75 |  | 0 | 83.3 | 16.7 |  |  |
| PHF | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 600 | . 788 | . 000 | . 779 | . 583 | . 000 | . 750 | . 778 | . 000 | . 815 | . 750 | . 865 | . 891 |
| Automobiles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 35 | 0 | 47 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 22 | 0 | 72 | 15 | 87 | 156 |
| \% Automobiles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 85.4 | 0 | 88.7 | 57.1 | 0 | 85.7 | 78.6 | 0 | 96.0 | 100 | 96.7 | 91.2 |
| Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 15 |
| \% Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14.6 | 0 | 11.3 | 42.9 | 0 | 14.3 | 21.4 | 0 | 4.0 | 0 | 3.3 | 8.8 |
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|  | N/A Southbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Westbound |  |  |  | Barwick Rd Northbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for En | Inter | ction | gins at | 04:15 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 0 | 24 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 38 |
| 04:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 0 | 28 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 45 |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 27 | 0 | 29 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 11 | 49 |
| 05:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 30 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 50 |
| Total Volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 97 | 0 | 111 | 21 | 0 | 10 | 31 | 0 | 32 | 8 | 40 | 182 |
| \% App. Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 12.6 | 87.4 | 0 |  | 67.7 | 0 | 32.3 |  | 0 | 80 | 20 |  |  |
| PHF | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 700 | . 898 | . 000 | . 925 | . 875 | . 000 | . 833 | . 861 | . 000 | . 800 | . 667 | . 769 | . 910 |
| Automobiles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 93 | 0 | 106 | 21 | 0 | 8 | 29 | 0 | 28 | 8 | 36 | 171 |
| \% Automobiles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92.9 | 95.9 | 0 | 95.5 | 100 | 0 | 80.0 | 93.5 | 0 | 87.5 | 100 | 90.0 | 94.0 |
| Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 11 |
| \% Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.1 | 4.1 | 0 | 4.5 | 0 | 0 | 20.0 | 6.5 | 0 | 12.5 | 0 | 10.0 | 6.0 |
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Groups Printed- Automobiles - Commercial

|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | N/A <br> Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 0 | 409 | 12 | 421 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 78 | 0 | 90 | 5 | 0 | 28 | 33 | 544 |
| 07:15 AM | 1 | 478 | 10 | 489 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 124 | 0 | 132 | 8 | 0 | 20 | 28 | 649 |
| 07:30 AM | 0 | 537 | 10 | 547 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 107 | 0 | 122 | 5 | 0 | 26 | 31 | 700 |
| 07:45 AM | 1 | 485 | 6 | 492 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 130 | 0 | 144 | 6 | 0 | 18 | 24 | 660 |
| Total | 2 | 1909 | 38 | 1949 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 439 | 0 | 488 | 24 | 0 | 92 | 116 | 2553 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 407 | 4 | 411 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 107 | 0 | 123 | 5 | 0 | 22 | 27 | 561 |
| 08:15 AM | 0 | 357 | 5 | 362 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 105 | 0 | 114 | 6 | 0 | 24 | 30 | 506 |
| 08:30 AM | 2 | 313 | 6 | 321 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 124 | 0 | 136 | 5 | 0 | 29 | 34 | 491 |
| 08:45 AM | 0 | 279 | 4 | 283 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 144 | 0 | 157 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 16 | 456 |
| Total | 2 | 1356 | 19 | 1377 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 480 | 0 | 530 | 21 | 0 | 86 | 107 | 2014 |


| 04:00 PM | 1 | 164 | 6 | 171 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 353 | 0 | 370 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 18 | 559 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 2 | 176 | 6 | 184 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 419 | 0 | 452 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 652 |
| 04:30 PM | 3 | 185 | 14 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 436 | 0 | 472 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 24 | 698 |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 162 | 7 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 494 | 0 | 516 | 9 | 0 | 15 | 24 | 709 |
| Total | 6 | 687 | 33 | 726 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 1702 | 0 | 1810 | 27 | 0 | 55 | 82 | 2618 |
| 05:00 PM | 2 | 213 | 19 | 234 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 506 | 0 | 543 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 19 | 796 |
| 05:15 PM | 1 | 181 | 13 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 511 | 0 | 571 | 9 | 0 | 13 | 22 | 788 |
| 05:30 PM | 0 | 147 | 13 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 481 | 0 | 558 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 14 | 732 |
| 05:45 PM | 2 | 142 | 9 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 457 | 0 | 497 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 20 | 670 |
| Total | 5 | 683 | 54 | 742 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 | 1955 | 0 | 2169 | 26 | 0 | 49 | 75 | 2986 |
| Grand Total | 15 | 4635 | 144 | 4794 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 421 | 4576 | 0 | 4997 | 98 | 0 | 282 | 380 | 10171 |
| Apprch \% | 0.3 | 96.7 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 8.4 | 91.6 | 0 |  | 25.8 | 0 | 74.2 |  |  |
| Total \% | 0.1 | 45.6 | 1.4 | 47.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.1 | 45 | 0 | 49.1 | 1 | 0 | 2.8 | 3.7 |  |
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|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | N/A <br> Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 <br> Northbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Automobiles | 15 | 4479 | 127 | 4621 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 397 | 4415 | 0 | 4812 | 86 | 0 | 267 | 353 | 9786 |
| \% Automobiles | 100 | 96.6 | 88.2 | 96.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94.3 | 96.5 | 0 | 96.3 | 87.8 | 0 | 94.7 | 92.9 | 96.2 |
| Commercial | 0 | 156 | 17 | 173 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 161 | 0 | 185 | 12 | 0 | 15 | 27 | 385 |
| \% Commercial | 0 | 3.4 | 11.8 | 3.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.7 | 3.5 | 0 | 3.7 | 12.2 | 0 | 5.3 | 7.1 | 3.8 |
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|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | N/A <br> Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:15 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:15 AM | 1 | 478 | 10 | 489 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 124 | 0 | 132 | 8 | 0 | 20 | 28 | 649 |
| 07:30 AM | 0 | 537 | 10 | 547 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 107 | 0 | 122 | 5 | 0 | 26 | 31 | 700 |
| 07:45 AM | 1 | 485 | 6 | 492 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 130 | 0 | 144 | 6 | 0 | 18 | 24 | 660 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 407 | 4 | 411 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 107 | 0 | 123 | 5 | 0 | 22 | 27 | 561 |
| Total Volume | 2 | 1907 | 30 | 1939 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 468 | 0 | 521 | 24 | 0 | 86 | 110 | 2570 |
| \% App. Total | 0.1 | 98.3 | 1.5 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 10.2 | 89.8 | 0 |  | 21.8 | 0 | 78.2 |  |  |
| PHF | . 500 | . 888 | . 750 | . 886 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 828 | . 900 | . 000 | . 905 | . 750 | . 000 | . 827 | . 887 | . 918 |
| Automobiles | 2 | 1846 | 26 | 1874 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 439 | 0 | 488 | 22 | 0 | 82 | 104 | 2466 |
| \% Automobiles | 100 | 96.8 | 86.7 | 96.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92.5 | 93.8 | 0 | 93.7 | 91.7 | 0 | 95.3 | 94.5 | 96.0 |
| Commercial | 0 | 61 | 4 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 29 | 0 | 33 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 104 |
| \% Commercial | 0 | 3.2 | 13.3 | 3.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.5 | 6.2 | 0 | 6.3 | 8.3 | 0 | 4.7 | 5.5 | 4.0 |
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|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | N/A <br> Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:45 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 162 | 7 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 494 | 0 | 516 | 9 | 0 | 15 | 24 | 709 |
| 05:00 PM | 2 | 213 | 19 | 234 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 506 | 0 | 543 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 19 | 796 |
| 05:15 PM | 1 | 181 | 13 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 511 | 0 | 571 | 9 | 0 | 13 | 22 | 788 |
| 05:30 PM | 0 | 147 | 13 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 481 | 0 | 558 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 14 | 732 |
| Total Volume | 3 | 703 | 52 | 758 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 196 | 1992 | 0 | 2188 | 26 | 0 | 53 | 79 | 3025 |
| \% App. Total | 0.4 | 92.7 | 6.9 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 9 | 91 | 0 |  | 32.9 | 0 | 67.1 |  |  |
| PHF | . 375 | . 825 | . 684 | . 810 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 636 | . 975 | . 000 | . 958 | . 722 | . 000 | . 883 | . 823 | . 950 |
| Automobiles | 3 | 688 | 47 | 738 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192 | 1954 | 0 | 2146 | 25 | 0 | 50 | 75 | 2959 |
| \% Automobiles | 100 | 97.9 | 90.4 | 97.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98.0 | 98.1 | 0 | 98.1 | 96.2 | 0 | 94.3 | 94.9 | 97.8 |
| Commercial | 0 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 38 | 0 | 42 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 66 |
| \% Commercial | 0 | 2.1 | 9.6 | 2.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 0 | 1.9 | 3.8 | 0 | 5.7 | 5.1 | 2.2 |
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Groups Printed- Automobiles - Commercial

|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | Dirksen Dr Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Benson Junction Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Factor | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| 07:00 AM | 24 | 356 | 9 | 389 | 34 | 19 | 11 | 64 | 9 | 70 | 16 | 95 | 11 | 4 | 11 | 26 | 574 |
| 07:15 AM | 27 | 429 | 12 | 468 | 28 | 24 | 17 | 69 | 11 | 105 | 21 | 137 | 10 | 2 | 15 | 27 | 701 |
| 07:30 AM | 24 | 469 | 15 | 508 | 34 | 26 | 20 | 80 | 15 | 96 | 19 | 130 | 16 | 5 | 17 | 38 | 756 |
| 07:45 AM | 27 | 440 | 17 | 484 | 42 | 34 | 21 | 97 | 20 | 120 | 22 | 162 | 19 | 4 | 17 | 40 | 783 |
| Total | 102 | 1694 | 53 | 1849 | 138 | 103 | 69 | 310 | 55 | 391 | 78 | 524 | 56 | 15 | 60 | 131 | 2814 |
| 08:00 AM | 34 | 376 | 19 | 429 | 37 | 41 | 9 | 87 | 21 | 108 | 19 | 148 | 19 | 5 | 19 | 43 | 707 |
| 08:15 AM | 24 | 356 | 24 | 404 | 41 | 35 | 15 | 91 | 18 | 110 | 25 | 153 | 13 | 5 | 16 | 34 | 682 |
| 08:30 AM | 19 | 301 | 22 | 342 | 45 | 26 | 13 | 84 | 22 | 111 | 20 | 153 | 10 | 6 | 11 | 27 | 606 |
| 08:45 AM | 24 | 220 | 16 | 260 | 43 | 24 | 13 | 80 | 16 | 100 | 11 | 127 | 9 | 5 | 13 | 27 | 494 |
| Total | 101 | 1253 | 81 | 1435 | 166 | 126 | 50 | 342 | 77 | 429 | 75 | 581 | 51 | 21 | 59 | 131 | 2489 |


| 04:00 PM | 27 | 119 | 9 | 155 | 24 | 4 | 22 | 50 | 10 | 328 | 82 | 420 | 10 | 20 | 11 | 41 | 666 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 26 | 156 | 9 | 191 | 35 | 5 | 23 | 63 | 9 | 357 | 77 | 443 | 12 | 24 | 16 | 52 | 749 |
| 04:30 PM | 36 | 175 | 7 | 218 | 26 | 2 | 25 | 53 | 12 | 346 | 83 | 441 | 16 | 27 | 20 | 63 | 775 |
| 04:45 PM | 24 | 188 | 13 | 225 | 25 | 6 | 20 | 51 | 11 | 401 | 75 | 487 | 16 | 25 | 21 | 62 | 825 |
| Total | 113 | 638 | 38 | 789 | 110 | 17 | 90 | 217 | 42 | 1432 | 317 | 1791 | 54 | 96 | 68 | 218 | 3015 |
| 05:00 PM | 30 | 189 | 13 | 232 | 26 | 8 | 25 | 59 | 17 | 393 | 98 | 508 | 14 | 35 | 19 | 68 | 867 |
| 05:15 PM | 26 | 182 | 14 | 222 | 34 | 6 | 28 | 68 | 16 | 391 | 87 | 494 | 42 | 41 | 20 | 103 | 887 |
| 05:30 PM | 20 | 114 | 12 | 146 | 24 | 4 | 35 | 63 | 9 | 354 | 92 | 455 | 55 | 35 | 22 | 112 | 776 |
| 05:45 PM | 24 | 128 | 17 | 169 | 17 | 5 | 21 | 43 | 6 | 356 | 78 | 440 | 34 | 24 | 20 | 78 | 730 |
| Total | 100 | 613 | 56 | 769 | 101 | 23 | 109 | 233 | 48 | 1494 | 355 | 1897 | 145 | 135 | 81 | 361 | 3260 |
| Grand Total | 416 | 4198 | 228 | 4842 | 515 | 269 | 318 | 1102 | 222 | 3746 | 825 | 4793 | 306 | 267 | 268 | 841 | 11578 |
| Apprch \% | 8.6 | 86.7 | 4.7 |  | 46.7 | 24.4 | 28.9 |  | 4.6 | 78.2 | 17.2 |  | 36.4 | 31.7 | 31.9 |  |  |
| Total \% | 3.6 | 36.3 | 2 | 41.8 | 4.4 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 9.5 | 1.9 | 32.4 | 7.1 | 41.4 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 7.3 |  |
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|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | Dirksen Dr Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Benson Junction Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Factor | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Automobiles | 406 | 4118 | 208 | 4732 | 503 | 265 | 302 | 1070 | 211 | 3635 | 812 | 4658 | 298 | 263 | 259 | 820 | 11280 |
| \% Automobiles | 97.6 | 98.1 | 91.2 | 97.7 | 97.7 | 98.5 | 95 | 97.1 | 95 | 97 | 98.4 | 97.2 | 97.4 | 98.5 | 96.6 | 97.5 | 97.4 |
| Commercial | 10 | 80 | 20 | 110 | 12 | 4 | 16 | 32 | 11 | 111 | 13 | 135 | 8 | 4 | 9 | 21 | 298 |
| \% Commercial | 2.4 | 1.9 | 8.8 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 5 | 2.9 | 5 | 3 | 1.6 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 1.5 | 3.4 | 2.5 | 2.6 |
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|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | Dirksen Dr Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Benson Junction Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for En | Inter | ction B | gins at | 07:15 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:15 AM | 27 | 429 | 12 | 468 | 28 | 24 | 17 | 69 | 11 | 105 | 21 | 137 | 10 | 2 | 15 | 27 | 701 |
| 07:30 AM | 24 | 469 | 15 | 508 | 34 | 26 | 20 | 80 | 15 | 96 | 19 | 130 | 16 | 5 | 17 | 38 | 756 |
| 07:45 AM | 27 | 440 | 17 | 484 | 42 | 34 | 21 | 97 | 20 | 120 | 22 | 162 | 19 | 4 | 17 | 40 | 783 |
| 08:00 AM | 34 | 376 | 19 | 429 | 37 | 41 | 9 | 87 | 21 | 108 | 19 | 148 | 19 | 5 | 19 | 43 | 707 |
| Total Volume | 112 | 1714 | 63 | 1889 | 141 | 125 | 67 | 333 | 67 | 429 | 81 | 577 | 64 | 16 | 68 | 148 | 2947 |
| \% App. Total | 5.9 | 90.7 | 3.3 |  | 42.3 | 37.5 | 20.1 |  | 11.6 | 74.4 | 14 |  | 43.2 | 10.8 | 45.9 |  |  |
| PHF | . 824 | . 914 | . 829 | . 930 | . 839 | . 762 | . 798 | . 858 | . 798 | . 894 | . 920 | . 890 | . 842 | . 800 | . 895 | . 860 | . 941 |
| Automobiles | 110 | 1694 | 61 | 1865 | 135 | 125 | 63 | 323 | 66 | 395 | 80 | 541 | 63 | 16 | 65 | 144 | 2873 |
| \% Automobiles | 98.2 | 98.8 | 96.8 | 98.7 | 95.7 | 100 | 94.0 | 97.0 | 98.5 | 92.1 | 98.8 | 93.8 | 98.4 | 100 | 95.6 | 97.3 | 97.5 |
| Commercial | 2 | 20 | 2 | 24 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 34 | 1 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 74 |
| \% Commercial | 1.8 | 1.2 | 3.2 | 1.3 | 4.3 | 0 | 6.0 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 7.9 | 1.2 | 6.2 | 1.6 | 0 | 4.4 | 2.7 | 2.5 |
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|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | Dirksen Dr Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Benson Junction Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:45 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:45 PM | 24 | 188 | 13 | 225 | 25 | 6 | 20 | 51 | 11 | 401 | 75 | 487 | 16 | 25 | 21 | 62 | 825 |
| 05:00 PM | 30 | 189 | 13 | 232 | 26 | 8 | 25 | 59 | 17 | 393 | 98 | 508 | 14 | 35 | 19 | 68 | 867 |
| 05:15 PM | 26 | 182 | 14 | 222 | 34 | 6 | 28 | 68 | 16 | 391 | 87 | 494 | 42 | 41 | 20 | 103 | 887 |
| 05:30 PM | 20 | 114 | 12 | 146 | 24 | 4 | 35 | 63 | 9 | 354 | 92 | 455 | 55 | 35 | 22 | 112 | 776 |
| Total Volume | 100 | 673 | 52 | 825 | 109 | 24 | 108 | 241 | 53 | 1539 | 352 | 1944 | 127 | 136 | 82 | 345 | 3355 |
| \% App. Total | 12.1 | 81.6 | 6.3 |  | 45.2 | 10 | 44.8 |  | 2.7 | 79.2 | 18.1 |  | 36.8 | 39.4 | 23.8 |  |  |
| PHF | . 833 | . 890 | . 929 | . 889 | . 801 | . 750 | . 771 | . 886 | . 779 | . 959 | . 898 | . 957 | . 577 | . 829 | . 932 | . 770 | . 946 |
| Automobiles | 96 | 653 | 43 | 792 | 108 | 20 | 103 | 231 | 47 | 1509 | 348 | 1904 | 123 | 134 | 79 | 336 | 3263 |
| \% Automobiles | 96.0 | 97.0 | 82.7 | 96.0 | 99.1 | 83.3 | 95.4 | 95.9 | 88.7 | 98.1 | 98.9 | 97.9 | 96.9 | 98.5 | 96.3 | 97.4 | 97.3 |
| Commercial | 4 | 20 | 9 | 33 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 30 | 4 | 40 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 92 |
| \% Commercial | 4.0 | 3.0 | 17.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 16.7 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 11.3 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 3.7 | 2.6 | 2.7 |
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http:de-traffic.com
US 17/92 at Dirksen Dr
Volusia County, FL
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|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | Barwick Rd Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Barwick Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Factor | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| 07:00 AM | 1 | 397 | 2 | 400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 113 | 1 | 122 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 13 | 535 |
| 07:15 AM | 4 | 448 | 0 | 452 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 109 | 0 | 115 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 575 |
| 07:30 AM | 4 | 463 | 1 | 468 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 126 | 1 | 131 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 614 |
| 07:45 AM | 3 | 455 | 6 | 464 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 152 | 1 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 629 |
| Total | 12 | 1763 | 9 | 1784 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 500 | 3 | 526 | 5 | 0 | 38 | 43 | 2353 |
| 08:00 AM | 4 | 416 | 1 | 421 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 128 | 1 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 561 |
| 08:15 AM | 5 | 336 | 0 | 341 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 120 | 0 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 477 |
| 08:30 AM | 2 | 365 | 1 | 368 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 132 | 1 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 515 |
| 08:45 AM | 5 | 276 | 1 | 282 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 129 | 6 | 139 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 435 |
| Total | 16 | 1393 | 3 | 1412 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 18 | 509 | 8 | 535 | 3 | 0 | 27 | 30 | 1988 |


| 04:00 PM | 0 | 203 | 2 | 205 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 467 | 1 | 485 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 693 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 2 | 209 | 1 | 212 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 459 | 0 | 468 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 690 |
| 04:30 PM | 6 | 235 | 6 | 247 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 16 | 508 | 2 | 526 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 783 |
| 04:45 PM | 1 | 246 | 0 | 247 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 537 | 3 | 552 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 813 |
| Total | 9 | 893 | 9 | 911 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 54 | 1971 | 6 | 2031 | 7 | 0 | 19 | 26 | 2979 |
| 05:00 PM | 2 | 259 | 2 | 263 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 538 | 0 | 546 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 825 |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 250 | 1 | 251 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 597 | 0 | 611 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 873 |
| 05:30 PM | 1 | 236 | 1 | 238 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 466 | 33 | 515 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 762 |
| 05:45 PM | 3 | 190 | 1 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 401 | 10 | 418 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 623 |
| Total | 6 | 935 | 5 | 946 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 45 | 2002 | 43 | 2090 | 7 | 0 | 28 | 35 | 3083 |
| Grand Total | 43 | 4984 | 26 | 5053 | 11 | 0 | 23 | 34 | 140 | 4982 | 60 | 5182 | 22 | 0 | 112 | 134 | 10403 |
| Apprch \% | 0.9 | 98.6 | 0.5 |  | 32.4 | 0 | 67.6 |  | 2.7 | 96.1 | 1.2 |  | 16.4 | 0 | 83.6 |  |  |
| Total \% | 0.4 | 47.9 | 0.2 | 48.6 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 47.9 | 0.6 | 49.8 | 0.2 | 0 | 1.1 | 1.3 |  |

## DE TRAFFIC

http:de-traffic.com
US 17/92 at Barwick Rd
Volusia County, FL

|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | Barwick Rd Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 <br> Northbound |  |  |  | Barwick Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Factor | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Automobiles | 38 | 4825 | 24 | 4887 | 10 | 0 | 22 | 32 | 118 | 4805 | 58 | 4981 | 21 | 0 | 107 | 128 | 10028 |
| \% Automobiles | 88.4 | 96.8 | 92.3 | 96.7 | 90.9 | 0 | 95.7 | 94.1 | 84.3 | 96.4 | 96.7 | 96.1 | 95.5 | 0 | 95.5 | 95.5 | 96.4 |
| Commercial | 5 | 159 | 2 | 166 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 177 | 2 | 201 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 375 |
| \% Commercial | 11.6 | 3.2 | 7.7 | 3.3 | 9.1 | 0 | 4.3 | 5.9 | 15.7 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 0 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 3.6 |
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|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | Barwick Rd Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Barwick Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for En | Inter | ction B | gins at | 07:15 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:15 AM | 4 | 448 | 0 | 452 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 109 | 0 | 115 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 575 |
| 07:30 AM | 4 | 463 | 1 | 468 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 126 | 1 | 131 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 614 |
| 07:45 AM | 3 | 455 | 6 | 464 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 152 | 1 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 629 |
| 08:00 AM | 4 | 416 | 1 | 421 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 128 | 1 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 561 |
| Total Volume | 15 | 1782 | 8 | 1805 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 515 | 3 | 539 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 34 | 2379 |
| \% App. Total | 0.8 | 98.7 | 0.4 |  | 0 | 0 | 100 |  | 3.9 | 95.5 | 0.6 |  | 11.8 | 0 | 88.2 |  |  |
| PHF | . 938 | . 962 | . 333 | . 964 | . 000 | . 000 | . 250 | . 250 | . 875 | . 847 | . 750 | . 853 | . 333 | . 000 | . 625 | . 567 | . 946 |
| Automobiles | 14 | 1718 | 7 | 1739 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 470 | 3 | 487 | 3 | 0 | 30 | 33 | 2260 |
| \% Automobiles | 93.3 | 96.4 | 87.5 | 96.3 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 66.7 | 91.3 | 100 | 90.4 | 75.0 | 0 | 100 | 97.1 | 95.0 |
| Commercial | 1 | 64 | 1 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 45 | 0 | 52 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 119 |
| \% Commercial | 6.7 | 3.6 | 12.5 | 3.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33.3 | 8.7 | 0 | 9.6 | 25.0 | 0 | 0 | 2.9 | 5.0 |
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|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | Barwick Rd Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Barwick Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for En | Inter | ction | gins at | 04:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30 PM | 6 | 235 | 6 | 247 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 16 | 508 | 2 | 526 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 783 |
| 04:45 PM | 1 | 246 | 0 | 247 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 537 | 3 | 552 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 813 |
| 05:00 PM | 2 | 259 | 2 | 263 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 538 | 0 | 546 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 825 |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 250 | 1 | 251 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 14 | 597 | 0 | 611 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 873 |
| Total Volume | 9 | 990 | 9 | 1008 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 16 | 50 | 2180 | 5 | 2235 | 8 | 0 | 27 | 35 | 3294 |
| \% App. Total | 0.9 | 98.2 | 0.9 |  | 31.2 | 0 | 68.8 |  | 2.2 | 97.5 | 0.2 |  | 22.9 | 0 | 77.1 |  |  |
| PHF | . 375 | . 956 | . 375 | . 958 | . 625 | . 000 | . 688 | . 800 | . 781 | . 913 | . 417 | . 914 | . 500 | . 000 | . 614 | . 795 | . 943 |
| Automobiles | 8 | 962 | 8 | 978 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 47 | 2133 | 3 | 2183 | 8 | 0 | 27 | 35 | 3211 |
| \% Automobiles | 88.9 | 97.2 | 88.9 | 97.0 | 80.0 | 0 | 100 | 93.8 | 94.0 | 97.8 | 60.0 | 97.7 | 100 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 97.5 |
| Commercial | 1 | 28 | 1 | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 47 | 2 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| \% Commercial | 11.1 | 2.8 | 11.1 | 3.0 | 20.0 | 0 | 0 | 6.3 | 6.0 | 2.2 | 40.0 | 2.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.5 |
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Groups Printed- Automobiles - Commercial

|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Factor | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| 07:00 AM | 9 | 345 | 10 | 364 | 21 | 12 | 11 | 44 | 10 | 81 | 7 | 98 | 13 | 12 | 27 | 52 | 558 |
| 07:15 AM | 13 | 374 | 13 | 400 | 25 | 11 | 11 | 47 | 13 | 95 | 10 | 118 | 16 | 17 | 36 | 69 | 634 |
| 07:30 AM | 17 | 315 | 17 | 349 | 34 | 15 | 13 | 62 | 16 | 101 | 8 | 125 | 26 | 25 | 25 | 76 | 612 |
| 07:45 AM | 16 | 387 | 21 | 424 | 43 | 21 | 19 | 83 | 19 | 108 | 15 | 142 | 42 | 12 | 24 | 78 | 727 |
| Total | 55 | 1421 | 61 | 1537 | 123 | 59 | 54 | 236 | 58 | 385 | 40 | 483 | 97 | 66 | 112 | 275 | 2531 |
| 08:00 AM | 12 | 336 | 36 | 384 | 53 | 25 | 26 | 104 | 24 | 101 | 18 | 143 | 35 | 17 | 16 | 68 | 699 |
| 08:15 AM | 11 | 325 | 30 | 366 | 45 | 19 | 28 | 92 | 16 | 115 | 19 | 150 | 37 | 18 | 26 | 81 | 689 |
| 08:30 AM | 9 | 303 | 25 | 337 | 37 | 18 | 26 | 81 | 13 | 102 | 11 | 126 | 44 | 16 | 21 | 81 | 625 |
| 08:45 AM | 7 | 259 | 19 | 285 | 27 | 18 | 17 | 62 | 11 | 79 | 9 | 99 | 30 | 11 | 12 | 53 | 499 |
| Total | 39 | 1223 | 110 | 1372 | 162 | 80 | 97 | 339 | 64 | 397 | 57 | 518 | 146 | 62 | 75 | 283 | 2512 |


| 04:00 PM | 20 | 128 | 12 | 160 | 19 | 12 | 13 | 44 | 20 | 303 | 12 | 335 | 25 | 22 | 20 | 67 | 606 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 25 | 147 | 17 | 189 | 24 | 17 | 20 | 61 | 26 | 317 | 16 | 359 | 31 | 21 | 25 | 77 | 686 |
| 04:30 PM | 17 | 159 | 21 | 197 | 18 | 17 | 21 | 56 | 14 | 312 | 21 | 347 | 41 | 26 | 17 | 84 | 684 |
| 04:45 PM | 25 | 180 | 25 | 230 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 56 | 34 | 347 | 21 | 402 | 34 | 18 | 25 | 77 | 765 |
| Total | 87 | 614 | 75 | 776 | 80 | 65 | 72 | 217 | 94 | 1279 | 70 | 1443 | 131 | 87 | 87 | 305 | 2741 |
| 05:00 PM | 27 | 157 | 16 | 200 | 34 | 26 | 26 | 86 | 26 | 328 | 20 | 374 | 52 | 35 | 22 | 109 | 769 |
| 05:15 PM | 26 | 148 | 20 | 194 | 53 | 24 | 20 | 97 | 17 | 357 | 21 | 395 | 52 | 33 | 18 | 103 | 789 |
| 05:30 PM | 27 | 129 | 19 | 175 | 48 | 20 | 17 | 85 | 24 | 347 | 22 | 393 | 66 | 29 | 17 | 112 | 765 |
| 05:45 PM | 24 | 139 | 23 | 186 | 25 | 32 | 11 | 68 | 19 | 340 | 19 | 378 | 53 | 26 | 11 | 90 | 722 |
| Total | 104 | 573 | 78 | 755 | 160 | 102 | 74 | 336 | 86 | 1372 | 82 | 1540 | 223 | 123 | 68 | 414 | 3045 |
| Grand Total | 285 | 3831 | 324 | 4440 | 525 | 306 | 297 | 1128 | 302 | 3433 | 249 | 3984 | 597 | 338 | 342 | 1277 | 10829 |
| Apprch \% | 6.4 | 86.3 | 7.3 |  | 46.5 | 27.1 | 26.3 |  | 7.6 | 86.2 | 6.2 |  | 46.8 | 26.5 | 26.8 |  |  |
| Total \% | 2.6 | 35.4 | 3 | 41 | 4.8 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 10.4 | 2.8 | 31.7 | 2.3 | 36.8 | 5.5 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 11.8 |  |
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http:de-traffic.com
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File Name : 17_92 at Highbanks
Site Code : 00000006
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Groups Printed- Automobiles - Commercial

|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Factor | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| Automobiles | 268 | 3727 | 302 | 4297 | 508 | 288 | 276 | 1072 | 287 | 3352 | 233 | 3872 | 583 | 326 | 327 | 1236 | 10477 |
| \% Automobiles | 94 | 97.3 | 93.2 | 96.8 | 96.8 | 94.1 | 92.9 | 95 | 95 | 97.6 | 93.6 | 97.2 | 97.7 | 96.4 | 95.6 | 96.8 | 96.7 |
| Commercial | 17 | 104 | 22 | 143 | 17 | 18 | 21 | 56 | 15 | 81 | 16 | 112 | 14 | 12 | 15 | 41 | 352 |
| \% Commercial | 6 | 2.7 | 6.8 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 5.9 | 7.1 | 5 | 5 | 2.4 | 6.4 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 3.2 | 3.3 |

## DE TRAFFIC
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|  | US 17/92 Southbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:45 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:45 AM | 16 | 387 | 21 | 424 | 43 | 21 | 19 | 83 | 19 | 108 | 15 | 142 | 42 | 12 | 24 | 78 | 727 |
| 08:00 AM | 12 | 336 | 36 | 384 | 53 | 25 | 26 | 104 | 24 | 101 | 18 | 143 | 35 | 17 | 16 | 68 | 699 |
| 08:15 AM | 11 | 325 | 30 | 366 | 45 | 19 | 28 | 92 | 16 | 115 | 19 | 150 | 37 | 18 | 26 | 81 | 689 |
| 08:30 AM | 9 | 303 | 25 | 337 | 37 | 18 | 26 | 81 | 13 | 102 | 11 | 126 | 44 | 16 | 21 | 81 | 625 |
| Total Volume | 48 | 1351 | 112 | 1511 | 178 | 83 | 99 | 360 | 72 | 426 | 63 | 561 | 158 | 63 | 87 | 308 | 2740 |
| \% App. Total | 3.2 | 89.4 | 7.4 |  | 49.4 | 23.1 | 27.5 |  | 12.8 | 75.9 | 11.2 |  | 51.3 | 20.5 | 28.2 |  |  |
| PHF | . 750 | . 873 | . 778 | . 891 | . 840 | . 830 | . 884 | . 865 | . 750 | . 926 | . 829 | . 935 | . 898 | . 875 | . 837 | . 951 | . 942 |
| Automobiles | 43 | 1316 | 107 | 1466 | 171 | 77 | 93 | 341 | 70 | 406 | 61 | 537 | 153 | 61 | 83 | 297 | 2641 |
| \% Automobiles | 89.6 | 97.4 | 95.5 | 97.0 | 96.1 | 92.8 | 93.9 | 94.7 | 97.2 | 95.3 | 96.8 | 95.7 | 96.8 | 96.8 | 95.4 | 96.4 | 96.4 |
| Commercial | 5 | 35 | 5 | 45 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 19 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 99 |
| \% Commercial | 10.4 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 7.2 | 6.1 | 5.3 | 2.8 | 4.7 | 3.2 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 4.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
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|  | US 17/92 <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Westbound |  |  |  | US 17/92 Northbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:45 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:45 PM | 25 | 180 | 25 | 230 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 56 | 34 | 347 | 21 | 402 | 34 | 18 | 25 | 77 | 765 |
| 05:00 PM | 27 | 157 | 16 | 200 | 34 | 26 | 26 | 86 | 26 | 328 | 20 | 374 | 52 | 35 | 22 | 109 | 769 |
| 05:15 PM | 26 | 148 | 20 | 194 | 53 | 24 | 20 | 97 | 17 | 357 | 21 | 395 | 52 | 33 | 18 | 103 | 789 |
| 05:30 PM | 27 | 129 | 19 | 175 | 48 | 20 | 17 | 85 | 24 | 347 | 22 | 393 | 66 | 29 | 17 | 112 | 765 |
| Total Volume | 105 | 614 | 80 | 799 | 154 | 89 | 81 | 324 | 101 | 1379 | 84 | 1564 | 204 | 115 | 82 | 401 | 3088 |
| \% App. Total | 13.1 | 76.8 | 10 |  | 47.5 | 27.5 | 25 |  | 6.5 | 88.2 | 5.4 |  | 50.9 | 28.7 | 20.4 |  |  |
| PHF | . 972 | . 853 | . 800 | . 868 | . 726 | . 856 | . 779 | . 835 | . 743 | . 966 | . 955 | . 973 | . 773 | . 821 | . 820 | . 895 | . 978 |
| Automobiles | 100 | 594 | 75 | 769 | 151 | 86 | 76 | 313 | 96 | 1359 | 79 | 1534 | 202 | 114 | 78 | 394 | 3010 |
| \% Automobiles | 95.2 | 96.7 | 93.8 | 96.2 | 98.1 | 96.6 | 93.8 | 96.6 | 95.0 | 98.5 | 94.0 | 98.1 | 99.0 | 99.1 | 95.1 | 98.3 | 97.5 |
| Commercial | 5 | 20 | 5 | 30 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 30 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 78 |
| \% Commercial | 4.8 | 3.3 | 6.3 | 3.8 | 1.9 | 3.4 | 6.2 | 3.4 | 5.0 | 1.5 | 6.0 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 4.9 | 1.7 | 2.5 |

## DE TRAFFIC

http:de-traffic.com

US 17/92 at Highbanks Rd
Volusia County, FL

File Name : 17_92 at Highbanks
Site Code : $00 \overline{0} 00006$
Start Date : 11/29/2018
Page No : 6

# DE TRAFFIC 

http:de-traffic.com
Highbanks Rd at Fort Florida Rd
Volusia County, FL

File Name : Fort at Highbanks Site Code : 00000001 Start Date : 11/28/2018 Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Automobiles - Commercial

|  | N/A Southbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Westbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Northbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 35 |
| 07:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 37 |
| 07:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 42 |
| 07:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 6 | 0 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 18 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 52 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 10 | 0 | 60 | 2 | 0 | 83 | 85 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 21 | 166 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 51 |
| 08:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 28 |
| 08:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 32 |
| 08:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 26 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 9 | 0 | 57 | 1 | 0 | 64 | 65 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 15 | 137 |


| $04: 00 ~ P M ~$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 32 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $04: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 40 |
| $04: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 6 | 0 | 25 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 21 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 48 |
| $04: 45 \mathrm{PM}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 7 | 0 | 28 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 14 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 49 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 21 | 0 | 95 | 12 | 0 | 46 | 58 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 16 | 169 |


| 05:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 24 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 40 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 11 | 0 | 29 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 19 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 57 |
| 05:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 25 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 18 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 50 |
| 05:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 18 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 36 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 32 | 0 | 96 | 27 | 0 | 37 | 64 | 0 | 19 | 4 | 23 | 183 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 72 | 0 | 308 | 42 | 0 | 230 | 272 | 0 | 58 | 17 | 75 | 655 |
| Apprch \% | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 76.6 | 23.4 | 0 |  | 15.4 | 0 | 84.6 |  | 0 | 77.3 | 22.7 |  |  |
| Total \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 11 | 0 | 47 | 6.4 | 0 | 35.1 | 41.5 | 0 | 8.9 | 2.6 | 11.5 |  |

## DE TRAFFIC

http:de-traffic.com
Highbanks Rd at Fort Florida Rd
Volusia County, FL

Groups Printed- Automobiles - Commercial

|  | N/A <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Westbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Northbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Automobiles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 232 | 62 | 0 | 294 | 40 | 0 | 224 | 264 | 0 | 50 | 16 | 66 | 624 |
| \% Automobiles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98.3 | 86.1 | 0 | 95.5 | 95.2 | 0 | 97.4 | 97.1 | 0 | 86.2 | 94.1 | 88 | 95.3 |
| Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 31 |
| \% Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.7 | 13.9 | 0 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 0 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 0 | 13.8 | 5.9 | 12 | 4.7 |

## DE TRAFFIC

http:de-traffic.com
Highbanks Rd at Fort Florida Rd
Volusia County, FL

File Name : Fort at Highbanks
Site Code : 00000001
Start Date : 11/28/2018 Page
No : 3

|  | N/A <br> Southbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Westbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Northbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:15 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 37 |
| 07:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 42 |
| 07:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 6 | 0 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 18 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 52 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 51 |
| Total Volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 10 | 0 | 73 | 2 | 0 | 83 | 85 | 0 | 16 | 8 | 24 | 182 |
| \% App. Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 86.3 | 13.7 | 0 |  | 2.4 | 0 | 97.6 |  | 0 | 66.7 | 33.3 |  |  |
| PHF | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 788 | . 417 | . 000 | . 702 | . 500 | . 000 | . 865 | . 885 | . 000 | . 667 | . 667 | . 750 | . 875 |
| Automobiles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 7 | 0 | 66 | 1 | 0 | 78 | 79 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 23 | 168 |
| \% Automobiles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93.7 | 70.0 | 0 | 90.4 | 50.0 | 0 | 94.0 | 92.9 | 0 | 93.8 | 100 | 95.8 | 92.3 |
| Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 14 |
| \% Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.3 | 30.0 | 0 | 9.6 | 50.0 | 0 | 6.0 | 7.1 | 0 | 6.3 | 0 | 4.2 | 7.7 |

## DE TRAFFIC

Highbanks Rd at Fort Florida Rd Volusia County, FL


File Name : Fort at Highbanks
Site Code : 00000001 Start Date : 11/28/2018 Page No : 4

## DE TRAFFIC

http:de-traffic.com
Highbanks Rd at Fort Florida Rd
Volusia County, FL

File Name : Fort at Highbanks Site Code : 00000001
Start Date : 11/28/2018 Page
No : 5

|  | N/A Southbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Westbound |  |  |  | Fort Florida Rd Northbound |  |  |  | Highbanks Rd Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:45 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 7 | 0 | 28 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 14 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 49 |
| 05:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 24 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 40 |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 11 | 0 | 29 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 19 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 57 |
| 05:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 25 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 18 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 50 |
| Total Volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 32 | 0 | 106 | 21 | 0 | 41 | 62 | 0 | 22 | 6 | 28 | 196 |
| \% App. Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 69.8 | 30.2 | 0 |  | 33.9 | 0 | 66.1 |  | 0 | 78.6 | 21.4 |  |  |
| PHF | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 881 | . 727 | . 000 | . 914 | . 583 | . 000 | . 788 | . 816 | . 000 | . 917 | . 500 | . 778 | . 860 |
| Automobiles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 28 | 0 | 102 | 21 | 0 | 41 | 62 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 24 | 188 |
| \% Automobiles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 87.5 | 0 | 96.2 | 100 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 86.4 | 83.3 | 85.7 | 95.9 |
| Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 8 |
| \% Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12.5 | 0 | 3.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13.6 | 16.7 | 14.3 | 4.1 |

## DE TRAFFIC

Highbanks Rd at Fort Florida Rd Volusia County, FL


File Name : Fort at Highbanks
Site Code : 00000001
Start Date : 11/28/2018 Page No : 6






# APPENDIX D INTERSECTIONS HCS SUMMARYEXISTING CONDITIONS 

| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | ACP | Intersection | Fort Florida at Barwick |
| Agency/Co. | LTG | Jurisdiction | Volusia |
| Date Performed | $12 / 3 / 2018$ | East/West Street | Fort Florida Road |
| Analysis Year | 2018 | North/South Street | Barwick Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak-Hour Existing | Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 4628.12 |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 78 | 16 |  | 12 | 43 |  |  | 7 |  | 22 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 43 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 4.12 |  |  |  | 6.83 |  | 6.34 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 2.22 |  |  |  | 3.89 |  | 3.43 |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | ACP | Intersection | Fort Florida at Barwick |
| Agency/Co. | LTG | Jurisdiction | Volusia |
| Date Performed | $12 / 3 / 2018$ | East/West Street | Fort Florida Road |
| Analysis Year | 2018 | North/South Street | Barwick Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak-Hour Existing | Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 4628.12 |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 33 | 8 |  | 15 | 101 |  |  | 22 |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 4.17 |  |  |  | 6.42 |  | 6.40 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 2.26 |  |  |  | 3.52 |  | 3.48 |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


General Information

| Analyst | AC |
| :--- | :---: |
| Agency/Co. | LT |
| Date Performed | $12 / 3$ |
| Analysis Year | 20 |
| Time Analyzed | AM |
| Intersection Orientation | N |
| Project Description | 46 |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |  | L | T |  |  | L | T | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 25 |  | 89 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 55 | 487 |  | 2 | 0 | 1983 | 31 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 8 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 8 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 7.5 | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 6.4 | 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 7.66 | 7.00 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.26 |  |  | 6.44 | 4.14 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 2.5 | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.58 | 3.35 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.28 |  |  | 2.52 | 2.22 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | ACP | Intersection | Fort Florida at US 17/92 |
| Agency/Co. | LTG | Jurisdiction | Volusia |
| Date Performed | $12 / 3 / 2018$ | East/West Street | US 17/92 |
| Analysis Year | 2018 | North/South Street | Fort Florida Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak-Hour Existing | Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 4628.12 |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |  | L | T |  |  | L | T | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 27 |  | 55 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 204 | 2072 |  | 3 | 0 | 731 | 54 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 4 |  | 6 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 7.5 | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 6.4 | 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 7.58 | 7.02 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.14 |  |  | 6.44 | 4.14 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 2.5 | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.54 | 3.36 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.22 |  |  | 2.52 | 2.22 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | ACP | Intersection | US 17/92 at Barwick Road |
| Agency/Co. | LTG | Jurisdiction | Volusia |
| Date Performed | $12 / 3 / 2018$ | East/West Street | US 17/92 |
| Analysis Year | 2018 | North/South Street | Barwick Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak-Hour Existing | Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 4628.12 |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | T | TR |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 4 | 0 | 31 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 536 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 1853 | 8 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 25 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 33 |  |  | 0 | 7 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \\| Storage | Left + Thru |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 8.00 | 6.54 | 6.94 | 7.54 | 6.54 | 6.94 | 4.76 |  |  |  | 4.24 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.75 | 4.02 | 3.32 | 3.52 | 4.02 | 3.32 | 2.53 |  |  |  | 2.27 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | ACP | Intersection | US 17/92 at Barwick Road |
| Agency/Co. | LTG | Jurisdiction | Volusia |
| Date Performed | $12 / 32018$ | East/West Street | US 17/92 |
| Analysis Year | 2018 | North/South Street | Barwick Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak-Hour Existing | Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 4628.12 |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | T | TR |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 8 | 0 | 28 |  | 5 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 52 | 2267 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 1030 | 9 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 20 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 |  |  | 0 | 11 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left + Thru |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | ACP | Intersection | Highbanks at Ft Florida |
| Agency/Co. | LTG | Jurisdiction | Volusia |
| Date Performed | $12 / 3 / 2018$ | East/West Street | Highbanks Rd |
| Analysis Year | 2018 | North/South Street | Fort Florida Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak-Hour Existing | Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 4628.12 |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 17 | 8 |  | 66 | 10 |  |  | 2 |  | 86 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  | 50 |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 4.16 |  |  |  | 6.90 |  | 6.26 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 2.25 |  |  |  | 3.95 |  | 3.35 |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | ACP | Intersection | Highbanks at Ft Florida |
| Agency/Co. | LTG | Jurisdiction | Volusia |
| Date Performed | $12 / 3 / 2018$ | East/West Street | Highbanks Rd |
| Analysis Year | 2018 | North/South Street | Fort Florida Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak-Hour Existing | Peak Hour Factor | 0.86 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 4628.12 |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  | TR |  | LT |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 23 | 6 |  | 77 | 33 |  |  | 22 |  | 43 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 4.12 |  |  |  | 6.42 |  | 6.22 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 2.22 |  |  |  | 3.52 |  | 3.32 |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |
| Signal Information |


| Signal Information |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | $1$ | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cycle, s | 131.0 | Reference Phase | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 5.5 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |  | 人1 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.5 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 |  |  |



| Timer Results | EBL |  | EBT | WBL |  | WBT | NBL |  | NBT | SBL |  | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase |  |  | 4 | 3 |  | 8 | 5 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 6 |
| Case Number |  |  | 5.3 | 1.0 |  | 3.0 | 1.1 |  | 3.0 | 1.1 |  | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s |  |  | 18.1 | 21.8 |  | 39.9 | 13.6 |  | 76.2 | 14.9 |  | 77.5 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), s |  |  | 7.5 | 9.0 |  | 7.5 | 8.0 |  | 7.5 | 8.5 |  | 7.5 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s |  |  | 4.1 | 4.0 |  | 4.1 | 4.0 |  | 5.9 | 4.0 |  | 5.9 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s |  |  | 9.3 | 12.3 |  | 9.9 | 4.5 |  | 12.1 | 6.2 |  | 71.5 |
| Green Extension Time ( $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{e}}$ ), s |  |  | 1.3 | 0.5 |  | 1.3 | 0.2 |  | 46.5 | 0.3 |  | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.93 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.76 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 71 | 18 | 76 | 156 | 138 | 74 | 74 | 474 | 89 | 123 | 984 | 984 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1251 | 1870 |  | 1753 | 1870 |  | 1781 | 1696 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1847 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g$ s ) , s | 7.3 | 1.2 |  | 10.3 | 7.9 |  | 2.5 | 10.1 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 67.6 | 69.5 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ), s | 7.3 | 1.2 |  | 10.3 | 7.9 |  | 2.5 | 10.1 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 67.6 | 69.5 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.08 | 0.08 |  | 0.19 | 0.25 |  | 0.57 | 0.52 | 0.62 | 0.57 | 0.53 | 0.53 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h | 156 | 151 |  | 325 | 462 |  | 131 | 1779 | 986 | 553 | 999 | 987 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.456 | 0.119 |  | 0.481 | 0.299 |  | 0.568 | 0.267 | 0.091 | 0.223 | 0.984 | 0.997 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 107.4 | 25.6 |  | 206.6 | 164.9 |  | 58.5 | 180.6 | 44.2 | 72.4 | 1110.2 | 1126.7 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 4.2 | 1.0 |  | 8.0 | 6.5 |  | 2.3 | 6.8 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 43.7 | 45.1 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 0.67 | 0.00 |  | 0.39 | 0.00 |  | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 58.7 | 55.9 |  | 46.8 | 40.1 |  | 30.8 | 17.2 | 9.9 | 13.3 | 29.9 | 30.4 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 2.1 | 0.3 |  | 1.1 | 0.4 |  | 3.8 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 24.6 | 27.8 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | 60.7 | 56.2 | 0.0 | 47.9 | 40.4 | 0.0 | 34.6 | 17.4 | 10.0 | 13.5 | 54.6 | 58.2 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | E | E | A | D | D | A | C | B | A | B | D | E |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 32.4 |  | C | 35.4 |  | D | 18.4 |  | B | 53.8 |  | D |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 43.7 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection Information

|  |  | Intersection Information |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Analysis Date | Dec 4, 2018 | Duration, h | 0.25 |
| Time Period | AM Peak-Hour <br> Existing | PHF | 0.94 |  |
| Analysis Year | 2018 | Analysis Period | $1>7: 00$ |  |
|  | File Name | 3. US 17-92 at Dirksen Dr - AM Existing.xus |  |  | | US 17/92 at Dirksen Dr | File Name | 3. US 17-92 at Dirksen Dr - AM Existing.xus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | 4628.12 Rivington


|  |  | Intersection Information |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Analysis Date | Dec 4, 2018 | Duration, h | 0.25 |
| Time Period | AM Peak-Hour <br> Existing | PHF | 0.94 |  |
| Analysis Year | 2018 | Analysis Period | $1>7: 00$ |  |
|  | File Name | 3. US 17-92 at Dirksen Dr - AM Existing.xus |  |  |

Analysis Year 2018 Analysis Period $1>$ 7:00 LTG
ACP Volusia

US 17/92


\section*{| Demand Information |
| :--- |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |
| Signal Information |}


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.47 | B | 2.30 | B | 2.10 | B | 2.09 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 0.76 | A | 1.10 | A | 1.01 | A | 2.21 | B |

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |
| Signal Information |

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |
| Signal Information |



| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 18.5 | 23.4 | 19.7 | 24.6 | 11.1 | 66.3 | 10.6 | 65.8 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 4.2 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s | 12.0 | 8.8 | 13.3 | 16.3 | 4.6 |  | 3.9 |  |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{e}$ ), s | 0.3 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.93 |  | 0.83 |  |
| Max Out Probability | 0.15 | 0.01 | 0.36 | 0.06 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 174 | 70 | 96 | 197 | 201 |  | 80 | 276 | 266 | 53 | 1495 | 123 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1767 | 1856 | 1547 | 1753 | 1636 |  | 1767 | 1826 | 1743 | 1668 | 1766 | 1560 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 10.0 | 4.1 | 6.8 | 11.3 | 14.3 |  | 2.6 | 10.7 | 10.8 | 1.9 | 44.4 | 5.2 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 10.0 | 4.1 | 6.8 | 11.3 | 14.3 |  | 2.6 | 10.7 | 10.8 | 1.9 | 44.4 | 5.2 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.24 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.25 | 0.15 |  | 0.53 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.53 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h | 257 | 260 | 217 | 398 | 246 |  | 172 | 912 | 870 | 435 | 1749 | 772 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.679 | 0.270 | 0.441 | 0.494 | 0.819 |  | 0.464 | 0.303 | 0.305 | 0.122 | 0.854 | 0.160 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 205.9 | 89.3 | 128.7 | 220.6 | 278.7 |  | 51 | 209.4 | 196.1 | 33.5 | 664.3 | 88.1 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 8.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 8.6 | 10.6 |  | 2.0 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 1.2 | 25.9 | 3.4 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 0.79 | 0.00 | 0.58 | 1.19 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.71 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 39.3 | 46.1 | 47.3 | 37.7 | 49.4 |  | 24.3 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 14.4 | 26.5 | 16.6 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 3.1 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 9.2 |  | 1.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 5.6 | 0.4 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 42.5 | 46.9 | 49.3 | 38.7 | 58.6 |  | 26.3 | 18.6 | 18.7 | 14.5 | 32.1 | 17.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | D | D | D | D | E |  | C | B | B | B | C | B |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 45.3 |  | D | 48.7 |  | D | 19.6 |  | B | 30.4 |  | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 32.3 |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.31 | B | 2.46 | B | 1.91 | B | 2.10 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.05 | A | 1.14 | A | 1.00 | A | 1.87 | B |

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand $(v)$, veh/h |

Intersection Information

## LTG

ACP Volusia

US 17/92 US 17/92 at Highbanks Rd 4628.12 Rivington

| Intersection Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Duration, h | 0.25 |
| Area Type | Other |
| PHF | 0.95 |
|  |  |
|  | Analysis Period |



## Signal Information

| Cycle, s | 150.0 | Reference Phase | 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On |

Timer Results
Assigned Phase

Case Number
Phase Duration, s
Change Period, $(Y+R c)$, s
Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s
Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s
Green Extension Time ( $g e$ ), s
Phase Call Probability
Max Out Probability

| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 223 | 126 | 89 | 168 | 186 |  | 111 | 805 | 796 | 115 | 673 | 87 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1781 | 1870 | 1547 | 1781 | 1710 |  | 1739 | 1870 | 1832 | 1739 | 1766 | 1535 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 16.1 | 9.2 | 7.8 | 12.2 | 16.0 |  | 4.3 | 52.7 | 53.5 | 4.5 | 16.3 | 4.2 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{\text {c }}$ ), s | 16.1 | 9.2 | 7.8 | 12.2 | 16.0 |  | 4.3 | 52.7 | 53.5 | 4.5 | 16.3 | 4.2 |
| Green Ratio ( $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{C}$ ) | 0.25 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.22 | 0.13 |  | 0.58 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.58 | 0.54 | 0.54 |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h | 289 | 294 | 243 | 318 | 218 |  | 433 | 1002 | 981 | 181 | 1896 | 824 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.773 | 0.429 | 0.367 | 0.530 | 0.854 |  | 0.255 | 0.804 | 0.811 | 0.635 | 0.355 | 0.106 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 326.6 | 202 | 147.3 | 241 | 330.2 |  | 80 | 829.8 | 815.4 | 106.7 | 282.6 | 72.4 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 12.9 | 8.0 | 5.7 | 9.5 | 12.9 |  | 3.1 | 32.7 | 32.6 | 4.1 | 11.0 | 2.8 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 1.26 | 0.00 | 0.67 | 1.30 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.46 | 0.00 | 0.58 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 49.3 | 57.1 | 56.5 | 50.5 | 64.1 |  | 15.5 | 28.4 | 28.6 | 29.2 | 19.9 | 17.1 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 11.8 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 20.6 |  | 0.3 | 6.8 | 7.2 | 3.7 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 61.1 | 58.5 | 57.8 | 52.2 | 84.7 |  | 15.8 | 35.3 | 35.9 | 32.8 | 20.4 | 17.3 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | E | E | E | D | F |  | B | D | D | C | C | B |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 59.7 |  | E | 69.3 |  | E | 34.3 |  | C | 21.7 |  | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 38.0 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS
38.0

D

| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.32 | B | 2.47 | B | 1.91 | B | 2.10 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.21 | A | 1.07 | A | 1.90 | B | 1.21 | A |

## APPENDIX E SIGNAL TIMINGS




## APPENDIX F TRAFFIC TRENDS ANALYSIS SHEETS

TRAFFIC TRENDS
Barwick -- Fort Florida Rd to US 17-92

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 127 |
| Highway: | Barwick |



|  | ${ }^{* *}$ Annual Trend Increase: | 50 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $14.5 \%$ |  |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $6.25 \%$ |  |
| Trend Growth Rate (2016 to Design Year): | $5.00 \%$ |  |
| Printed: | 21-Nov-18 |  |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |  |


*Axle-Adjusted

TRAFFIC TRENDS
Dirksen Drive -- US 17/92 to Sunrise Blvd.

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 520 |
| Highway: | Dirksen Drive |




*Axle-Adjusted

TRAFFIC TRENDS
Fort Florida Road -- Barwick Rd to US 17-92

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 660 |
| Highway: | Fort Florida Road |



| ** Annual Trend Increase: | 80 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $69.6 \%$ |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $5.77 \%$ |
| Trend Growth Rate (2016 to Design Year): | $5.21 \%$ |
| Printed: | 21-Nov-18 |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |


| Year | Traffic (ADT/AADT) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count* | Trend** |
| 2012 | 1400 | 1300 |
| 2013 | 1300 | 1400 |
| 2014 | 1400 | 1500 |
| 2015 | 1500 | 1500 |
| 2016 | 1700 | 1600 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2018 Opening Year Trend |  |  |
| 2018 | N/A | 1800 |
| 2020 Mid-Year Trend |  |  |
| 2020 | N/A | 1900 |
| 2022 Design Year Trend |  |  |
| 2022 | N/A | 2100 |
| TRANPLAN Forecasts/Trends |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

*Axle-Adjusted

TRAFFIC TRENDS
Fort Florida Road -- Ft. Florida Point Rd to Barwick Rd

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 662 |
| Highway: | Fort Florida Road |



| ** Annual Trend Increase: | 80 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $57.1 \%$ |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $10.71 \%$ |
| Trend Growth Rate (2016 to Design Year): | $8.33 \%$ |
| Printed: | 21-Nov-18 |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |


*Axle-Adjusted

TRAFFIC TRENDS
Fort Florida Road -- Highbanks Dr. to Ft. Florida Point Rd

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 661 |
| Highway: | Fort Florida Road |



| ${ }^{* *}$ Annual Trend Increase: | 80 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $45.7 \%$ |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $10.00 \%$ |
| Trend Growth Rate (2016 to Design Year): | $4.76 \%$ |
| Printed: | $21-\mathrm{Nov}-18$ |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |


*Axle-Adjusted

TRAFFIC TRENDS
Highbanks Rd -- Donald E Smith Blvd to US 17-92

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 861 |
| Highway: | Highbanks Rd |



| ${ }^{* *}$ Annual Trend Increase: | 100 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $1.6 \%$ |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $1.06 \%$ |
| Trend Growth Rate (2016 to Design Year): | $1.02 \%$ |
| Printed: | $21-$ Nov-18 |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |


*Axle-Adjusted

TRAFFIC TRENDS
Highbanks Rd -- Fort Florida Rd to Donald E Smith Blvd

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 860 |
| Highway: | Highbanks Rd |




*Axle-Adjusted

TRAFFIC TRENDS
Highbanks Rd -- US 17-92 to Enterprise Rd

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 863 |
| Highway: | Highbanks Rd |



| ${ }^{* *}$ Annual Trend Increase: | 240 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $94.1 \%$ |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $3.08 \%$ |
| Trend Growth Rate (2016 to Design Year): | $3.05 \%$ |
| Printed: | 21-Nov-18 |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |


*Axle-Adjusted

TRAFFIC TRENDS
US 17-92 -- Barwick Rd. to Seminole/Volusia County Line

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 0040-S |
| Highway: | US 17-92 |



| ${ }^{* *}$ Annual Trend Increase: | 2,000 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $94.8 \%$ |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $9.26 \%$ |
| Trend Growth Rate (2017 to Design Year): | $6.76 \%$ |
| Printed: | $21-\mathrm{Nov-18}$ |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |


*Axle-Adjusted

TRAFFIC TRENDS
US 17-92 -- DeBary Plantation Blvd. to Highbanks Rd.

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 8 |
| Highway: | US 17-92 |



| ** Annual Trend Increase: | 850 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $85.0 \%$ |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $3.81 \%$ |
| Trend Growth Rate (2017 to Design Year): | $3.35 \%$ |
| Printed: | 21-Nov-18 |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |


*Axle-Adjusted

TRAFFIC TRENDS
US 17-92 -- Dirksen Dr. to Fort Florida Rd.

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 101 |
| Highway: | US 17-92 |



| ** Annual Trend Increase: | 1,450 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $70.6 \%$ |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $6.47 \%$ |
| Trend Growth Rate (2017 to Design Year): | $5.18 \%$ |
| Printed: | $21-$ Nov-18 |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |


*Axle-Adjusted

TRAFFIC TRENDS
US 17-92 -- Fort Florida Rd. to Barwick Rd.

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | $0040-S$ |
| Highway: | US 17-92 |



| ${ }^{* *}$ Annual Trend Increase: | 2,000 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $94.8 \%$ |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $9.26 \%$ |
| Trend Growth Rate (2017 to Design Year): | $6.76 \%$ |
| Printed: | $21-$ Nov-18 |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |


*Axle-Adjusted

TRAFFIC TRENDS
US 17-92 -- Highbanks Rd. to Valencia Rd.

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 7 |
| Highway: | US 17-92 |



| ${ }^{* *}$ Annual Trend Increase: | 1,100 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $91.7 \%$ |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $5.19 \%$ |
| Trend Growth Rate (2017 to Design Year): | $4.30 \%$ |
| Printed: | $21-$ Nov-18 |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |


*Axle-Adjusted

TRAFFIC TRENDS
US 17-92 -- Valencia Rd. to Dirksen Dr.

| County: | Volusia |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 479 |
| Highway: | US 17-92 |



| ** Annual Trend Increase: | 600 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $67.9 \%$ |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $2.86 \%$ |
| Trend Growth Rate (2017 to Design Year): | $2.56 \%$ |
| Printed: | 21-Nov-18 |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |


*Axle-Adjusted

# APPENDIX G VESTED TRAFFIC AND TRIP ASSIGNMENT SPREADSHEETS 

City of DeBary Vested Trip Database

| Roadway | Segment |  | Developments Approved - Total P.M. Peak-Hour Trips |  |  |  |  | Total Vested Trips |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | From | To | Integra / Hawthorn | Riviera Bella East | Springview Unit 8 Residential | Wal-Mart (Revised 10/2015) | Wal-Mart <br> Remaining <br> Outparcels |  |
|  |  |  | 177 | 151 | 192 | 317 | 76 | 596 |
| 1-4 | Seminole County | Dirksen Dr. | 6 |  |  | 11 | 3 | 9 |
|  | Dirksen Dr. | Saxon Blvd. | 13 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 13 |
| US 17/92 | Saxon Blvd. | DeBary Plantation Blvd. |  |  |  | 159 | 38 | 38 |
|  | DeBary Plantation Blvd. | Highbanks Rd. |  |  |  | 166 | 40 | 40 |
|  | Highbanks Rd. | Valencia Rd. |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | Valencia Rd. | Dirksen Dr. | 41 |  | 100 |  |  | 141 |
|  | Dirksen Dr. | Ft Florida Rd. | 108 |  |  |  |  | 108 |
|  | Ft Florida Rd. | Barwick Rd. | 106 | 123 |  |  |  | 229 |
|  | Barwick Rd. | Seminole Co. Line |  | 123 |  |  |  | 123 |
| Barwick Rd. | Ft Florida Rd. | US 17/92 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Dirksen Dr. | US 17/92 | Sunrise Blvd. | 28 |  |  |  |  | 28 |
|  | Sunrise Blvd. | WB I-4 Ramps | 30 |  |  |  |  | 30 |
|  | WB I-4 Ramps | EB I-4 Ramps | 23 |  |  |  |  | 23 |
|  | EB I-4 Ramps | Deltona Blvd. | 15 |  |  |  |  | 15 |
|  | Deltona Blvd. | Enterprise St. |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Ft. Florida Rd. | Highbanks Rd. | Ft Florida Point Rd. |  | 151 |  |  |  | 151 |
|  | Ft Florida Point Rd. | Barwick Rd. |  | 151 |  |  |  | 151 |
|  | Barwick Rd. | US 17/92 |  | 151 |  |  |  | 151 |
| Highbanks Rd. | Ft Florida Rd. | Westside Connector |  | 123 |  |  |  | 123 |
|  | Westside Connector | US 17/92 | 2 | 96 | 35 |  |  | 133 |
|  | US 17/92 | Enterprise Rd. |  | 27 |  |  |  | 27 |
| Saxon Blvd. | US 17/92 | Enterprise Rd. |  |  |  | 95 | 23 | 23 |
|  | Enterprise Rd. | Veterans Memorial Pkwy |  |  |  | 88 | 21 | 21 |
|  | Veterans Memorial Pkwy | FDOT Park \& Ride |  |  |  | 72 | 17 | 17 |
|  | FDOT Park \& Ride | 1-4 |  |  |  | 70 | 17 | 17 |
|  | 1-4 | Finland Dr. |  |  |  | 41 | 10 | 10 |
| Shell Rd. | Highbanks Rd. | Sanford Ave. |  |  | 38 |  |  | 38 |
|  | Sanford Ave. | Benson Junction Rd. |  |  | 38 |  |  | 38 |
| Spring Vista Dr. | (dead end) | Shell Rd. |  |  | 192 |  |  | 192 |
|  | Shell Rd. | US 17/92 |  |  | 144 |  |  | 144 |


| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Hawthorn Landing / Integra |  | Riviera Bella East PM | Springview Unit 8 Residential |  | Wal-Mart |  |  |  | AM Total | PM Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM | PM |  | AM | PM | AM | Outparcel AM | PM | Outparcel PM |  |  |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Left |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 10 |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Right |  |  | 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 46 |
|  | Westbound | U-Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Northbound | U-Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Left |  |  | 78 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 78 |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Southbound | U-Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Right |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 17 |


| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Hawthorn Landing / Integra |  | Riviera <br> Bella East <br> PM | Springview Unit 8 Residential |  | Wal-Mart |  |  |  | AM Total | PM Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM | PM |  | AM | PM | AM | Outparcel AM | PM | Outparcel PM |  |  |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Westbound | U-Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Left | 5 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 18 |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 4 | 17 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 17 |
|  | Northbound | U-Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Left | 17 | 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 38 |
|  |  | Through | 27 | 14 |  | 15 | 45 |  |  |  |  | 42 | 59 |
|  |  | Right | 18 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 | 10 |
|  | Southbound | U-Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 11 | 7 |  |  |  |  | 11 | 7 |
|  |  | Through | 7 | 27 |  | 45 | 29 |  |  |  |  | 52 | 56 |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |


| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Hawthorn Landing / Integra |  | Riviera Bella East PM | Springview Unit 8 Residential |  | Wal-Mart |  |  |  | AM Total | PM Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM | PM |  | AM | PM | AM | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Outparcel } \\ 54.76 \%: \text { AM } \end{array}$ | PM | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Outparcel } \\ \text { 23.97\%: PM } \end{array}$ |  |  |
|  | Eastbound | U-Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Left |  |  | 25 | 11 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 13 | 27 |
|  |  | Through |  |  | 10 | 9 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 9 | 16 |
|  |  | Right |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 |
|  | Westbound | U-Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4 |
|  |  | Through |  |  | 17 | 3 | 10 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 27 |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  |  |  | 24 | 13 | 20 | 5 | 13 | 5 |
|  | Northbound | U-Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Left |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 9 |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  | 21 | 14 | 51 | 28 | 43 | 10 | 49 | 24 |
|  |  | Right |  |  |  | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2 |
|  | Southbound | U-Turn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Left |  |  |  |  |  | 19 | 10 | 20 | 5 | 10 | 5 |
|  |  | Through |  |  |  | 8 | 24 | 40 | 22 | 42 | 10 | 30 | 34 |
|  |  | Right |  |  | 43 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 56 |

Table 6A
Hawthorn Landing
Future (YR 2019) 2-Way PM Peak Hour Roadway Analysis

| Roadway | No. of Lanes | Critical / NearCritical | Level of Service |  | 2016 2-Way PM Peak Hour * | Count Year | Growth Rate ** | $\begin{gathered} \text { Vested } \\ \text { Trips**** } \end{gathered}$ | Background Traffic |  | YR 2019 Project Traffic |  | Total Traffic | Project |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Adopted LOS | MSV |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Background } \\ \text { Total*** } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Deficient } \\ & \text { Yes/No } \end{aligned}$ | Trips | ect |  | Deficient Yes/No | Deficiency Yes/No | Remaining Capacity |
| 1-4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seminole County to Dirksen Dr. | 6 | Critical | D | 10,060 | 9,900 | 2016 | 2.0\% |  | 10,494 | YES | 6 | 3.02\% | 10,500 | YES | No | -440 |
| Dirksen Dr. to Saxon Blva. | 6 | Critical | D | 10,060 | 9,720 | 2016 | 3.5\% |  | 10,754 | YES | 13 | 7.24\% | 10,767 | YES | No | -707 |
| US 17/92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valencia Rd. to Dirksen Dr. | 4 |  | D | 3,580 | 1,863 | 2016 | 2.0\% | 336 | 2,311 | No | 41 | 23.05\% | 2,352 | No | No | 1,228 |
| Dirksen Dr. to Project Entrance | 4 |  | D | 3,580 | 2,819 | 2016 | 4.2\% | 463 | 3,638 | YES | 70 | 39.44\% | 3,708 | YES | No | -128 |
| Project Entrance to Ft. Florida Rd. | 4 |  | D | 3,580 | 2,819 | 2016 | 4.2\% | 463 | 3,638 | YES | 108 | 60.56\% | 3,746 | YES | No | -166 |
| Ft. Florida Rd. to Barwick Rd. | 4 |  | D | 3,580 | 2,753 | 2016 | 7.6\% | 463 | 3,844 | YES | 106 | 59.34\% | 3,950 | YES | No | -370 |
| Dirksen Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| US 17/92 to Sunrise Blvd. | 2 |  | D | 1,230 | 1,327 | 2016 | 9.4\% | 203 | 1,905 | YES | 28 | 15.77\% | 1,933 | YES | No | -703 |
| Sunrise Blvd. to WB I-4 Ramps | 2 | Critical | D | 1,230 | 1,451 | 2016 | 5.7\% |  | 1,699 | YES | 30 | 16.72\% | 1,729 | YES | No | -499 |
| $1-4$ to Deltona Blvd. | 4 | Near Critical | D | 2,740 | 2,378 | 2016 | 3.1\% |  | 2,600 | No | 15 | 8.22\% | 2,615 | NO | No | 125 |
| Highbanks Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Westside Connector to US 17/92 | 2 | Near Critical | D | 960 | 1,027 | 2016 | 2.0\% |  | 1,089 | YES | 2 | 0.75\% | 1,091 | YES | No | -131 |

## ource:

VHB, Inc.
Notes:
*Data from 2016 Volusia County 2016 AADT and Historical Counts, I-4 Peak Hour uses K factor of 9.0 from permanent count station 799906.
** Trend derived from latest 5 years of Daily Traffic Counts
*** highest of growth versus vested trips
**** Vested trips include the following projects: Springview TIA, 2017 Transportation Needs Assessment


## Evhb. Figure 4

Future AM Traffic Volumes


N | ........ |
| :--- |
| Future Road |

$X+(X)=X x$ —Total Traffic
,

### 4.2 Roadway Segment Analysis

Roadway segment capacity was analyzed by comparing the traffic volumes on the study roadway segments to the service volumes at the adopted Level of Service (LOS) standard. Service Volumes were obtained from Volusia County's 2014 Annual Daily Traffic \& Historical Counts, included in Appendix E. The roadway segment analysis is summarized in Table 4.

Table 4
Segment Capacity Analysis

|  | Segment | Sta <br> Num | \# of <br> Lns | $\begin{gathered} \text { SV @ } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \text { Std } \end{gathered}$ | Existing |  | Projected Backg'd |  | Project Trips |  | Total Projected |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway |  |  |  |  | Vol | Deficient (Yes/No)? | Vol | Deficient (Yes/No)? | Distrib (\%) | Vol | Vol | Deficient (Yes/No)? |
| US 17/92 | Ft. Florida Rd to Barwick Rd | 0040-S | 4 | 3,580 | 2,435 | No | 2,746 | No | 45\% | 123 | 2,869 | No |
|  | Barwick Rd to Seminole Co Line | 0040-S | 4 | 3,580 | 2,509 | No | 2,828 | No | 45\% | 123 | 2,951 | No |
| Fort Florida Rd | Highbanks Rd to Ft. Florida Point Rd | 661 | 2 | 1,020 | 615 | No | 760 | No | 55\% | 151 | 911 | No |
|  | Ft. Florida Point Rd to Barwick Rd | 662 | 2 | 1,020 | 395 | No | 518 | No | 55\% | 151 | 669 | No |
|  | Barwick Rd. to US 17/92 | 660 | 2 | 1,020 | 175 | No | 276 | No | 55\% | 151 | 427 | No |
| Highbanks Rd | Fort Forida Ra. Io westside Connector | 860 | 2 | 1,150 | 615 | No | 744 | No | 45\% | 123 | 867 | No |
|  | Westside Connector to US 17/92 | 861 | 2 | 960 | 615 | No | 729 | No | 35\% | 96 | 825 | No |
|  | US 17/92 to Enterprise Rd | 863 | 2 | 1,150 | 615 | No | 692 | No | 10\% | 27 | 719 | No |

Service Volume obtained from Volusia County 2014 Annual Daily Traffic \& Historical Counts Tables
Existing Volumes were obtained from Intersection Volume Counts (2015)
Projected Background Volumes include traffic from Riviera Bella West

The results of the analysis indicate that all the study roadway segments currently operate within their adopted capacity and are projected to continue to do so at project buildout in 2020.

Riviera Bella East
Project № 15-034 (Rev 01/16)

## Legend:

Background+\{RBW* $\}+$ (Project)=Total
*RBW is traffic from the undeveloped portion of Riviera Bella West


## PROJECTED TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Projected traffic conditions for the project buildout in 2019 were analyzed using peak hour traffic volumes for the study roadway segments and intersections. The analysis was conducted for the projected background traffic volumes plus project trips. Background traffic was determined by applying a growth factor to existing traffic. A trends analysis of historical AADT data obtained from Volusia County on US 17-92 and Shell Road revealed a growth rate ranging from (-)0.10\% to (+)0.74\%. The trends analysis charts are included in Appendix F. Therefore, a minimum of $2 \%$ annual growth was used in the background traffic estimation. Background traffic volumes were then combined with project trips to obtain total traffic volumes.

## Roadway Segment Analysis

A roadway segment analysis was performed for the study segments by comparing the projected P.M. peak hour volumes of the segments with the corresponding capacities at the adopted LOS standard. The analysis is summarized in Table 4. The results of the analysis show that the study roadway segments will continue to operate at a satisfactory Levels of Service in the projected conditions.

Table 4
Projected Roadway Capacity Analysis
(2-Way P.M. Peak Hour)

| Seg ID | Roadway | Segment | Backg'd Vol* | Project Trips** |  | Capacity | Total Vol | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Dist | Vol |  |  |  |
| -- | Spring Vista Dr | Project Site to Shell Rd | 199 | 100\% | 192 | 960 | 391 | C |
| -- | Spring Vista Dr | Shell Rd to US 17-92 | 219 | 75\% | 144 | 960 | 363 | C |
| 479 | US 17-92 | Dirksen Dr to Valencia Rd | 2,272 | 52\% | 100 | 3,580 | 2,372 | C |
| 1700 | Shell Rd | Benson Junction Rd to Sanford Ave | 188 | 20\% | 38 | 960 | 226 | C |
| 1701 | Shell Rd | Sanford Ave to Highbanks Rd | 188 | 20\% | 38 | 960 | 226 | C |
| 861 | Highbanks Rd | Westside Connector to US 17-92 | 905 | 18\% | 35 | 960 | 940 | D |

*Existing X 1.06
**Highest percentage on the segment


Springview Unit 8
Project № 4867
Figure 5
Projected A.M. Peak Hour Intersection Volumes


Table 8
2016 Build-Out P.M. Peak-Hour Two Way LOS- Roadway Segments
Shoppes at Pine Meadow BPUD

| Roadway | Segment | Lanes | Adopted LOS $^{1}$ | Peak-Hour Two-Way Capacity at Adopted LOS $^{2}$ | PeakHour Two-Way Volume | Growth Factor | Background Volume | Background LOS | Project Distribution | Project Trips | Build-Out P.M. Peak-Hour Two-Way Volume | Build-Out LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Significant Segments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| US 17-92 | Saxon Blvd to DeBary Plantation Blvd | 4 | D | 3,420 | 2,340 | 1.03 | 2,410 | C | 50.2\% | 159 | 2,569 | C |
|  | DeBary Plantation Blvd to Highbanks Rd | 4 | D | 3,420 | 1,980 | 1.03 | 2,039 | C | 52.5\% | 166 | 2,206 | C |
| Saxon Blvd | US 17-92 to Enterprise Rd | 4 | E | 2,736 | 1,256 | 1.03 | 1,294 | D | 30.1\% | 95 | 1,390 | D |
| Critical and Near Critical Segments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Saxon Blvd | Enterprise Rd to Veterans Memorial Pkwy | 6 | E | 5,390 | 2,508 | 1.03 | 2,584 | C | 27.7\% | 88 | 2,671 | C |
|  | Veterans Memorial Pkwy to FDOT Park \& Ride | 6 | E | 5,390 | 3,270 | 1.03 | 3,368 | C | 22.6\% | 72 | 3,439 | C |
|  | FDOT Park \& Ride to l-4 | 6 | E | 5,390 | 3,280 | 1.03 | 3,378 | C | 22.2\% | 70 | 3,448 | C |
|  | I-4 to Finland Dr | 4 | E | 3,383 | 3,098 | 1.03 | 3,191 | C | 12.9\% | 41 | 3,232 | C |
| I-4 | Seminole County to Dirksen Dr | 6 | C | 8,370 | 9,720 | 1.03 | 10,012 | D | 3.5\% | 11 | 10,023 | D |
|  | Dirksen Dr to Saxon Blvd | 6 | C | 8,370 | 8,676 | 1.03 | 8,936 | D | 0.7\% | 2 | 8,938 | D |
|  | Saxon Blvd to SR 472 | 6 | C | 8,370 | 7,965 | 1.05 | 8,364 | C | 4.2\% | 14 | 8,377 | D |
| Graves Ave | Veterans Memorial Pkwy to Kentucky Ave | 2 | E | 1,440 | 1,508 | 1.03 | 1,553 | F | 2.7\% | 9 | 1,561 | F |
| Veterans Memorial Pkwy | Rhode Island Ave to Harley Strickland Blvd | 2 | E | 1,440 | 1,620 | 1.03 | 1,669 | F | 4.2\% | 13 | 1,682 | F |

${ }^{1}$ Per Volusia County Traffic Concurrency Spreadsheet and City of DeBary, Orange City, and Deltona Comprehensive Plans
${ }^{2}$ Per 2013 Quality Level of Service Handbook

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 106＋ <br> Pine Meadow Dr |  | Proposed Site $]=91$ | SEE FIGURE 7B FORSITE ACCESS BUILD－OUT TRAFFIC |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 141+(4)=145 \\ 90 \\ 139 \end{array}$ | $\uparrow \uparrow \upharpoonright$ <br> 领然领 <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | A．M．Peak－Hour | Enter | Exit | Total |
|  |  |  |  | Project Trips | 187 | 149 | 336 |
|  |  |  |  | Pass－By Trips | 90 | 86 | 176 |
|  |  |  |  | Total | 277 | 235 | 512 |
| Shoppes at Pine Meadow BPUD | 2016 Build－Out Traffic A．M．Peak－Hour |  | Lassiter Transportation Group，Inc． <br> Engineering and Planning |  |  |  |  |
|  | Project No．： 3940.02 | Figure：7A | $\begin{array}{ccc} \hline 123 \text { Live Oak Avenue - Daytona Beach, Florida } 32114 \\ \text { Telephone: } 386.257 .2571 & \text { Fax: 386.257.6996 } & \text { EB\# } 0009227 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |







| Walmart | Trip Gen: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Net External Trips (less Internal \& Pass-By) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Period | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Land } \\ & \text { Use } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \hline \text { Land } \\ \text { Use } \\ \text { Code } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Trip Rate Equation | Quantity | Units | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { Trips (T) } \end{aligned}$ | Percent Entering | Percent Exiting | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Trips } \\ \text { Entering } \end{array}$ | Trips Exiting | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Daily | Supermarket | 850 | $\mathrm{T}=102.24$ (X) | 41.12 | KSF | 4,204 | 50\% | 50\% | 2,102 | 2,102 | 1098 | 1098 | 2195 |
|  | Specialty Retail | 826 | $\mathrm{T}=44.32$ (X) | 11.2 | KSF | 496 | 50\% | 50\% | 248 | 248 | 73 | 73 | 146 |
|  | Coffee Shop w/ Drive-Thru | 937 | $\mathrm{T}=818.58$ (X) | 2 | KSF | 1,637 | 50\% | 50\% | 819 | 819 | 316 | 316 | 632 |
|  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Fast-Food Restaurant w/ Drive- } \\ \text { Thru }\end{array}$ | 934 | $\mathrm{T}=496.12$ ( X$)$ | 3.5 | KSF | 1,736 | 50\% | 50\% | 868 | 868 | 334 | 334 | 668 |
|  | Totals: |  |  |  |  | 8,074 |  |  | 4,037 | 4,037 | 1821 | 1821 | 3641 |
| AM PeakHour | Supermarket | 850 | $\mathrm{T}=3.4(\mathrm{X})$ | 41.12 | KSF | 140 | 62\% | 38\% | 87 | 53 | 87 | 53 | 140 |
|  | Specialty Retail | 826 | $\mathrm{T}=1.06$ (X) | 11.2 | KSF | 12 | 62\% | 38\% | 7 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 12 |
|  | Coffee Shop w/ Drive-Thru | 937 | $\mathrm{T}=100.58$ (X) | 2 | KSF | 201 | 51\% | 49\% | 103 | 99 | 52 | 51 | 103 |
|  | Fast-Food Restaurant w/ Drive- Thru | 934 | $\mathrm{T}=45.42$ (X) | 3.5 | KSF | 159 | 51\% | 49\% | 81 | 78 | 41 | 40 | 81 |
|  | Totals: |  |  |  |  | 512 |  |  | 278 | 235 | 187 | 149 | 336 |
| PM PeakHour | Supermarket | 850 | $\mathrm{T}=9.48$ (X) | 41.12 | KSF | 390 | 51\% | 49\% | 199 | 191 | 111 | 107 | 218 |
|  | Specialty Retail | 826 | $\mathrm{T}=2.4(\mathrm{X})+21.48$ | 11.2 | KSF | 48 | 44\% | 56\% | 21 | 27 | 10 | 13 | 23 |
|  | Coffee Shop w/ Drive-Thru | 937 | $\mathrm{T}=42.8$ (X) | 2 | KSF | 86 | 50\% | 50\% | 43 | 43 | 17 | 16 | 33 |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Fast-Food Restaurant w/ Drive- } \\ \text { Thru } \end{array}$ | 934 | T=32.65(X) | 3.5 | KSF | 114 | 52\% | 48\% | 59 | 55 | 22 | 21 | 43 |
|  | Totals: |  |  |  |  | 638 |  |  | 322 | 316 | 160 | 157 | 317 |

Wal-Mart
\% of Total
Outparcels Only Enter Exit Total Development $\begin{array}{lrrrr}\text { Daily } & 650 & 650 & 1300 & 35.70 \% \\ \text { AM } & 93 & 91 & 184 & 54.76 \%\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { PM } & 39 & 37 & 76 & 23.97 \%\end{array}$
A.M. Peak-Hour Turning Movements

|  | Approach | Mvmn't. | 2019 Existing Traffic |  |  |  | PHF $=0.89$ <br> \% Trucks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count |  | Seasonal Factor | TMCAdjusted Volume |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Trucks |  |  |  |
|  | Eastbound | Left | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 75 | 3 | 1.04 | 78 | 4.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 15 | 0 | 1.04 | 16 | 0.0\% |
|  | Westbound | Left | 12 | 0 | 1.04 | 12 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 41 | 6 | 1.04 | 43 | 14.6\% |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Northbound | Left | 7 | 3 | 1.04 | 7 | 42.9\% |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 21 | 3 | 1.04 | 22 | 14.3\% |
|  | Southbound | Left |  | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |


| 2022 Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2022 Build-Out Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT Historial Growth Method |  |  | Vested Trip Method |  | Applied Growth | Total <br> Background Volume | ExternalProject Trips | Total Build-Out Volume |
| Growth Rate | Growth Factor | Projected | Peak-Hour Trips | Projected Growth |  |  |  |  |
| 8.33\% | 1.33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8.33\% | 1.33 | 104 | 0 | 78 | Historical | 104 | 153 | 257 |
| 8.33\% | 1.33 | 21 | 0 | 16 | Historical | 21 | 0 | 21 |
| 5.21\% | 1.21 | 15 | 0 | 12 | Historical | 15 | 35 | 50 |
| 5.21\% | 1.21 | 52 | 0 | 43 | Historical | 52 | 40 | 92 |
| 5.21\% | 1.21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5.00\% | 1.20 | 8 | 0 | 7 | Historical | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| 5.00\% | 1.20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5.00\% | 1.20 | 26 | 0 | 22 | Historical | 26 | 79 | 105 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Two-Way Stop |  |  |  | 2019 Ex | g Traffic |  | PHF $=0.95$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Seasonal | TMC |  |
| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Total | Trucks | Factor | Volume | \% Trucks |
|  | Eastbound | Left | 4 | 1 | 1.04 | 4 | 25.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 30 | 0 | 1.04 | 31 | 0.0\% |
|  | Westbound | Left | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 1 | 0 | 1.04 | 1 | 0.0\% |
|  | Northbound | Left | 21 | 7 | 1.04 | 22 | 33.3\% |
|  |  | Through | 515 | 45 | 1.04 | 536 | 8.7\% |
|  |  | Right | 3 | 0 | 1.04 | 3 | 0.0\% |
|  | Southbound | Left | 15 | 1 | 1.04 | 16 | 6.7\% |
|  |  | Through | 1782 | 64 | 1.04 | 1,853 | 3.6\% |
|  |  | Right | 8 | 1 | 1.04 | 8 | 12.5\% |


| 2022 Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2022 Build-Out Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT Historial Growth Method |  |  | Vested Trip Method |  | Applied Growth | Total <br> Background <br> Volume <br> 家 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { External } \\ \text { Project Trips } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Build-Out } \\ \text { Volume } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Growth Rate | Growth Factor | Projected Growth | Peak-Hour Trips | Projected Growth |  |  |  |  |
| 5.00\% | 1.20 | 5 | 0 | 4 | Historical | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| 5.00\% | 1.20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5.00\% | 1.20 | 37 | 0 | 31 | Historical | 37 | 82 | 119 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 1 | 0 | 1 | Historical | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 28 | 0 | 22 | Historical | 28 | 31 | 59 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 681 | 0 | 536 | Historical | 681 | 31 | 712 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 4 | 0 | 3 | Historical | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 20 | 0 | 16 | Historical | 20 | 0 | 20 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 2,354 | 0 | 1,853 | Historical | 2,354 | 82 | 2,436 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 10 | 0 | 8 | Historical | 10 | 1 | 11 |


| Two-Way Stop <br>  <br> Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | 2019 Existing Traffic |  |  |  | PHF $=0.88$ <br> \% Trucks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count |  | Seasonal Factor | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMC } \\ & \text { Adjusted } \\ & \text { Volume } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Trucks |  |  |  |
|  | Eastbound | Left | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 16 | 1 | 1.04 | 17 | 6.3\% |
|  |  | Right | 8 | 0 | 1.04 | 8 | 0.0\% |
|  | Westbound | Left | 63 | 4 | 1.04 | 66 | 6.3\% |
|  |  | Through | 10 | 3 | 1.04 | 10 | 30.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Northbound | Left | 2 | 1 | 1.04 |  | 50.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 83 | 5 | 1.04 | 86 | 6.0\% |
|  | Southbound | Left | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |


| 2022 Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2022 Build-Out Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT Historial Growth Method |  |  | Vested Trip Method |  | Applied Growth | TotalBackgroundVolume | External Project Trips | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Total } \\ \text { Build-Out } \\ \text { Volume } \end{gathered}$ |
| Growth Rate | Growth Factor | Projected Growth | Peak-Hour Trips | Projected Growth |  |  |  |  |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 18 | 0 | 17 | Historical | 18 | 0 | 18 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 9 | 0 | 8 | Historical | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| 16.33\% | 1.65 | 109 | 0 | 66 | Historical | 109 | 9 | 118 |
| 16.33\% | 1.65 | 17 | 0 | 10 | Historical | 17 | 0 | 17 |
| 16.33\% | 1.65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4.76\% | 1.19 | 2 | 0 | 2 | Historical | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 4.76\% | 1.19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4.76\% | 1.19 | 102 | 0 | 86 | Historical | 102 | 22 | 124 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Signalized <br>  <br> Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | 2018 Existing Traffic |  |  |  | PHF $=0.92$ <br> \% Trucks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count |  | Seasonal Factor | TMCAdjusted Volume |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Trucks |  |  |  |
|  |  | Left | 24 | 2 | 1.04 | 25 | 8.3\% |
|  | Eastbound | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| F |  | Right | 86 | 4 | 1.04 | 89 | 4.7\% |
| 5 |  | Left | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| $\stackrel{\square}{5}$ | Westbound | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| ${ }^{\circ}$ |  | Right | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 尔 |  | Left | 53 | 4 | 1.04 | 55 | 7.5\% |
| " | Northbound | Through | 468 | 29 | 1.04 | 487 | 6.2\% |
| 은 |  | Right | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| t |  | Left | 2 | 0 | 1.04 | 2 | 0.0\% |
|  | Southbound | Through | 1907 | 61 | 1.04 | 1,983 | 3.2\% |
|  |  | Right | 30 | 4 | 1.04 | 31 | 13.3\% |


| 2022 Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2022 Build-Out Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT Historial Growth Method 2022 |  |  | Vested Trip Method |  | Applied Growth | TotalBackgroundVolume | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c} \text { External } \\ \text { Project Trips } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Build-Out } \\ \text { Volume } \end{gathered}$ |
| Growth Rate | Growth Factor | Projected Growth | Peak-Hour Trips | Projected Growth |  |  |  |  |
| 5.21\% | 1.21 | 30 | 9 | 34 | Vested | 34 | 113 | 147 |
| 5.21\% | 1.21 | 0 | 9 | 9 | Vested | 9 | 16 | 25 |
| 5.21\% | 1.21 | 108 | 0 | 89 | Historical | 108 | 82 | 190 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 246 | 246 | Vested | 246 | 0 | 246 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 19 | 19 | Vested | 19 | 2 | 21 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 10 | 10 | Vested | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 70 | 0 | 55 | Historical | 70 | 31 | 101 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 619 | 158 | 645 | Vested | 645 | 1 | 646 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 0 | 48 | 48 | Vested | 48 | 0 | 48 |
| 5.18\% | 1.21 | 2 | 20 | 22 | Vested | 22 | 0 | 22 |
| 5.18\% | 1.21 | 2,394 | 44 | 2,027 | Historical | 2,394 | 0 | 2,394 |
| 5.18\% | 1.21 | 37 | 0 | 31 | Historical | 37 | 35 | 72 |



| 2022 Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2022 Build-Out Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT Historial Growth Method |  |  | Vested Trip Method |  | Applied Growth | TotalBackgroundVolume | External Project Trips | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Build-Out } \\ \text { Volume } \end{gathered}$ |
| Growth Rate | Growth Factor | Projected Growth | Peak-Hour Trips | Projected Growth |  |  |  |  |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 72 | 0 | 67 | Historical | 72 | 0 | 72 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 18 | 0 | 17 | Historical | 18 | 0 | 18 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 77 | 0 | 71 | Historical | 77 | 0 | 77 |
| 7.96\% | 1.32 | 194 | 46 | 193 | Historical | 194 | 11 | 205 |
| 7.96\% | 1.32 | 171 | 0 | 130 | Historical | 171 | 0 | 171 |
| 7.96\% | 1.32 | 92 | 0 | 70 | Historical | 92 | 0 | 92 |
| 5.18\% | 1.21 | 85 | 11 | 81 | Historical | 85 | 0 | 85 |
| 5.18\% | 1.21 | 538 | 109 | 555 | Vested | 555 | 43 | 598 |
| 5.18\% | 1.21 | 101 | 54 | 138 | Vested | 138 | 28 | 166 |
| 5.56\% | 1.22 | 142 | 0 | 116 | Historical | 142 | 0 | 142 |
| 5.56\% | 1.22 | 2,180 | 0 | 1,783 | Historical | 2,180 | 17 | 2,197 |
| 5.56\% | 1.22 | 81 | 0 | 66 | Historical | 81 | 0 | 81 |


| Signalized | Approach | Mvmn't. | 2018 Existing Traffic |  |  |  | PHF $=0.94$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection |  |  | Raw Count |  | Seasonal Factor | TMC Adjusted Volume | \% Trucks |
|  |  |  | Total | Trucks |  |  |  |
|  | Eastbound | Left | 158 | 5 | 1.04 | 164 | 3.2\% |
|  |  | Through | 63 | 2 | 1.04 | 66 | 3.2\% |
|  |  | Right | 87 | 4 | 1.04 | 90 | 4.6\% |
|  | Westbound | Left | 178 | 7 | 1.04 | 185 | 3.9\% |
|  |  | Through | 83 | 6 | 1.04 | 86 | 7.2\% |
|  |  | Right | 99 | 6 | 1.04 | 103 | 6.1\% |
|  | Northbound | Left | 72 | 2 | 1.04 | 75 | 2.8\% |
|  |  | Through | 426 | 20 | 1.04 | 443 | 4.7\% |
|  |  | Right | 63 | 2 | 1.04 | 66 | 3.2\% |
|  | Southbound | Left | 48 | 5 | 1.04 | 50 | 10.4\% |
|  |  | Through <br> Right | 1351 | 35 | 1.04 | $\frac{1,405}{116}$ | 2.6\% |
|  |  | Right | 112 | 5 | 1.04 | 116 | 4.5\% |


| 2022 Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2022 Build-Out Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT Historial Growth Method |  |  | Vested Trip Method |  | Applied Growth | TotalBackgroundVolume | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { External } \\ \text { Project Trips } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\square$ <br> Total Build-Ou Volume |
| Growth Rate | Growth Factor | Projected Growth | Peak-Hour Trips | Projected Growth |  |  |  |  |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 177 | 0 | 164 | Historical | 177 | 1 | 178 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 71 | 0 | 66 | Historical | 71 | 9 | 80 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 97 | 2 | 92 | Historical | 97 | 0 | 97 |
| 3.05\% | 1.12 | 208 | 1 | 186 | Historical | 208 |  | 208 |
| 3.05\% | 1.12 | 96 | 0 | 86 | Historical | 96 | 4 | 100 |
| 3.05\% | 1.12 | 116 | 0 | 103 | Historical | 116 | 0 | 116 |
| 4.30\% | 1.17 | 88 | 2 | 77 | Historical | 88 | 0 | 88 |
| 4.30\% | 1.17 | 519 | 51 | 494 | Historical | 519 | 31 | 550 |
| 4.30\% | 1.17 | 77 | 1 | 67 | Historical | 77 | 0 | 77 |
| 3.35\% | 1.13 | 57 | 0 | 50 | Historical | 57 | 0 | 57 |
| 3.35\% | 1.13 | 1,593 | 50 | 1,455 | Historical | 1,593 | 12 | 1,605 |
| 3.35\% | 1.13 | 132 | 0 | 116 | Historical | 132 | 1 | 133 |

P.M. Peak-Hour Turning Movements

| Two-Way Stop |  |  |  | 2019 Ex | $g$ Traffic |  | PHF $=0.91$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Seasonal | TMC Adjusted |  |
| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Total | Trucks | Factor | Volume | \% Trucks |
|  | Eastbound | Left | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 32 | 4 | 1.04 | 33 | 12.5\% |
|  |  | Right | 8 | 0 | 1.04 | 8 | 0.0\% |
|  | Westbound | Left | 14 | 1 | 1.04 | 15 | 7.1\% |
|  |  | Through | 97 | 4 | 1.04 | 101 | 4.1\% |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Northbound | Left | 21 | 0 | 1.04 | 22 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 10 | 2 | 1.04 | 10 | 20.0\% |
|  | Southbound | Left | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |


| 2022 Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2022 Build-Out Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT Historial Growth Method |  |  | Vested Trip Method |  | Applied Growth | Total Background <br> Volume | External Project Trips | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Build-Out } \\ \text { Volume } \end{gathered}$ |
| Growth Rate | Growth Factor | Projected Growth | Peak-Hour Trips | Projected Growth |  |  |  |  |
| 8.33\% | 1.33 |  | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | O | 0 |
| 8.33\% | 1.33 | 44 | 0 | 33 | Historical | 44 | 118 | 162 |
| 8.33\% | 1.33 | 11 | 0 | 8 | Historical | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| 5.21\% | 1.21 | 18 | 0 | 15 | Historical | 18 | 131 | 149 |
| 5.21\% | 1.21 | 122 | 0 | 101 | Historical | 122 | 147 | 269 |
| 5.21\% | 1.21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5.00\% | 1.20 | 26 | 0 | 22 | Historical | 26 | 0 | 26 |
| 5.00\% | 1.20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5.00\% | 1.20 | 12 | 0 | 10 | Historical | 12 | 58 | 70 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Two-Way Stop |  |  |  | 2019 Ex | Traffic |  | PHF $=0.94$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | TMC |  |
| Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | Total | Trucks | Factor | Volume | \% Trucks |
|  | Eastbound | Left | 8 | 0 | 1.04 | 8 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 27 | 0 | 1.04 | 28 | 0.0\% |
|  | Westbound | Left | 5 | 1 | 1.04 | 5 | 20.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 11 | 0 | 1.04 | 11 | 0.0\% |
|  | Northbound | Left | 50 | 3 | 1.04 | 52 | 6.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 2180 | 47 | 1.04 | 2,267 | 2.2\% |
|  |  | Right | 5 | 2 | 1.04 | 5 | 40.0\% |
|  | Southbound | Left | 9 | 9 | 1.04 | 9 | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 990 | 1030 | 1.04 | 1,030 | 104.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 9 | 9 | 1.04 | 9 | 100.0\% |


| 2022 Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2022 Build-Out Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT Historial Growth Method |  |  | Vested Trip Method |  | Applied Growth | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \begin{array}{c} \text { Background } \\ \text { Volume } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | ExternalProject Trips | Total Build-Ou Volume |
| Growth Rate | Growth Factor | Projected Growth | Peak-Hour Trips | Projected Growth |  |  |  |  |
| 5.00\% | 1.20 | 10 | 0 | 8 | Historical | 10 | 2 | 12 |
| 5.00\% | 1.20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5.00\% | 1.20 | 34 | 0 | 28 | Historical | 34 | 59 | 93 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 5 | 0 | 5 | Historical | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 12 | 0 | 11 | Historical | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 66 | 0 | 52 | Historical | 66 | 93 | 159 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 2,880 | 0 | 2,267 | Historical | 2,880 | 93 | 2,973 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 6 | 0 | 5 | Historical | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 11 | 0 | 9 | Historical | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 1,309 | 0 | 1,030 | Historical | 1,309 | 59 | 1,368 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 11 | 0 | 9 | Historical | 11 | 3 | 14 |


| Two-Way Stop <br>  <br> Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | 2019 Existing Traffic |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PHF = } 0.86 \\ \hline \\ \text { \% Trucks } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count |  | Seasonal Factor | тмс Adjusted Volume |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Trucks |  |  |  |
|  | Eastbound | Left | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 22 | 3 | 1.04 | 23 | 13.6\% |
|  |  | Right | 6 | 1 | 1.04 | 6 | 16.7\% |
|  | Westbound | Left | 74 | 0 | 1.04 | 77 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 32 | 4 | 1.04 | 33 | 12.5\% |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Northbound | Left | 21 | 0 | 1.04 | 22 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 41 | 0 | 1.04 | 43 | 0.0\% |
|  | Southbound | Left | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through |  | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |


| 2022 Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2022 Build-Out Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT Historial Growth Method |  |  | Vested Trip Method |  | Applied Growth | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Total } \\ \text { Background } \\ \text { Volume } \end{array}$ | ExternalProject Trips | Total Build-Ou Volume |
| Growth Rate | Growth Factor | Projected | Peak-Hour | Projected Growth |  |  |  |  |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 25 | 0 | 23 | Historical | 25 | 0 | 25 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 6 | 0 | 6 | Historical | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| 16.33\% | 1.65 | 127 | 0 | 77 | Historical | 127 | 26 | 153 |
| 16.33\% | 1.65 | 55 | 0 | 33 | Historical | 55 | 0 | 55 |
| 16.33\% | 1.65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4.76\% | 1.19 | 26 | 0 | 22 | Historical | 26 | 0 | 26 |
| 4.76\% | 1.19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical |  | 0 | 0 |
| 4.76\% | 1.19 | 51 | 0 | 43 | Historical | 51 | 16 | 67 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Historical | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Signalized <br>  <br> Intersection | Approach | Mvmn't. | 2018 Existing Traffic |  |  |  | $\text { PHF = } 0.95$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Raw Count |  | SeasonalFactor | TMCAdjusted Volume |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Trucks |  |  | \% Trucks |
|  | Eastbound | Left | 26 | 1 | 1.04 | 27 | 3.8\% |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 53 | 3 | 1.04 | 55 | 5.7\% |
|  | Westbound | Left | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Northbound | Left | 196 | 4 | 1.04 | 204 | 2.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 1992 | 38 | 1.04 | 2,072 | 1.9\% |
|  |  | Right | 0 | 0 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Southbound | Left | 3 | 0 | 1.04 | 3 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 703 | 15 | 1.04 | 731 | 2.1\% |
|  |  | Right | 52 | 5 | 1.04 | 54 | 9.6\% |


| 2022 Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2021 Build-Out Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT Historial Growth Method |  |  | Vested Trip Method |  | Applied Growth | TotalBackgroundVolume | ExternalProject Trips | Total Build-Out Volume |
| Growth Rate | Growth | Projected Growth | Peak-Hour | Projected |  |  |  |  |
| 5.21\% | 1.21 | 33 | 21 | 48 | Vested | 48 | 82 | 130 |
| 5.21\% | 1.21 | 0 | 13 | 13 | Vested | 13 | 12 | 25 |
| 5.21\% | 1.21 | 66 | 46 | 101 | Vested | 101 | 59 | 160 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 215 | 215 | Vested | 215 | 0 | 215 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 20 | 20 | Vested | 20 | 20 | 40 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 0 | 10 | 10 | Vested | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 259 | 78 | 282 | Vested | 282 | 93 | 375 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 | 2,632 | 198 | 2,270 | Historical | 2,632 | 0 | 2,632 |
| 6.76\% | 1.27 |  | 50 | 50 | Vested | 50 | 0 | 50 |
| 5.18\% | 1.21 | 4 | 30 | 33 | Vested | 33 | 0 | 33 |
| 5.18\% | 1.21 | 882 | 20 | 751 | Historical | 882 | 1 | 883 |
| 5.18\% | 1.21 | 65 | 17 | 71 | Vested | 71 | 135 | 206 |



| 2022 Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2021 Build-Out Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT Historial Growth Method |  |  | Vested Trip Method |  | Applied Growth | TotalBackgroundVolume | External <br> Project Trips | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { Build-Out } \\ & \text { Volume } \end{aligned}$ |
| Growth Rate | Growth Factor | Projected Growth | Peak-Hour Trips | Projected Growth |  |  |  |  |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 143 | 1 | 133 | Historical | 143 | 0 | 143 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 152 | 0 | 141 | Historical | 152 | 0 | 152 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 92 | 0 | 85 | Historical | 92 | 0 | 92 |
| 7.96\% | 1.32 | 149 | 73 | 186 | Vested | 186 | 32 | 218 |
| 7.96\% | 1.32 | 33 | 0 | 25 | Historical | 33 | 0 | 33 |
| 7.96\% | 1.32 | 148 | 17 | 129 | Historical | 148 | 0 | 148 |
| 5.18\% | 1.21 | 66 | 48 | 103 | Vested | 103 | 0 | 103 |
| 5.18\% | 1.21 | 1,933 | 169 | 1,770 | Historical | 1,933 | 31 | 1,964 |
| 5.18\% | 1.21 | 442 | 58 | 424 | Historical | 442 | 20 | 462 |
| 5.56\% | 1.22 | 127 | 41 | 145 | Vested | 145 | 0 | 145 |
| 5.56\% | 1.22 | 856 | 106 | 806 | Historical | 856 | 49 | 905 |
| 5.56\% | 1.22 | 66 | 1 | 55 | Historical | 66 | 0 | 66 |


| Signalized | Approach | Mvmn't. | 2018 Existing Traffic |  |  |  | PHF $=0.95$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection |  |  | Raw Count |  | Seasonal Factor | TMC Adjusted Volume | \% Trucks |
|  |  |  | Total | Trucks |  |  |  |
|  | Eastbound | Left | 204 | 5 | 1.04 | 212 | 2.5\% |
|  |  | Through | 115 |  | 1.04 | 120 | 1.7\% |
|  |  | Right | 82 | 4 | 1.04 | 85 | 4.9\% |
|  | Westbound | Left | 154 | 7 | 1.04 | 160 | 4.5\% |
|  |  | Through | 89 | 6 | 1.04 | 93 | 6.7\% |
|  |  | Right | 81 | 6 | 1.04 | 84 | 7.4\% |
|  | Northbound | Left | 101 | 2 | 1.04 | 105 | 2.0\% |
|  |  | Through | 1379 | 20 | 1.04 | 1,434 | 1.5\% |
|  |  | Right | 84 | 2 | 1.04 | 87 | 2.4\% |
|  | Southbound | Left | 105 | 5 | 1.04 | 109 | 4.8\% |
|  |  | Through | 614 | 35 | 1.04 | 639 | 5.7\% |
|  |  | Right | 80 | 5 | 1.04 | 83 | 6.3\% |


| 2022 Background Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2021 Build-Out Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT Historial Growth Method |  |  | Vested Trip Method |  | Applied Growth | Total Background Volume | External Project Trips | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Total } \\ & \text { Build-Out } \\ & \text { Volume } \end{aligned}$ |
| Growth Rate | Growth Factor | Projected Growth | Peak-Hour | Projected |  |  |  |  |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 229 | 27 | 239 | Vested | 239 | 1 | 240 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 130 | 16 | 136 | Vested | 136 | 8 | 144 |
| 2.00\% | 1.08 | 92 | 7 | 92 | Historical | 92 | 0 | 92 |
| 3.05\% | 1.12 | 180 | 5 | 165 | Historical | 180 | 0 | 180 |
| 3.05\% | 1.12 | 104 | 27 | 120 | Vested | 120 | 13 | 133 |
| 3.05\% | 1.12 | 94 | 5 | 89 | Historical | 94 | 0 | 94 |
| 4.30\% | 1.17 | 123 | 11 | 116 | Historical | 123 | 0 | 123 |
| 4.30\% | 1.17 | 1,681 | 74 | 1,508 | Historical | 1,681 | 22 | 1,703 |
| 4.30\% | 1.17 | 102 | 3 | 90 | Historical | 102 | 0 | 102 |
| 3.35\% | 1.13 | 124 | 5 | 114 | Historical | 124 | 0 | 124 |
| 3.35\% | 1.13 | 725 | 94 | 733 | Vested | 733 | 35 | 768 |
| 3.35\% | 1.13 | 94 | 56 | 139 | Vested | 139 | 2 | 141 |

## APPENDIX H INTERSECTIONS HCS SUMMARYBACKGROUND CONDITIONS




| HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| Analyst | KLD | Intersection | US 17/92 at Barwick Road |
| Agency/Co. | LTG | Jurisdiction | Volusia |
| Date Performed | 7/19/19 | East/West Street | US 17/92 |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | North/South Street | Barwick Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak-Hour Background | Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 4628.13 |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | T | TR |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 5 | 0 | 37 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 681 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 2354 | 10 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 25 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 33 |  |  | 0 | 7 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left + Thru |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 8.00 | 6.54 | 6.94 | 7.54 | 6.54 | 6.94 | 4.76 |  |  |  | 4.24 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.75 | 4.02 | 3.32 | 3.52 | 4.02 | 3.32 | 2.53 |  |  |  | 2.27 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



| HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| Analyst | KLD | Intersection | US 17/92 at Barwick Road |
| Agency/Co. | LTG | Jurisdiction | Volusia |
| Date Performed | 17/19/19 | East/West Street | US 17/92 |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | North/South Street | Barwick Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak-Hour Background | Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 4628.13 |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | T | TR |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 10 | 0 | 34 |  | 5 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 66 | 2880 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 1308 | 11 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 20 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 |  |  | 0 | 11 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left + Thru |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service





## General Information

| Agency |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyst |  |  |  |
| Jurisdiction |  |  |  |
| Urban Street |  |  |  |
| Intersection |  |  |  |
| Project Description |  |  |  |
| Demand Information |  |  |  |
| Approach Movement |  |  |  |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |  |  |  |
| Signal Information |  |  |  |
| 159.8 |  |  |  |

Signal Information

| Cycle, s | 159.8 | Reference Phase | 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On |

Timer Results
Assigned Phase
Case Number
Phase Duration, s
Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s
Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s
Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s
Green Extension Time ( $g$ e ), s
Phase Call Probability
Max Out Probability

## Movement Group Results

Approach Movement
Assigned Movement
Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h
Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln
Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s
Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s
Green Ratio ( $g / C$ )
Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h
Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ )
Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/In ( 95 th percentile)
Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile)
Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile)
Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh
Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh
Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh
Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh
Level of Service (LOS)
Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS
Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS

Intersection Information

|  |  | Duration, h | 0.25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Date | Jul 19, 2019 | Area Type | Other |
| Time Period | AM Peak-Hour Background | PHF | 0.92 |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | Analysis Period | 1> 7:00 |
| File Name | 2. Fort Florida Rd at US 17-92-AM Background -... |  |  |



## General Information

| Agency | L |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | KL |
| Jurisdiction | V |
| Urban Street | US |
| Intersection | US |


| LTG |
| :--- |
| KLD |
| Volusia |
| US 17/92 |
| US 17/92 at Fort Florida... |
| 4628.12 Rivington |


| Analysis Date | $12 / 5 / 2018$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Time Period | PM Peak-Hour <br> Background |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | Intersection Information Project Description 4628.12 Rivington



| Demand Information |  |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement |  |  |  | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |  |  |  | 48 | 13 | 101 | 215 | 20 | 10 | 282 | 2632 | 50 | 33 | 882 | 71 |
| Signal Information |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 隹 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle, s | 161.4 | Reference Phase | 2 |  | - | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\xrightarrow{\text { A }}$ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 4.7 | 0.8 | 82.7 | 18.6 | 22.1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.0 |  |  | 6 | 7 |  |


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase |  | 4 |  | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Case Number |  | 12.0 |  | 10.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s |  | 25.1 |  | 28.6 | 18.5 | 96.5 | 11.2 | 89.2 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), s |  | 6.5 |  | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s |  | 4.3 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 3.9 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s |  | 18.4 |  | 21.9 | 14.0 | 92.0 | 3.5 | 31.4 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{e}$ ), s |  | 0.3 |  | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 44.5 |
| Phase Call Probability |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.79 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability |  | 0.18 |  | 0.91 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.66 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h |  | 171 |  | 226 | 32 |  | 297 | 2771 | 53 | 35 | 508 | 495 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln |  | 1660 |  | 1810 | 1792 |  | 1781 | 1781 | 1610 | 1781 | 1870 | 1821 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s |  | 16.4 |  | 19.9 | 2.5 |  | 12.0 | 90.0 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 29.4 | 29.4 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ), s |  | 16.4 |  | 19.9 | 2.5 |  | 12.0 | 90.0 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 29.4 | 29.4 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) |  | 0.12 |  | 0.14 | 0.14 |  | 0.60 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.54 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h |  | 192 |  | 247 | 245 |  | 363 | 1985 | 898 | 97 | 959 | 933 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) |  | 0.890 |  | 0.915 | 0.129 |  | 0.819 | 1.396 | 0.059 | 0.359 | 0.530 | 0.530 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) |  | 328.7 |  | 411.3 | 50.8 |  | 268.6 | $\begin{gathered} 3235 . \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | 39.6 | 31.5 | 472.4 | 454.7 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) |  | 12.9 |  | 16.5 | 2.0 |  | 10.6 | 127.4 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 18.6 | 18.2 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.71 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh |  | 70.4 |  | 68.8 | 61.2 |  | 24.0 | 35.7 | 16.3 | 38.5 | 26.3 | 26.3 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh |  | 24.1 |  | 28.9 | 0.1 |  | 13.7 | 181.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh |  | 94.5 |  | 97.6 | 61.3 |  | 37.7 | 216.9 | 16.4 | 39.3 | 26.8 | 26.8 |
| Level of Service (LOS) |  | F |  | F | E |  | D | F | B | D | C | C |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 94.5 |  | F | 93.2 |  | F | 196. |  | F | 27.2 |  | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 148.5 |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.47 | B | 2.34 | B | 1.91 | B | 1.69 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 0.77 | A | 0.91 | A | 3.06 | C | 1.34 | A |

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |
| Signal Information |

Signal Information

| Cycle, s | 135.7 | Reference Phase | 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On |

Timer Results
Assigned Phase
Case Number
Phase Duration, s
Change Period, $\left(Y+R_{c}\right)$, s
Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s
Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s
Green Extension Time ( $g$ e ), s
Phase Call Probability
Max Out Probability
Movement Group Results
Approach Movement
Assigned Movement
Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h
Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln
Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s
Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s
Green Ratio ( $g / C$ )
Capacity ( c ), veh/h
Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ )
Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile)
Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile)
Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile)
Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh
Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh
Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh
Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh
Level of Service (LOS)
Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS
Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS

Intersection Information

|  | Duration, h |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type | 0.25 |
| PHF | 0.94 |
|  | Analysis Period |



## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |
| Signal Information |


| Cycle, s | 149.5 | Reference Phase | 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On |

Timer Results
Assigned Phase

Case Number
Phase Duration, s
Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s
Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s
Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s
Green Extension Time ( $g$ e ), s
Phase Call Probability
Max Out Probability

## Movement Group Results

Approach Movement
Assigned Movement
Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h
Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln
Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s
Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g c$ ), s
Green Ratio ( $g / C$ )
Capacity ( c ), veh/h
Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ )
Back of Queue ( Q ), ft/In ( 95 th percentile)
Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile)
Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile)
Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh
Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh
Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh
Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh
Level of Service (LOS)
Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS
Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS

Intersection Information

|  | Duration, h |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type | 0.25 |
| PHF | 0.95 |
|  |  |
|  | Analysis Period |



## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand $(v)$, veh/h |

Intersection Information

| LTG |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| KLD |  |
| Volusia |  |
| US 17/92 |  | US 17/92 at Highbanks Rd 4628.12 Rivington


| Intersection Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Duration, h | 0.25 |
| Area Type | Other |
| PHF | 0.94 |
|  | Analysis Period |




| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 19.2 | 24.6 | 21.0 | 26.4 | 11.6 | 63.7 | 10.7 | 62.8 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), s | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 4.2 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s | 12.6 | 9.3 | 14.6 | 18.0 | 5.3 |  | 4.2 |  |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{\text {e }}$ ), s | 0.3 | 2.2 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 0.87 |  |
| Max Out Probability | 0.26 | 0.02 | 0.88 | 0.16 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 188 | 76 | 103 | 221 | 226 |  | 94 | 323 | 311 | 61 | 1695 | 140 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1767 | 1856 | 1547 | 1753 | 1635 |  | 1767 | 1826 | 1743 | 1668 | 1766 | 1560 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 10.6 | 4.3 | 7.3 | 12.6 | 16.0 |  | 3.3 | 13.5 | 13.6 | 2.2 | 56.4 | 6.3 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g$ c ), s | 10.6 | 4.3 | 7.3 | 12.6 | 16.0 |  | 3.3 | 13.5 | 13.6 | 2.2 | 56.4 | 6.3 |
| Green Ratio ( g/C ) | 0.26 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.27 | 0.16 |  | 0.51 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.51 | 0.47 | 0.47 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h | 267 | 279 | 232 | 426 | 270 |  | 137 | 872 | 832 | 378 | 1660 | 733 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.706 | 0.271 | 0.444 | 0.520 | 0.837 |  | 0.683 | 0.371 | 0.373 | 0.160 | 1.021 | 0.192 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 218.6 | 94.9 | 137.3 | 239.2 | 311.6 |  | 68.8 | 254.8 | 237.9 | 41 | 978.1 | 108.2 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 8.5 | 3.7 | 5.3 | 9.3 | 11.8 |  | 2.7 | 9.8 | 9.5 | 1.5 | 38.2 | 4.2 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 0.84 | 0.00 | 0.62 | 1.29 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.87 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 38.3 | 45.2 | 46.4 | 36.3 | 48.5 |  | 28.2 | 19.9 | 19.9 | 16.2 | 31.8 | 18.5 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 4.3 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 11.8 |  | 5.9 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 27.5 | 0.6 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 42.5 | 45.9 | 48.3 | 37.3 | 60.4 |  | 34.1 | 21.1 | 21.2 | 16.4 | 59.3 | 19.1 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | D | D | D | D | E |  | C | C | C | B | F | B |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 44.9 |  | D | 48.9 |  | D | 22.8 |  | C | 54.9 |  | D |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 46.3 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.31 | B | 2.46 | B | 1.91 | B | 2.10 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.09 | A | 1.22 | A | 1.09 | A | 2.05 | B |

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand $(v)$, veh/h |

Intersection Information

| LTG | Analysis Date | Jul 19, 2019 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| KLD | Time Period | PM Peak-Hour <br> Background |
| Volusia | Analysis Year | 2022 |
| US 17/92 | US 17/92 at Highbanks Rd | File Name |
| 5. US 17-92 at Hig |  |  |
| 4628.12 Rivington |  |  |


| Intersection Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Duration, h | 0.25 |
| Area Type | Other |
| PHF | 0.95 |
|  | Analysis Period |



| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 25.0 | 33.5 | 20.0 | 28.5 | 14.1 | 80.9 | 15.6 | 82.4 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{\text {c }}$ ), s | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 4.2 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s | 19.9 | 12.2 | 15.6 | 21.3 | 7.5 |  | 9.0 |  |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{\text {e }}$ ), s | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Max Out Probability | 1.00 | 0.05 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 252 | 143 | 97 | 189 | 225 |  | 129 | 940 | 937 | 131 | 772 | 146 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1781 | 1870 | 1547 | 1781 | 1720 |  | 1739 | 1870 | 1833 | 1739 | 1766 | 1535 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 17.9 | 10.2 | 8.2 | 13.6 | 19.3 |  | 5.5 | 74.5 | 74.5 | 7.0 | 20.7 | 7.8 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 17.9 | 10.2 | 8.2 | 13.6 | 19.3 |  | 5.5 | 74.5 | 74.5 | 7.0 | 20.7 | 7.8 |
| Green Ratio ( g/C ) | 0.28 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.24 | 0.15 |  | 0.55 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.56 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h | 290 | 335 | 277 | 335 | 251 |  | 380 | 930 | 911 | 154 | 1791 | 778 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.868 | 0.427 | 0.349 | 0.566 | 0.898 |  | 0.341 | 1.011 | 1.029 | 0.846 | 0.431 | 0.188 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 381.3 | 219.1 | 155.2 | 263.3 | 404.8 |  | 103.8 | $\begin{gathered} 1317 . \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | 1330 | 239.1 | 345.8 | 136.7 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 15.0 | 8.6 | 6.0 | 10.4 | 15.8 |  | 4.0 | 51.9 | 53.2 | 9.2 | 13.5 | 5.2 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 1.47 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 1.42 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.04 | 0.00 | 1.09 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 47.5 | 54.7 | 53.9 | 48.9 | 63.0 |  | 18.4 | 37.7 | 37.7 | 43.7 | 23.3 | 20.2 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 23.3 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 29.8 |  | 0.5 | 32.2 | 37.4 | 11.8 | 0.8 | 0.5 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay ( d ), s/veh | 70.7 | 55.9 | 55.0 | 51.1 | 92.8 |  | 18.9 | 70.0 | 75.2 | 55.5 | 24.1 | 20.7 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | E | E | D | D | F |  | B | F | F | E | C | C |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 63.3 |  | E | 73.7 |  | E | 69.1 |  | E | 27.5 |  | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 57.9 |  |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.31 | B | 2.47 | B | 1.92 | B | 2.10 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.30 | A | 1.17 | A | 2.14 | B | 1.35 | A |

# APPENDIX I INTERSECTIONS HCS SUMMARYBACKGROUND CONDITIONS IMPROVED 

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |
| Signal Information |
| Cycs |

Signal Information

| Cycle, s | 156.6 | Reference Phase | 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On |

Timer Results
Assigned Phase
Case Number
Phase Duration, s
Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s
Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s
Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s
Green Extension Time ( $g$ e ), s
Phase Call Probability
Max Out Probability

## Movement Group Results

Approach Movement
Assigned Movement
Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h
Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln
Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s
Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g c$ ), s
Green Ratio ( $g / C$ )
Capacity ( c ), veh/h
Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ )
Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile)
Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile)
Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile)
Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh
Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh
Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh
Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh
Level of Service (LOS)
Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS
Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS

Intersection Information

|  | Duration, h |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type | 0.25 |
| PHF | 0.92 |
|  | Analyer |
|  | at US 17-92 - AM Background $-\ldots$ |



## General Information

| Agency | L |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | K |
| Jurisdiction | F |
| Urban Street | US |
| Intersection | US |


| LTG |
| :--- |
| KLD |
| FDOT |
| US 17/92 |
| US 17/92 at Fort Florida... |
| 4628.12 Rivington |

Intersection Information

Project Description
4628.12 Rivington


| Demand Information |  |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement |  |  |  | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |  |  |  | 48 | 13 | 101 | 215 | 20 | 10 | 282 | 2632 | 50 | 33 | 882 | 71 |
| Signal Information |  |  |  |  | $s$ |  | Dive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle, s | 161.3 | Reference Phase | 2 |  | \% | ${ }^{7}$ |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{4}{ }$ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 4.7 | 0.8 | 82.6 | 18.6 | 22.1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.0 |  |  | 6 | 7 |  |


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase |  | 4 |  | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Case Number |  | 12.0 |  | 10.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s |  | 25.1 |  | 28.6 | 18.5 | 96.4 | 11.2 | 89.1 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{\text {c }}$ ), s |  | 6.5 |  | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s |  | 4.3 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 3.9 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s |  | 18.3 |  | 21.9 | 14.0 | 87.1 | 3.5 | 19.5 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{\text {e }}$ ), s |  | 0.3 |  | 0.1 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 47.0 |
| Phase Call Probability |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.79 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability |  | 0.18 |  | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h |  | 171 |  | 226 | 32 |  | 297 | 2771 | 53 | 35 | 677 | 326 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln |  | 1660 |  | 1810 | 1792 |  | 1781 | 1698 | 1610 | 1781 | 1870 | 1796 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g$ s ) , s |  | 16.3 |  | 19.9 | 2.5 |  | 12.0 | 85.1 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 17.4 | 17.5 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s |  | 16.3 |  | 19.9 | 2.5 |  | 12.0 | 85.1 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 17.4 | 17.5 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) |  | 0.12 |  | 0.14 | 0.14 |  | 0.60 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.54 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h |  | 192 |  | 247 | 245 |  | 404 | 2839 | 897 | 99 | 1916 | 920 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $~(~) ~$ |  | 0.890 |  | 0.915 | 0.129 |  | 0.735 | 0.976 | 0.059 | 0.352 | 0.353 | 0.355 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) |  | 328.3 |  | 411 | 50.7 |  | 247.7 | 1153.5 | 39.6 | 31.4 | 304.1 | 291.8 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) |  | 12.9 |  | 16.4 | 2.0 |  | 9.8 | 45.4 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 12.0 | 11.7 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh |  | 70.3 |  | 68.7 | 61.2 |  | 19.3 | 34.6 | 16.3 | 38.4 | 23.4 | 23.4 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh |  | 24.1 |  | 28.8 | 0.1 |  | 6.8 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh |  | 94.4 |  | 97.5 | 61.3 |  | 26.1 | 46.4 | 16.4 | 39.2 | 23.5 | 23.7 |
| Level of Service (LOS) |  | F |  | F | E |  | C | D | B | D | C | C |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 94.4 |  | F | 93.1 |  | F | 44.0 |  | D | 24.1 |  | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.75 | C | 2.63 | C | 1.91 | B | 1.69 | B |  |  |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 0.77 | A | 0.91 | A | 2.20 | B | 1.06 | A |  |  |

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |
| Signal Information |

Signal Information

| Cycle, s | 134.9 | Reference Phase | 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On |

Timer Results
Assigned Phase
Case Number
Phase Duration, s
Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s
Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s
Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s
Green Extension Time ( $g$ e ), s
Phase Call Probability
Max Out Probability

Intersection Information

## LTG

KLD FDOT

US 17/92
US 17/92 at Dirksen Dr 4628.12 Rivington

| Duration, h | 0.25 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Area Type | Other |
| PHF | 0.94 |
| Analysis Period | 1> 7:00 |
| ksen Dr - AM Background - Imp... |  |



## Movement Group Results

Approach Movement
Assigned Movement
Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h
Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln
Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s
Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s
Green Ratio ( $g / C$ )
Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h
Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ )
Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile)
Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile)
Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile)
Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh
Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh
Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh
Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh
Level of Service (LOS)
Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS
Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS

| EB |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L | T | R | L | T | R |
| 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 |
| 77 | 19 | 82 | 206 | 182 | 98 |
| 1202 | 1870 |  | 1753 | 1870 |  |
| 8.4 | 1.3 |  | 14.0 | 10.6 |  |
| 8.4 | 1.3 |  | 14.0 | 10.6 |  |
| 0.08 | 0.08 |  | 0.22 | 0.27 |  |
| 152 | 154 |  | 370 | 510 |  |
| 0.504 | 0.125 |  | 0.557 | 0.357 |  |
| 120.2 | 28 |  | 263 | 214.4 |  |
| 4.7 | 1.1 |  | 10.2 | 8.4 |  |
| 0.75 | 0.00 |  | 0.50 | 0.00 |  |
| 60.7 | 57.4 |  | 46.5 | 39.5 |  |
| 2.6 | 0.4 |  | 1.3 | 0.4 |  |
| 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| 63.3 | 57.8 | 0.0 | 47.8 | 40.0 | 0.0 |
| E | E | A | D | D | A |
| 33.5 |  | C | 35.2 |  | D |


| NB |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L | T | R | L | T | R |
| 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| 90 | 590 | 147 | 151 | 1610 | 796 |
| 1781 | 1696 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1835 |
| 3.3 | 14.4 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 49.5 | 50.2 |
| 3.3 | 14.4 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 49.5 | 50.2 |
| 0.54 | 0.49 | 0.62 | 0.55 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| 148 | 1676 | 979 | 478 | 1923 | 943 |
| 0.611 | 0.352 | 0.150 | 0.316 | 0.837 | 0.844 |
| 68.4 | 248 | 79.6 | 99.9 | 735.2 | 750.4 |
| 2.7 | 9.3 | 3.1 | 3.9 | 28.9 | 30.0 |
| 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 30.0 | 20.9 | 10.9 | 15.7 | 28.0 | 28.1 |
| 4.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 3.7 | 7.7 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 34.0 | 21.2 | 11.0 | 16.0 | 31.7 | 35.8 |
| C | C | B | B | C | D |
| 20.8 | C | 32.1 | C |  |  |

## Multimodal Results

Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS
Bicycle LOS Score / LOS

| EB |  | WB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.61 | C | 2.45 | B |
| 0.78 | A | 1.29 | A |


| NB |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2.10 | B |
| 1.17 | A |


| SB |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2.10 | B |
| 1.89 | B |

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |
| Signal Information |

Signal Information

| Cycle, s | 189.9 | Reference Phase | 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On |


| LTG |
| :--- | :--- |
| KLD |
| FDOT |
| US 17/92 |
| US 17/92 at Dirksen Dr |
| 4628.12 Rivington |


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase |  | 4 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Case Number |  | 5.3 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s |  | 23.5 | 29.0 | 52.5 | 15.1 | 116.9 | 20.5 | 122.3 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s |  | 7.5 | 9.0 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 7.5 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s |  | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 5.9 | 4.0 | 5.9 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s |  | 19.2 | 20.5 | 17.4 | 7.0 | 107.7 | 13.7 | 17.9 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g$ e ), s |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 83.3 |
| Phase Call Probability |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.36 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.86 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 151 | 160 | 97 | 196 | 35 | 156 | 108 | 2035 | 423 | 153 | 654 | 316 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1363 | 1870 |  | 1781 | 1648 |  | 1654 | 1781 | 1585 | 1753 | 1856 | 1785 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 17.2 | 16.2 |  | 18.5 | 3.1 |  | 5.0 | 105.7 | 21.2 | 11.7 | 15.8 | 15.9 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g c$ ), s | 17.2 | 16.2 |  | 18.5 | 3.1 |  | 5.0 | 105.7 | 21.2 | 11.7 | 15.8 | 15.9 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.09 | 0.09 |  | 0.21 | 0.24 |  | 0.63 | 0.58 | 0.69 | 0.65 | 0.61 | 0.61 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h | 161 | 169 |  | 243 | 401 |  | 384 | 2074 | 1100 | 165 | 2268 | 1091 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.933 | 0.944 |  | 0.804 | 0.087 |  | 0.282 | 0.981 | 0.385 | 0.925 | 0.289 | 0.290 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 379.4 | 394 |  | 370.6 | 66.5 |  | 92.6 | $\begin{gathered} 1501 . \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 297.3 | 378.2 | 280.2 | 267.7 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 14.8 | 15.5 |  | 14.6 | 2.3 |  | 3.4 | 59.1 | 11.7 | 14.7 | 10.9 | 10.7 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 2.37 | 0.00 |  | 0.70 | 0.00 |  | 0.44 | 0.00 | 1.86 | 1.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 87.9 | 85.9 |  | 67.1 | 56.0 |  | 14.8 | 39.2 | 12.1 | 67.3 | 17.7 | 17.5 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 51.5 | 52.9 |  | 17.5 | 0.1 |  | 0.4 | 15.5 | 0.5 | 48.6 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 139.4 | 138.8 | 0.0 | 84.6 | 56.1 | 0.0 | 15.2 | 54.7 | 12.6 | 115.8 | 17.8 | 17.8 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | F | F | A | F | E | A | B | D | B | F | B | B |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 106. |  | F | 47.9 |  | D | 46.1 |  | D | 31.1 |  | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 48.0 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection Information

|  |  | Duration, h | 0.25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Date | Jul 19, 2019 | Area Type | Other |
| Time Period | PM Background Improved | PHF | 0.95 |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | Analysis Period | 1> 7:00 |
| File Name | 3. US 17-92 at Dirksen Dr - PM Background - Imp... |  |  |

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand $(v)$, veh/h |

Intersection Information

| LTG | An |
| :--- | :--- |
| KLD | Ti |
| FDOT | An | US 17/92 at Highbanks Rd 4628.12 Rivington


| Intersection Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Duration, h | 0.25 |
| Area Type | Other |
| PHF | 0.94 |
|  | Analysis Period |



| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 19.0 | 23.1 | 21.0 | 25.1 | 11.3 | 65.2 | 10.7 | 64.6 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 4.2 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s | 12.7 | 9.4 | 14.7 | 18.2 | 5.1 |  | 4.1 |  |
| Green Extension Time ( $g e$ ), s | 0.1 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 0.87 |  |
| Max Out Probability | 1.00 | 0.42 | 0.92 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 |  |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 188 | 76 | 103 | 221 | 226 |  | 94 | 323 | 311 | 61 | 1695 | 140 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1767 | 1856 | 1547 | 1753 | 1635 |  | 1767 | 1826 | 1743 | 1668 | 1766 | 1560 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 10.7 | 4.4 | 7.4 | 12.7 | 16.2 |  | 3.1 | 13.2 | 13.3 | 2.1 | 56.5 | 6.1 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ), s | 10.7 | 4.4 | 7.4 | 12.7 | 16.2 |  | 3.1 | 13.2 | 13.3 | 2.1 | 56.5 | 6.1 |
| Green Ratio ( g/C ) | 0.25 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.27 | 0.16 |  | 0.53 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.53 | 0.49 | 0.49 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h | 258 | 262 | 219 | 422 | 258 |  | 145 | 894 | 861 | 397 | 1727 | 763 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.730 | 0.288 | 0.471 | 0.524 | 0.873 |  | 0.646 | 0.362 | 0.361 | 0.153 | 0.981 | 0.184 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 232.1 | 96.3 | 139.5 | 240.6 | 345.8 |  | 68.2 | 248.8 | 231.2 | 38.6 | 896.3 | 103.2 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 9.1 | 3.8 | 5.4 | 9.3 | 13.1 |  | 2.7 | 9.6 | 9.2 | 1.4 | 35.0 | 4.0 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 0.89 | 0.00 | 0.63 | 1.30 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.83 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 38.8 | 46.3 | 47.4 | 36.7 | 49.3 |  | 28.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 14.8 | 30.4 | 17.2 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 9.1 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 25.5 |  | 6.6 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 17.6 | 0.5 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 47.9 | 47.2 | 49.6 | 37.7 | 74.9 |  | 34.6 | 20.1 | 20.1 | 15.0 | 48.0 | 17.8 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | D | D | D | D | E |  | C | C | C | B | D | B |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 48.2 |  | D | 56.5 |  | E | 22.0 |  | C | 44.7 |  | D |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 41.8 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.31 | B | 2.46 | B | 1.91 | B | 2.10 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.09 | A | 1.22 | A | 1.09 | A | 2.05 | B |

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |
| Demand Information |
| Approach Movement |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |
| Signal Information |



| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 22.0 | 28.8 | 21.6 | 28.4 | 13.6 | 84.8 | 14.8 | 86.0 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), s | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 4.2 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s | 18.5 | 12.5 | 15.2 | 21.2 | 7.0 |  | 8.2 |  |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{\text {e }}$ ), s | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Max Out Probability | 1.00 | 0.18 | 0.33 | 1.00 | 0.03 |  | 0.08 |  |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 252 | 143 | 97 | 189 | 225 |  | 129 | 940 | 937 | 131 | 772 | 146 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1781 | 1870 | 1547 | 1781 | 1720 |  | 1739 | 1870 | 1833 | 1739 | 1766 | 1535 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 16.5 | 10.5 | 8.5 | 13.2 | 19.2 |  | 5.0 | 71.5 | 74.0 | 6.2 | 19.5 | 7.3 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 16.5 | 10.5 | 8.5 | 13.2 | 19.2 |  | 5.0 | 71.5 | 74.0 | 6.2 | 19.5 | 7.3 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.26 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.26 | 0.15 |  | 0.58 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.59 | 0.54 | 0.54 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h | 270 | 287 | 237 | 322 | 259 |  | 405 | 988 | 968 | 162 | 1893 | 822 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.932 | 0.499 | 0.408 | 0.589 | 0.870 |  | 0.320 | 0.951 | 0.968 | 0.804 | 0.408 | 0.178 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 197.6 | 226.2 | 161.4 | 255.5 | 392.5 |  | 94.3 | 1165.7 | 1182.1 | 238.3 | 325.8 | 5.1 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 7.8 | 8.9 | 6.2 | 10.1 | 15.3 |  | 3.6 | 45.9 | 47.3 | 9.2 | 12.7 | 0.2 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 0.76 | 0.00 | 0.73 | 1.38 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.04 | 0.00 | 0.04 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 50.8 | 58.6 | 57.4 | 46.7 | 62.3 |  | 16.0 | 33.9 | 34.2 | 41.0 | 20.9 | 17.9 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 36.9 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 24.2 |  | 0.5 | 19.0 | 22.2 | 11.3 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 87.7 | 60.5 | 59.0 | 48.4 | 86.5 |  | 16.5 | 52.9 | 56.3 | 52.3 | 21.5 | 18.3 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | F | E | E | D | F |  | B | D | E | D | C | B |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 74.1 |  | E | 69.1 |  | E | 52.2 |  | D | 24.9 |  | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 49.4 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.32 | B | 2.47 | B | 1.91 | B | 2.10 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.30 | A | 1.17 | A | 2.14 | B | 1.35 | A |

## APPENDIX J <br> INTERSECTIONS HCS SUMMARY-BUILD-OUT CONDITIONS




## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |

Intersection Information

| LTG |
| :--- |
| KLD |
| FDOT |
| US 17/92 |
| US 17/92 at Fort Florida... |
| 4628.12 Rivington |


| Analysis Date | Jul 30, 2019 | Area Type | Other |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Time Period | AM Build-Out | PHF | 0.92 |
|  | Analysis Year | 2022 | Analysis Period | 1> 7:00 |
|  | File Name | 2. Fort Florida Rd at US 17-92 - AM Build-Out - R... |  |  | 4628.12 Rivington


| Demand Inform | mation |  |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Move | ment |  |  | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand ( $v$ ), v | h/h |  |  | 147 | 25 | 190 | 246 | 21 | 10 | 101 | 646 | 48 | 22 | 2394 | 72 |
| Signal Inform | on |  |  |  | 5 |  | It |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle, s | 168.4 | Reference Phase | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 4.0 | 4.2 | 84.2 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.5 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.0 |  |  | 6 | 7 |  |


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase |  | 4 |  | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Case Number |  | 12.0 |  | 10.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s |  | 31.5 |  | 31.5 | 14.7 | 94.9 | 10.5 | 90.7 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R{ }_{c}$ ), s |  | 6.5 |  | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s |  | 4.2 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 3.9 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s |  | 27.5 |  | 26.8 | 8.2 | 15.2 | 3.1 | 81.7 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{\text {e }}$ ), s |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 36.7 | 0.0 | 2.5 |
| Phase Call Probability |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.67 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.35 | 0.00 | 1.00 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h |  | 393 |  | 267 | 34 |  | 110 | 702 | 52 | 24 | 1790 | 891 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln |  | 1678 |  | 1810 | 1796 |  | 1697 | 1644 | 1610 | 1781 | 1856 | 1827 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g$ s), s |  | 25.5 |  | 24.8 | 2.7 |  | 6.2 | 13.2 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 78.0 | 79.7 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ), s |  | 25.5 |  | 24.8 | 2.7 |  | 6.2 | 13.2 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 78.0 | 79.7 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) |  | 0.15 |  | 0.15 | 0.15 |  | 0.56 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h |  | 254 |  | 274 | 272 |  | 134 | 2603 | 850 | 414 | 1866 | 919 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) |  | 1.549 |  | 0.976 | 0.124 |  | 0.822 | 0.270 | 0.061 | 0.058 | 0.959 | 0.970 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) |  | 1163.2 |  | 529.9 | 55.7 |  | 245.1 | 227.5 | 44.8 | 20.2 | 1199.7 | 1247.4 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) |  | 45.8 |  | 21.2 | 2.2 |  | 9.2 | 8.7 | 1.8 | 0.8 | 46.9 | 49.9 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh |  | 71.4 |  | 71.1 | 61.8 |  | 46.0 | 22.0 | 19.4 | 19.3 | 40.4 | 40.6 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh |  | 265.5 |  | 47.3 | 0.1 |  | 21.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.4 | 22.3 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh |  | 337.0 |  | 118.5 | 61.9 |  | 67.3 | 22.1 | 19.4 | 19.3 | 52.8 | 62.9 |
| Level of Service (LOS) |  | F |  | F | E |  | E | C | B | B | D | E |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 337.0 |  | F | 112.1 |  | F | 27.7 |  | C | 55.9 |  | E |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 80.1 |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.75 | C | 2.63 | C | 1.92 | B | 1.69 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.14 | A | 0.98 | A | 0.96 | A | 1.97 | B |

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |

Intersection Information

| LTG |
| :--- |
| KLD |
| FDOT |
| US 17/92 |
| US 17/92 at Fort Florida... |
| 4628.12 Rivington |


| Analysis Date | Jul 30, 2019 | Area Type | Other |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Time Period | PM Build-Out | PHF | 0.95 |
|  | Analysis Year | 2022 | Analysis Period | $1>7: 00$ |
|  | File Name | 2. Fort Florida Rd at US 17-92 - PM Build-Out - R... |  |  | 4628.12 Rivington



| Demand Inform | ation |  |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Move | ment |  |  | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand ( $v$ ), v | h/h |  |  | 130 | 25 | 160 | 215 | 40 | 10 | 375 | 2632 | 50 | 33 | 883 | 206 |
| Signal Informa | ion |  |  |  |  |  | 河 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle, s | 168.8 | Reference Phase | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{4}{\rightarrow}$ |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 4.8 | 0.7 | 82.8 | 25.0 | 23.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.0 |  |  | 6 | 7 |  |


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase |  | 4 |  | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Case Number |  | 12.0 |  | 10.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s |  | 31.5 |  | 29.5 | 18.5 | 96.5 | 11.3 | 89.3 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), s |  | 6.5 |  | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s |  | 4.2 |  | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 3.9 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s |  | 27.0 |  | 22.8 | 14.0 | 92.0 | 3.6 | 25.1 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{e}$ ), s |  | 0.0 |  | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 46.6 |
| Phase Call Probability |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.80 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.58 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h |  | 332 |  | 226 | 53 |  | 395 | 2771 | 53 | 35 | 789 | 357 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln |  | 1682 |  | 1810 | 1834 |  | 1781 | 1698 | 1610 | 1781 | 1870 | 1686 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s |  | 25.0 |  | 20.8 | 4.3 |  | 12.0 | 90.0 | 2.7 | 1.6 | 23.0 | 23.1 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ), s |  | 25.0 |  | 20.8 | 4.3 |  | 12.0 | 90.0 | 2.7 | 1.6 | 23.0 | 23.1 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) |  | 0.15 |  | 0.14 | 0.14 |  | 0.57 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.52 | 0.49 | 0.49 |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h |  | 249 |  | 246 | 250 |  | 343 | 2717 | 859 | 94 | 1836 | 827 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) |  | 1.331 |  | 0.919 | 0.211 |  | 1.151 | 1.020 | 0.061 | 0.371 | 0.430 | 0.432 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) |  | 878.8 |  | 432 | 90.1 |  | 668.4 | $\begin{gathered} 1323 . \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | 44.6 | 31.6 | 388.6 | 354.1 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) |  | 34.6 |  | 17.3 | 3.6 |  | 26.3 | 52.1 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 15.3 | 14.2 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 1.76 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh |  | 71.9 |  | 72.0 | 64.9 |  | 35.7 | 39.4 | 19.0 | 40.2 | 27.7 | 27.8 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh |  | 173.9 |  | 31.7 | 0.2 |  | 96.3 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh |  | 245.7 |  | 103.7 | 65.0 |  | 132.1 | 61.8 | 19.0 | 41.1 | 27.9 | 28.1 |
| Level of Service (LOS) |  | F |  | F | E |  | F | F | B | D | C | C |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 245. |  | F | 96.4 |  | F | 69.8 |  | E | 28.4 |  | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 73.1 |  |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.75 | C | 2.63 | C | 1.91 | B | 1.70 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.03 | A | 0.95 | A | 2.26 | B | 1.14 | A |

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |

Demand Information
Approach Movement
Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h

LTG
KLD
FDOT
US 17/92
US 17/92 at Dirksen Dr 4628.12 Rivington

Intersection Information

| Intersection Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Duration, h |
| Area Type | 0.25 |
| PHF | Other |
|  | 0.94 |
| Analysis Period |  |
| D> 7:00 |  |



| Signal Information |  |  |  |  |  | 20 | 测 <br> E1T |  |  |  | $1$ | $\boldsymbol{Y}_{2}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cycle, s | 136.1 | Reference Phase | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 5.5 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.5 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase |  | 4 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Case Number |  | 5.3 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s |  | 18.6 | 26.6 | 45.3 | 13.8 | 74.3 | 16.5 | 77.0 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R$ ) , s |  | 7.5 | 9.0 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 7.5 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s |  | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 5.9 | 4.0 | 5.9 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s |  | 10.5 | 17.0 | 12.6 | 5.4 | 18.0 | 7.7 | 53.7 |
| Green Extension Time ( $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{e}}$ ), s |  | 0.6 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 47.6 | 0.4 | 15.8 |
| Phase Call Probability |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.89 | 0.00 | 0.97 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 77 | 19 | 82 | 218 | 182 | 98 | 90 | 636 | 177 | 151 | 1621 | 802 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1202 | 1870 |  | 1753 | 1870 |  | 1781 | 1696 | 1585 | 1781 | 1870 | 1835 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 8.5 | 1.3 |  | 15.0 | 10.6 |  | 3.4 | 16.0 | 6.5 | 5.7 | 51.0 | 51.7 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g$ c ), s | 8.5 | 1.3 |  | 15.0 | 10.6 |  | 3.4 | 16.0 | 6.5 | 5.7 | 51.0 | 51.7 |
| Green Ratio ( g/C ) | 0.08 | 0.08 |  | 0.23 | 0.28 |  | 0.53 | 0.49 | 0.62 | 0.55 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h | 151 | 153 |  | 380 | 519 |  | 145 | 1663 | 983 | 453 | 1910 | 937 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.506 | 0.125 |  | 0.573 | 0.350 |  | 0.623 | 0.382 | 0.180 | 0.333 | 0.849 | 0.856 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 121.4 | 28.2 |  | 276.8 | 214.7 |  | 68.9 | 270.9 | 98.1 | 102.2 | 759.5 | 777.2 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 4.8 | 1.1 |  | 10.7 | 8.5 |  | 2.7 | 10.2 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 29.9 | 31.1 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 0.76 | 0.00 |  | 0.52 | 0.00 |  | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.61 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 61.3 | 58.0 |  | 46.6 | 39.3 |  | 30.6 | 21.8 | 11.1 | 16.3 | 28.8 | 29.0 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 2.6 | 0.4 |  | 1.4 | 0.4 |  | 4.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 4.1 | 8.5 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 63.9 | 58.3 | 0.0 | 47.9 | 39.7 | 0.0 | 34.9 | 22.1 | 11.2 | 16.7 | 32.9 | 37.4 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | E | E | A | D | D | A | C | C | B | B | C | D |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 33.8 |  | C | 35.5 |  | D | 21.2 |  | C | 33.4 |  | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 31.0 |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.61 | C | 2.45 | B | 2.10 | B | 2.10 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 0.78 | A | 1.31 | A | 1.23 | A | 1.90 | B |

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |

Project Description Intersection Information

## LTG

 KLD FDOT US 17/92US 17/92 at Dirksen Dr 4628.12 Rivington

| Duration, h |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type | 0.25 |
| PHF | 0.95 |
|  | Analyer |



| Demand Inform | ation |  |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Move | ment |  |  | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand ( $v$ ), v | h/h |  |  | 143 | 152 | 92 | 218 | 33 | 148 | 103 | 1964 | 462 | 145 | 905 | 66 |
| Signal Inform | ion |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | S. | 此 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle, s | 190.5 | Reference Phase | 2 |  |  |  | ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 7.1 | 5.4 | 110.0 | 20.0 | 16.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uncoordinated | Yes | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 5.5 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.5 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 |  |  | ${ }^{6}$ | 7 |  |


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase |  | 4 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Case Number |  | 5.3 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s |  | 23.5 | 29.0 | 52.5 | 15.1 | 117.5 | 20.5 | 122.9 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), s |  | 7.5 | 9.0 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 7.5 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s |  | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 5.9 | 4.0 | 5.9 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s |  | 19.3 | 23.3 | 17.4 | 7.0 | 111.6 | 14.2 | 18.9 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{e}$ ), s |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 83.8 |
| Phase Call Probability |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.36 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.89 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 151 | 160 | 97 | 229 | 35 | 156 | 108 | 2067 | 444 | 153 | 689 | 333 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1363 | 1870 |  | 1781 | 1648 |  | 1654 | 1781 | 1585 | 1753 | 1856 | 1788 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 17.3 | 16.2 |  | 21.3 | 3.1 |  | 5.0 | 109.6 | 22.5 | 12.2 | 16.8 | 16.9 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ), s | 17.3 | 16.2 |  | 21.3 | 3.1 |  | 5.0 | 109.6 | 22.5 | 12.2 | 16.8 | 16.9 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.09 | 0.09 |  | 0.21 | 0.24 |  | 0.63 | 0.58 | 0.70 | 0.66 | 0.61 | 0.61 |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h | 161 | 170 |  | 244 | 401 |  | 370 | 2081 | 1103 | 162 | 2274 | 1096 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.932 | 0.942 |  | 0.941 | 0.087 |  | 0.293 | 0.994 | 0.403 | 0.942 | 0.303 | 0.304 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 379.6 | 393.9 |  | 475.4 | 66.8 |  | 92.4 | $\begin{gathered} 1571 . \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 312.6 | 385.9 | 294.4 | 281.5 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 14.8 | 15.5 |  | 18.7 | 2.4 |  | 3.4 | 61.9 | 12.3 | 15.0 | 11.5 | 11.3 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 2.37 | 0.00 |  | 0.90 | 0.00 |  | 0.44 | 0.00 | 1.95 | 1.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 88.1 | 86.1 |  | 69.2 | 56.2 |  | 14.8 | 39.6 | 12.2 | 69.5 | 17.8 | 17.5 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 51.2 | 52.2 |  | 41.5 | 0.1 |  | 0.4 | 18.2 | 0.5 | 53.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay ( d ), s/veh | 139.3 | 138.3 | 0.0 | 110.7 | 56.3 | 0.0 | 15.3 | 57.8 | 12.7 | 123.3 | 18.0 | 17.9 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | F | F | A | F | E | A | B | E | B | F | B | B |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 105.8 |  | F | 65.2 |  | E | 48.4 |  | D | 31.6 | C |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 50.7 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |

## Multimodal Results

Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS
Bicycle LOS Score / LOS

| EB |  | WB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.68 | C | 2.47 | B |
| 1.16 | A | 1.18 | A |


| NB |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2.10 | B |
| 2.65 | C |


| SB |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2.10 | B |
| 1.13 | A |


| HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| Analyst | KLD | Intersection | US 17/92 at Barwick Road |
| Agency/Co. | LTG | Jurisdiction | Volusia |
| Date Performed | 7/30/19 | East/West Street | US 17/92 |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | North/South Street | Barwick Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak-Hour Build-Out | Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 4628.13 |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach <br> Movement | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | T | TR |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 7 | 0 | 119 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 59 | 712 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 2436 | 11 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 25 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 33 |  |  | 0 | 7 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \\| Storage | Left + Thru |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 8.00 | 6.54 | 6.94 | 7.54 | 6.54 | 6.94 | 4.76 |  |  |  | 4.24 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.75 | 4.02 | 3.32 | 3.52 | 4.02 | 3.32 | 2.53 |  |  |  | 2.27 |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



| HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| Analyst | KLD | Intersection | US 17/92 at Barwick Road |
| Agency/Co. | LTG | Jurisdiction | Volusia |
| Date Performed | 17/30/19 | East/West Street | US 17/92 |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | North/South Street | Barwick Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak-Hour Build-Out | Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 4628.13 |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L |  | TR |  |  | LTR |  |  | L | T | TR |  | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 12 | 0 | 93 |  | 5 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 159 | 2973 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 1368 | 14 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 20 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 |  |  | 0 | 11 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left + Thru |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways


## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description | Project Description

Intersection Information

## LTG

 KLD FDOT US 17/92 US 17/92 at Highbanks Rd File Name 4628.12 RivingtonDuration, h 0.25

|  | Analysis Date | Jul 30, 2019 | Area Type | Other |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Time Period | AM Build-Out | PHF | 0.94 |
|  | Analysis Year | 2022 | Analysis Period | $1>7: 00$ |
|  | File Name | 5. US 17-92 at Highbanks Rd - AM Build-Out - Re... |  |  | 5. US 17-92 at Highbanks Rd - AM Build-Out - Re...


| EB |  |  | WB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| 178 | 80 | 97 | 208 | 100 | 116 | 88 | 550 | 77 | 57 | 1605 | 133 |



| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 19.1 | 23.4 | 21.0 | 25.3 | 11.3 | 64.9 | 10.7 | 64.3 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH), s | 4.2 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s | 12.7 | 9.3 | 14.6 | 18.5 | 5.1 |  | 4.1 |  |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{\text {e }}$ ), s | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 0.87 |  |
| Max Out Probability | 1.00 | 0.42 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 |  |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 189 | 85 | 103 | 221 | 230 |  | 94 | 340 | 327 | 61 | 1707 | 141 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1767 | 1856 | 1547 | 1753 | 1638 |  | 1767 | 1826 | 1747 | 1668 | 1766 | 1560 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 10.7 | 4.9 | 7.3 | 12.6 | 16.5 |  | 3.1 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 2.1 | 57.6 | 6.1 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ), s | 10.7 | 4.9 | 7.3 | 12.6 | 16.5 |  | 3.1 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 2.1 | 57.6 | 6.1 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.25 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.27 | 0.16 |  | 0.53 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.53 | 0.49 | 0.49 |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h | 258 | 267 | 223 | 417 | 262 |  | 142 | 890 | 859 | 382 | 1720 | 759 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $~(~) ~$ | 0.735 | 0.319 | 0.464 | 0.530 | 0.878 |  | 0.659 | 0.382 | 0.380 | 0.159 | 0.993 | 0.186 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 233.3 | 108.8 | 138.8 | 240 | 353.3 |  | 70.2 | 261.9 | 243.9 | 38.8 | 924.5 | 104.6 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 9.1 | 4.2 | 5.3 | 9.3 | 13.4 |  | 2.7 | 10.1 | 9.8 | 1.4 | 36.1 | 4.1 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 0.90 | 0.00 | 0.63 | 1.30 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.84 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 38.6 | 46.3 | 47.1 | 36.5 | 49.3 |  | 28.1 | 19.4 | 19.3 | 15.1 | 30.8 | 17.4 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 9.5 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 26.4 |  | 8.0 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 20.1 | 0.5 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | 48.1 | 47.3 | 49.3 | 37.6 | 75.7 |  | 36.1 | 20.6 | 20.6 | 15.3 | 50.9 | 17.9 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | D | D | D | D | E |  | D | C | C | B | D | B |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 48.2 |  | D | 57.0 |  | E | 22.5 |  | C | 47.3 | D |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 43.3 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.31 | B | 2.46 | B | 1.91 | B | 2.10 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.11 | A | 1.23 | A | 1.12 | A | 2.06 | B |

## General Information

| Agency |
| :--- |
| Analyst |
| Jurisdiction |
| Urban Street |
| Intersection |
| Project Description |

Intersection Information

## LTG

 KLD FDOT US 17/92 US 17/92 at Highbanks Rd File Name 4628.12 Rivington| Intersection Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Duration, h | 0.25 |
| Area Type | Other |
| PHF | 0.95 |
| Analysis Period | $1>7: 00$ |



| Demand Information |  |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement |  |  |  | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |  |  |  | 240 | 144 | 92 | 180 | 133 | 94 | 123 | 1703 | 102 | 124 | 768 | 141 |
| Signal Information |  |  |  |  | $s$ | SU | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle, s | 150.0 | Reference Phase | 2 |  | 5 |  |  |  | $\overbrace{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 7.3 | 1.7 | 77.0 | 15.4 | 0.5 | 22.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 4.4 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 22.0 | 29.7 | 21.5 | 29.2 | 13.7 | 83.4 | 15.4 | 85.0 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R{ }_{c}$ ), s | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 4.2 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s | 18.5 | 13.1 | 15.1 | 22.3 | 7.2 |  | 8.9 |  |
| Green Extension Time ( $\mathrm{ge}_{\text {e }}$, s | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |
| Max Out Probability | 1.00 | 0.22 | 0.31 | 1.00 | 0.06 |  | 0.29 |  |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 253 | 152 | 97 | 189 | 239 |  | 129 | 951 | 949 | 131 | 808 | 148 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1781 | 1870 | 1547 | 1781 | 1727 |  | 1739 | 1870 | 1833 | 1739 | 1766 | 1535 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 16.5 | 11.1 | 8.4 | 13.1 | 20.3 |  | 5.2 | 74.7 | 77.6 | 6.9 | 20.9 | 7.6 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g$ c ), s | 16.5 | 11.1 | 8.4 | 13.1 | 20.3 |  | 5.2 | 74.7 | 77.6 | 6.9 | 20.9 | 7.6 |
| Green Ratio ( g/C ) | 0.27 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.26 | 0.16 |  | 0.57 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.58 | 0.53 | 0.53 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h | 268 | 298 | 247 | 323 | 270 |  | 387 | 970 | 950 | 162 | 1871 | 813 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.944 | 0.508 | 0.392 | 0.587 | 0.885 |  | 0.335 | 0.981 | 0.999 | 0.807 | 0.432 | 0.183 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 421 | 236 | 159.9 | 253.7 | 418.2 |  | 97 | 1251 | $\begin{gathered} 1275 . \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | 242.5 | 346.6 | 131.2 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 16.6 | 9.3 | 6.2 | 10.0 | 16.3 |  | 3.7 | 49.3 | 51.0 | 9.3 | 13.5 | 5.0 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 1.62 | 0.00 | 0.73 | 1.37 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.05 | 0.00 | 1.05 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 50.3 | 58.0 | 56.5 | 46.1 | 62.0 |  | 16.8 | 35.8 | 36.1 | 44.4 | 21.7 | 18.4 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 39.9 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 27.1 |  | 0.5 | 24.6 | 28.9 | 13.9 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 90.2 | 59.9 | 58.0 | 47.8 | 89.0 |  | 17.3 | 60.4 | 65.0 | 58.2 | 22.5 | 18.9 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | F | E | E | D | F |  | B | E | E | E | C | B |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 74.8 |  | E | 70.8 | E |  | 59.8 | E |  | 26.3 | C |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 53.8 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.32 | B | 2.47 | B | 1.91 | B | 2.10 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.31 | A | 1.19 | A | 2.16 | B | 1.38 | A |








|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| General Information | Site Information |  |  |
| Analyst | KLD | Intersection | Barwick Rd at Driveway 3 |
| Agency/Co. | LTG | Jurisdiction | DeBary |
| Date Performed | $7 / 20 / 2019$ | East/West Street | Barwick Road |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | North/South Street | Project Driveway 3 |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak-Hour Build-Out | Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 4628.12 Rivington |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 79 |  | 90 |  |  |  |  |  | 35 | 34 |  |  |  | 36 | 35 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 7.1 | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 6.41 | 6.21 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.51 | 3.31 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| General Information | Site Information |  |  |
| Analyst | KLD | Intersection | Barwick Rd at Driveway 3 |
| Agency/Co. | LTG | Jurisdiction | DeBary |
| Date Performed | $7 / 30 / 2019$ | East/West Street | Barwick Road |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | North/South Street | Project Driveway 3 |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak-Hour Build-Out | Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 4628.12 Rivington |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 58 |  | 65 |  |  |  |  |  | 103 | 38 |  |  |  | 29 | 131 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 7.1 | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 6.41 | 6.21 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 3.51 | 3.31 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## APPENDIX K INTERSECTIONS HCS SUMMARY-BUILD-OUT CONDITIONS IMPROVED

## General Information

| Agency | LT |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | KLD |
| Jurisdiction | FD |
| Urban Street | US |
| Intersection | US |


| LTG |
| :--- |
| KLD |
| FDOT |
| US 17/92 |
| US 17/92 at Fort Florida... |
| 4628.12 Rivington |

Intersection Information

Project Description

| Analysis Date | Jul 30, 2019 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Time Period | AM Build-Out - <br> Improved |
| Analysis Year | 2022 |


| Duration, h | 0.25 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type | Other |
| PHF | 0.92 |
|  | Analysis Period |



| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 7 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 18.5 | 31.5 | 26.5 | 39.5 | 14.0 | 93.6 | 10.5 | 90.0 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{\text {c }}$ ), s | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 3.1 | 4.2 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 3.9 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s | 14.5 | 25.1 | 21.8 | 4.5 | 7.5 | 14.4 | 3.0 | 76.2 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{\text {e }}$ ), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 36.9 | 0.0 | 7.3 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.66 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.59 | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.93 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 160 | 234 |  | 267 | 34 |  | 110 | 702 | 52 | 24 | 1790 | 891 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1697 | 1614 |  | 1810 | 1796 |  | 1697 | 1644 | 1610 | 1781 | 1856 | 1827 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 12.5 | 23.1 |  | 19.8 | 2.5 |  | 5.5 | 12.4 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 72.7 | 74.2 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ), s | 12.5 | 23.1 |  | 19.8 | 2.5 |  | 5.5 | 12.4 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 72.7 | 74.2 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.23 | 0.16 |  | 0.30 | 0.21 |  | 0.57 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.52 | 0.52 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h | 377 | 254 |  | 290 | 371 |  | 135 | 2667 | 870 | 428 | 1924 | 947 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.423 | 0.920 |  | 0.921 | 0.091 |  | 0.815 | 0.263 | 0.060 | 0.056 | 0.930 | 0.940 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 250.6 | 450.5 |  | 422.1 | 49.5 |  | 135.6 | 213.5 | 41.2 | 18.5 | 1091.5 | 1129.2 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 9.4 | 17.7 |  | 16.9 | 2.0 |  | 5.1 | 8.1 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 42.6 | 45.2 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.36 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 52.4 | 67.3 |  | 49.4 | 52.0 |  | 41.9 | 20.1 | 17.7 | 17.3 | 36.5 | 36.7 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.3 | 35.8 |  | 32.3 | 0.0 |  | 18.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 16.4 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | 52.7 | 103.1 |  | 81.7 | 52.0 |  | 60.2 | 20.1 | 17.7 | 17.4 | 45.0 | 53.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | D | F |  | F | D |  | E | C | B | B | D | D |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 82.7 |  | F | 78.3 |  | E | 25.1 |  | C | 47.4 |  | D |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 48.3 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.75 | C | 2.61 | C | 1.91 | B | 1.92 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.14 | A | 0.98 | A | 0.96 | A | 1.97 | B |

## General Information

| Agency | L |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | K |
| Jurisdiction | F |
| Urban Street | US |
| Intersection | US |


| LTG |
| :--- |
| KLD |
| FDOT |
| US 17/92 |
| US 17/92 at Fort Florida... |
| 4628.12 Rivington |

Intersection Information

Project Description

| Analysis Date | Jul 30, 2019 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Time Period | PM Build-Out - <br> Improved |
| Analysis Year | 2022 |


| Duration, h | 0.25 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type | Other |
| PHF | 0.95 |
|  |  |
|  | Analysis Period | $1>7: 00$


| Demand Information | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h | 130 | 25 | 160 | 215 | 40 | 10 | 375 | 2632 | 50 | 33 | 883 | 206 |



| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 7 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 18.5 | 27.9 | 25.7 | 35.0 | 27.5 | 96.4 | 11.2 | 80.2 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{\text {c }}$ ), s | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 3.1 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 3.9 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s | 12.8 | 21.1 | 19.0 | 5.9 | 20.4 | 86.9 | 3.6 | 25.5 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{\text {e }}$ ), s | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 46.4 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.79 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.05 | 0.27 | 0.73 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.58 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 137 | 195 |  | 226 | 53 |  | 395 | 2771 | 53 | 35 | 789 | 357 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1753 | 1618 |  | 1810 | 1834 |  | 1781 | 1698 | 1610 | 1781 | 1870 | 1686 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 10.8 | 19.1 |  | 17.0 | 3.9 |  | 18.4 | 84.9 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 23.4 | 23.5 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ), s | 10.8 | 19.1 |  | 17.0 | 3.9 |  | 18.4 | 84.9 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 23.4 | 23.5 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.21 | 0.13 |  | 0.26 | 0.18 |  | 0.60 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.49 | 0.46 | 0.46 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h | 351 | 214 |  | 277 | 325 |  | 429 | 2842 | 898 | 99 | 1709 | 771 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.389 | 0.908 |  | 0.818 | 0.162 |  | 0.920 | 0.975 | 0.059 | 0.352 | 0.462 | 0.464 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 217.5 | 377.7 |  | 325.7 | 80.9 |  | 378.6 | 1148.5 | 39.4 | 32 | 395.4 | 360.5 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 95 th percentile) | 8.4 | 14.9 |  | 13.0 | 3.2 |  | 14.9 | 45.2 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 15.6 | 14.4 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 95 th percentile) | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 55.0 | 68.9 |  | 51.5 | 56.2 |  | 24.7 | 34.5 | 16.3 | 38.4 | 30.1 | 30.2 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.3 | 30.8 |  | 9.9 | 0.1 |  | 22.0 | 11.6 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | 55.2 | 99.7 |  | 61.4 | 56.3 |  | 46.7 | 46.1 | 16.3 | 39.2 | 30.3 | 30.6 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | E | F |  | E | E |  | D | D | B | D | C | C |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 81.4 |  | F | 60.4 |  | E | 45.7 |  | D | 30.7 |  | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 45.3 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.75 | C | 2.61 | C | 1.91 | B | 1.92 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.03 | A | 0.95 | A | 2.26 | B | 1.14 | A |




and

CONCEPTUAL SKETCH
5/20/2019 - CONTACT BRENT A. LENZEN, P.E. (407) 427-1610

NOT TO SCALE
Kimley»)Horn


[^0]:    Annette Hatch, City Clerk

[^1]:    Annette Hatch, City Clerk

[^2]:    *Adopted LOS, capacity, existing AADT, and existing P.M. Peak-Hour Two-Way Volume obtained from the 2017 Volusia County Traffic Count Spreadsheet; When
    2017 data unavailable, 2016 AADT data and K-Factor of 0.09 used; Capacity of US 17/92 based on capacity reported in the approved Hawthorn Landing TIA.
    **Improved capacity based upon HIGHPLAN analysis.

