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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides a summary of a traffic impact study that was performed for a proposed mixed-use development to be located at the northeast corner of Concord Road and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive in Knox County, Tennessee. The project site is located on the east side of Concord Road and north side of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive. The development plan for this site proposes a 7,015 square-foot Convenience Store / Gas Station with 14 fueling stations, and two 2,800 square-foot retail buildings with unknown usage. For the purposes of this study, it was assumed that these retail buildings would both be fast food restaurants with drive through windows, to accommodate for the potential maximum amount of traffic to be generated. The proposed development will have one partial access on Concord Road approximately 390 feet north of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive, where a driveway cut currently exists. The partial access will be a right-in / right-out only access on Concord Road. Additionally, the development will have one full access on $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive approximately 150 feet east of Concord Road.

The purpose of this study was the evaluation of the traffic operational and safety impacts of the proposed development upon roadways in the vicinity of the project site. Comments received from Knox County Engineering, Knoxville-Knox County Planning, and the Town of Farragut resulted in the existing intersections of Concord Road at Turkey Creek Road / Summerdale Drive, Concord Road at $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive, and Concord Road at Northshore Drive being identified for detailed study. Appropriate intersection evaluations such as capacity analyses, turn-lane warrants, and signal warrants were conducted at the study intersections for existing and future conditions, both with and without site generated traffic, in order to determine the anticipated impacts and to establish recommended measures to mitigate these impacts. Additionally, the proposed site accesses on Concord Road and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive were evaluated for turn lane warrants and sight distance.

The primary conclusion of this study is that the traffic generated from the proposed development will have only minor impacts at the study intersections. However, some improvements are recommended to improve operations, safety, and capacity. The following is a list of recommendations developed with this traffic impact study:

1) A northbound right turn lane onto $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive from Concord Road should be constructed with a storage length of 50 feet and a taper length of 120 feet.
2) Ensure that grading, landscaping, signing, and other site features do not restrict lines of sight exiting the development. The sight distance looking left when exiting the site onto $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive should be improved to at least 250 feet.
3) The lanes on $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive should be widened to at least 10 feet per Knox County requirements.
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## INTRODUCTION \& PURPOSE OF STUDY

This report provides a summary of a traffic impact study that was performed for a proposed mixed-use development to be located at the northeast corner of Concord Road and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive in Knox County, Tennessee. The project site is located on the east side of Concord Road and the north side of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive. FIGURE 1 is a location map showing the major roadways in the project site vicinity.


FIGURE 1 LOCATION MAP

The development plan for this site proposes a 7,015 square-foot Convenience Store / Gas Station with 14 fueling stations, and two 2,800 square-foot retail buildings with unknown usage. For the purposes of this study, it was assumed that these retail buildings would both be fast food restaurants with drive through windows, to accommodate for the potential maximum amount of traffic to be generated. The proposed development will have one partial access on Concord Road approximately 390 feet north of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive, where a driveway cut currently exists. The partial access will be a right-in / right-out only access on Concord Road. Additionally, the development will have one full access on $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive approximately 150 feet east of Concord Road. FIGURE 2 is a Conceptual Site Plan detailing the proposed site.
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The purpose of this study was the evaluation of the traffic operational and safety impacts of the proposed development upon roadways in the vicinity of the project site. Comments received from Knox County Engineering, Knoxville-Knox County Planning, and the Town of Farragut resulted in the existing intersections of Concord Road at Turkey Creek Road / Summerdale Drive, Concord Road at $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive, and Concord Road at Northshore Drive being identified for detailed study. Appropriate intersection evaluations such as capacity analyses, turn-lane warrants, and signal warrants were conducted at the study intersections for existing and future conditions, both with and without site generated traffic, in order to determine the anticipated impacts and to establish recommended measures to mitigate these impacts. Additionally, the proposed site accesses on Concord Road and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive were evaluated for turn lane warrants and sight distance.


FIGURE 2
CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

## EXISTING ROADWAY CONDITIONS

Concord Road is classified as a Minor Arterial per the Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) Functional Classification Maps and runs south to north from Northshore Drive to Kingston Pike. Within the study limits, Concord Road varies between a divided four-lane roadway with 2 travel lanes in each direction and an undivided five-lane roadway with two travel lanes in each direction and a center twoway left turn lane. In the study vicinity, Concord Road has 12-foot travel lanes and a posted speed limit of 40 mph . Concord Road has curb and gutter, bike lanes, and sidewalk on both sides of the roadway within the vicinity of the study

Turkey Creek Road is classified as a Major Collector per the TDOT Functional Classification Maps and runs west to east from Virtue Road to Concord Road. Turkey Creek Road is a two-lane road with one travel lane in each direction. Within this section, Turkey Creek Road has 12-foot travel lanes and a posted speed limit of 40 mph . Turkey Creek Road has curb and gutter on both sides and sidewalk on the north side in the study vicinity.

2nd Drive is a local road with no pavement markings except at the intersection with Concord Road, and one travel lane each direction ranging from 7 to 8 feet wide. 2nd Drive has a posted speed limit of 25 mph , and it does not have curb and gutter or sidewalk.

Northshore Drive is a west to east road running from Beals Chapel Road to Papermill Drive. East of Concord Road, Northshore Drive is classified as a Minor Arterial per the TDOT Functional Classification Maps; west of Concord Road it is classified as a Major Collector. In the study vicinity, Northshore Drive is a two-lane road with one travel lane in each direction, has no curb and gutter or sidewalk, and has a posted speed limit of 40 mph . Northshore Drive has 12 -foot lane widths east of Concord Road and 11foot lane widths west of Concord Road in the study vicinity.

The existing intersection of Concord Road at Turkey Creek Road / Summerdale Drive is a four-legged signalized intersection. Concord Road is considered the north-south street, and Turkey Creek Road / Summerdale Drive are considered the east-west streets. The southbound Concord Road approach contains one exclusive left turn lane, two exclusive through lanes, and one exclusive right turn lane. The left turn lane has storage of approximately 90 feet, and the right turn storage is 470 feet. The northbound Concord Road approach contains one exclusive left turn lane, one exclusive through lane, and a shared through / right turn lane. The left turn lane storage is approximately 70 feet. The eastbound approach, Turkey Creed Road, contains one exclusive left turn lane and one lane that services all movements with a storage length of approximately 165 feet. The westbound approach, Summerdale Drive, consists of one lane to service all movements. Marked crosswalks and actuated pedestrian signal phases exist crossing all legs of the intersection.

The existing intersection of Concord Road at $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive is a three-legged, side-street stop controlled intersection. Concord Road is the north-south street and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive is the east-west street. The southbound approach of Concord Road contains one exclusive left turn lane and two exclusive through lanes. The left turn lane has a storage length of approximately 65 feet. The northbound approach of Concord Road contains one exclusive through lane and one shared through / right turn
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lane. The westbound approach of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive has one lane to service all movements. A marked crosswalk exists crossing the east leg of the intersection.

The existing intersection of Concord Road at Northshore Drive is a three-legged intersection controlled by a roundabout. Concord Road is considered the north-south street and Northshore Drive is considered the east-west street. The southbound approach of Concord Road contains one exclusive, yield controlled right turn bypass lane and an additional lane entering the roundabout. The eastbound approach of Northshore Drive has one lane entering the roundabout. The westbound approach of Northshore Drive contains one exclusive, free flowing right turn bypass lane and an additional lane entering the roundabout.

## EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

The project site is located at the intersection of Concord Road and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive on the east side of Concord Road and the north side of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive. The area of the site is approximately 20.6 acres, and it is currently zoned Neighborhood Commercial. The site is relatively flat and wooded throughout with no existing structures. A driveway cut currently exists on the west side of the site to Concord Road. FIGURE 3 provides an aerial view of the project site and the surrounding area.


FIGURE 3
EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

## EXISTING TRAFFIC DATA

Two types of traffic data were gathered for this study. The Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) collects annual average daily traffic (AADT) data on roadways in the study area. Three count stations, located on Turkey Creek Road east of Brixworth Boulevard, Northshore Drive east of Concord Park Drive, and Concord Road at Clarity Pointe Lane, were found near the project site that were felt to have particular relevance for this study. The most currently available data from these stations can be found in TABLE 1.

TABLE 1: ANNUAL AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC COUNT SUMMARY

| COUNT YEAR | TDOT COUNT STATION 47000305 TURKEY CREEK ROAD | TDOT COUNT STATION 47000361 NORTHSHORE DRIVE | $\begin{gathered} \text { TDOT COUNT STATION } \\ 47000455 \\ \text { CONCORD ROAD } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2018 | 2,889 | 13,682 | 10,070 |
| 2019 | 2,664 | 13,523 | 11,530 |
| 2020 | 2,264 | 13,793 | 11,464 |
| 2021 | 4,453 | 17,152 | 12,037 |
| 2022 | 4,404 | 15,495 | 11,905 |
| 2023 | 3,062 | 15,305 | 15,482 |

In addition to the available AADT data, intersection turning movement counts (TMC) were conducted at the existing study intersections to determine the current morning (AM) and evening (PM) peak hour operating volumes. These peak hour volumes are the traffic volumes with which the study's capacity analyses are based. The intersection TMC data were collected on March 20, 2024. The 2024 existing peak hour traffic volumes are summarized in FIGURE 4, and the raw data traffic count summary sheets are contained in APPENDIX A.

## EXISTING CAPACITY ANALYSES

Capacity analyses employing the methods of the Highway Capacity Manual were conducted for the existing conditions at the study intersections. These analyses were performed with the 2024 existing traffic volumes, shown in FIGURE 4, and existing intersection geometry, traffic control, and signal timing. Synchro 11 software was utilized for the capacity analyses for the intersection of Concord Road at Turkey Creek Road / Summerdale Drive. HCS 2022 software was utilized for the capacity analysis for the intersections of Concord Road at $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive and Concord Road at Northshore Drive. The EVALUATIONS section of this report may be referenced for discussion and tabular summaries of these analyses, while more detailed summaries are presented on the computer printouts contained in APPENDIX C. Also contained in APPENDIX C is a section titled "Capacity and Level of Service Concepts," which provides a description of the utilized procedures.
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FIGURE 4
2024 EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

## BACKGROUND CONDITIONS

## BACKGROUND TRAFFIC GROWTH

The year for full buildout of the proposed development is unknown, however, the gas station / convenience store is anticipated to be completed in 2026. Therefore, Year 2026 was established as the appropriate design / analysis year for the study. In order to determine traffic volumes resulting solely from background traffic growth to Year 2026, it was necessary to establish an annual growth rate for existing traffic. The TDOT AADT values previously discussed, as well as knowledge of the area, were used to determine an approximate annual growth rate. Based on the available data, a background annual growth rate of $3.5 \%$ was assumed. FIGURE 5 contains the background traffic volumes that would result from this annual growth rate from Year 2024, when the counts were conducted, to Year 2026.

## BACKGROUND CAPACITY ANALYSES / LEVELS-OF-SERVICE

Capacity analyses as described in the EXISTING CONDITIONS section of this report were conducted utilizing the Year 2026 background volumes shown in FIGURE 5 and existing intersection geometry, traffic control, and signal timing. The EVALUATIONS section of this report may be referenced for discussion and tabular summaries of these analyses, while more detailed summaries are presented on the computer printouts contained in APPENDIX C.


FIGURE 5
2026 BACKGROUND TRAFFIC VOLUMES

## FUTURE CONDITIONS

## TRIP GENERATION

In order to estimate the expected traffic volumes to be generated by the proposed development, the procedures recommended by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) were utilized. The proposed development will include a gas station / convenience store that is 7,015 square feet and has 14 vehicle fueling stations, as well as two undetermined use retail buildings. These buildings are 2,800 square feet each, and were assumed to be fast food restaurants with drive throughs to account for the reasonable worst-case scenario traffic generated. The ITE Trip Generation Manual $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition was utilized for estimating traffic generated. The generated traffic volumes were determined based on the data for the peak hours of adjacent street traffic. Per guidance from a Knoxville-Knox County memorandum regarding pass-by rates for several land uses, a $65 \%$ pass-by rate was applied to the trip generation for the convenience market / gas station, and a $40 \%$ pass-by rate was applied to the trip generation for the fast-food restaurant. Pass-by trips are traffic volumes that are currently on the roadway and enter/exit the development as they "pass by" on their way to another destination. Additional trip generation information is contained in APPENDIX B. See TABLE 2 for a summary of the traffic generated for this development.

TABLE 2: TRIP GENERATION SUMMARY

| LAND USE | SIZE | WEEKDAY (TRIPS/DAY) | AM PEAK HOUR (TRIPS/HOUR) | $\begin{gathered} \text { PM PEAK } \\ \text { HOUR } \\ \text { (TRIPS/HOUR) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window LUC (934) | $\begin{gathered} 2,800 \\ \text { sqft } \end{gathered}$ | 1,309 | 125 | 92 |
| Entering Trips Exiting Trips |  | $\begin{aligned} & 655 \text { (50\%) } \\ & 654 \text { (50\%) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64 \text { (51\%) } \\ & 61 \text { (49\%) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48 \text { (52\%) } \\ & 44 \text { (48\%) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window LUC (934) | $\begin{gathered} 2,800 \\ \text { sqft } \end{gathered}$ | 1,309 | 125 | 92 |
| Entering Trips Exiting Trips |  | $\begin{aligned} & 654 \text { (50\%) } \\ & 655 \text { (50\%) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64 \text { (51\%) } \\ & 61 \text { (49\%) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48 \text { (52\%) } \\ & 44 \text { (48\%) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Convenience Store / Gas Station LUC (945) | 7,015 Sqft 14 pumps | 4,841 | 442 | 377 |
| Entering Trips Exiting Trips |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2,420(50 \%) \\ & 2,421(50 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 221 \text { (50\%) } \\ & 221 \text { (50\%) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 188 \text { (50\%) } \\ & 189 \text { (50\%) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Trips |  | 7,459 | 692 | 561 |
| Entering Trips Exiting Trips |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3,729 \\ & 3,730 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 349 \\ & 343 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 284 \\ & 277 \end{aligned}$ |
| Internal Trips |  | N/A | 90 | 129 |
| Entering Trips Exiting Trips |  | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65 \\ & 64 \end{aligned}$ |
| Net External Trips |  | 7,459 | 602 | 432 |
| Entering Trips Exiting Trips |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3,729 \\ & 3,730 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 304 \\ & 298 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 219 \\ & 213 \end{aligned}$ |
| Pass-by Trips |  | 4,194 | 387 | 319 |
| Entering Trips Exiting Trips |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2,097 \\ & 2,097 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 195 \\ & 192 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 161 \\ & 158 \end{aligned}$ |
| Non-Pass-by Trips |  | 3,265 | 215 | 113 |
| Entering Trips Exiting Trips |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1,632 \\ & 1,633 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 109 \\ & 106 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58 \\ & 55 \end{aligned}$ |

A.M. Peak Hour trip generation is based on Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
P.M. Peak Hour trip generation is based on Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.

## TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

The proposed trip distribution for this development was determined through a review of existing travel patterns, local knowledge of the study area, proposed site location in relation to the surrounding roadway network, and engineering judgment. Primary trips and pass-by trips were separated based on the Knoxville-Knox County Metropolitan Planning Commission pass-by rates. FIGURES 6A and 6B provide a summary of how the above site generated trips would be assigned to the study intersections. FIGURES 7A-7C provide the proposed trip assignment volumes to the study intersections.

## FUTURE TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Future projected traffic volumes for the study intersections were developed by adding the generated and assigned trips shown in FIGURE 7C to the 2026 background traffic volumes developed in the previous section and shown in FIGURE 5. These combined 2026 volumes reflect the existing traffic, the background traffic growth, and the generated traffic from the proposed development. These future volumes are shown on FIGURE 8 and are the combined volumes used in the analyses of future conditions with the proposed development.

## FUTURE CAPACITY ANALYSES / LEVELS-OF-SERVICE

Capacity analyses as described in the EXISTING CONDITIONS section of this report were conducted utilizing the Year 2026 combined volumes shown in FIGURE 8 and existing intersection geometry, traffic control, and signal timing, as well as some improvement alternatives. Tabular summaries of the analyses results and associated discussion are also contained in the EVALUATIONS section. In addition, detailed computer printout summaries of the analyses are contained in APPENDIX C.


FIGURE 6A
PRIMARY TRIP DISTRIBUTION


FIGURE 6B
PASS-BY TRIP DISTRIBUTION


FIGURE 7A
PRIMARY TRIP ASSIGNMENT


FIGURE 7B
PASS-BY TRIP ASSIGNMENT


FIGURE 7C
TOTAL TRIP ASSIGNMENT


FIGURE 8
2026 COMBINED TRAFIC VOLUMES

## EVALUATIONS

## INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSES

Intersection capacity analyses were performed for the study intersections. The capacity analyses employed the procedures of the Highway Capacity Manual utilizing Synchro 11 software. A description of the fundamentals of these procedures is contained in the APPENDIX C section titled "Capacity and Level-of-Service Concepts." The results of these analyses for the existing, background and combined future traffic conditions are presented and discussed by individual intersection in the subsections below. Capacity analyses summaries are presented for each intersection in these individual subsections, which are accompanied by tables showing level-of-service (LOS) and queuing results. More detailed information is contained on the capacity software output summaries contained in APPENDIX C.

Potential mitigation measures were identified at intersections experiencing poor LOS or where vehicle queuing may become an issue. These mitigation strategies, where applicable, are described for each intersection in their respective subsections. The accompanying LOS and queue length tables show comparisons between the intersections under existing geometry, traffic control, and signal timing to these mitigation strategies in order to provide a quantitative measure of effectiveness of the mitigation.

## Intersection \#1: Concord Road at Turkey Creek Road / Summerdale Drive

As shown in TABLE 3, this intersection currently operates at overall LOS "C" during the peak hours. The intersection is expected to continue to operate at the same LOS under combined traffic conditions upon construction and full buildout of the proposed development. The eastbound shared left turn lane / through lane / right turn lane queue exceeds the current storage length in all scenarios, but lengthening the storage for this lane is not feasible due to the bridge. Queues for the northbound left turn lane may exceed the storage length; however, the two-way left turn lane provides plenty of spillback storage. Based on these analyses, the development will have only minimal impacts on intersection operations.

TABLE 3: CAPACITY ANALYSES SUMMARY - CONCORD ROAD AT TURKEY CREEK ROAD / SUMMERDALE DRIVE

| SCENARIO |  | MOVEMENT/ APPROACH | AM PEAK (LOS/DELAY) | PM PEAK (LOS/DELAY) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 Existing | Existing Geometry, Traffic Control \& Signal Timing | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { NB } \\ \text { SB } \\ \text { Overall } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } 28.0 \\ \text { A } 0.7 \\ \text { C } 26.5 \\ \text { B } 16.4 \\ \text { C } 24.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { D } 42.8 \\ & \text { C } 33.3 \\ & \text { B } 16.7 \\ & \text { C } 22.7 \\ & \text { C } 23.7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2026 Background | Existing Geometry, Traffic Control \& Signal Timing | EB WB NB SB <br> Overall | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } 30.2 \\ \text { A } 0.8 \\ \text { C } 27.9 \\ \text { B } 16.4 \\ \text { C } 25.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { D } 45.4 \\ & \text { C } 34.0 \\ & \text { B } 17.2 \\ & \text { C } 24.2 \\ & \text { C } 25.1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2026 Combined | Existing Geometry, Traffic Control \& Signal Timing | EB <br> WB <br> NB <br> SB <br> Overall | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } 33.3 \\ \text { A } 0.9 \\ \text { C } 29.9 \\ \text { B } 19.6 \\ \text { C } 27.8 \end{gathered}$ | D 45.8 <br> D 37.6 <br> B 17.8 <br> C 25.7 <br> C 26.1 |


| TABLE 4: 95TH PERCENTIAL QUEUE SUMMARY - CONCORD ROAD AT TURKEY CREEK ROAD / SUMMERDALE DRIVE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCENARIO |  | MOVEMENT/ APPROACH | AM PEAK | PM PEAK |
| 2024 Existing | Existing Geometry, Traffic Control \& Signal Timing | EBL EBL/T/R WBL/T/R NBL NBT/R SBL SBT SBR | $\begin{gathered} 404^{\prime} \\ 178^{\prime} \\ 0^{\prime} \\ 31^{\prime} \\ 443^{\prime} \\ 10^{\prime} \\ 145^{\prime} \\ 19^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ | $248^{\prime}$ $193^{\prime}$ $36^{\prime}$ $92^{\prime}$ $293^{\prime}$ $12^{\prime}$ $468^{\prime}$ $33^{\prime}$ |
| 2026 Background | Existing Geometry, Traffic Control \& Signal Timing | EBL EBL/T/R WBL/T/R NBL NBT/R SBL SBT SBR | $\begin{gathered} 445^{\prime} \\ 206^{\prime} \\ 0^{\prime} \\ 32^{\prime} \\ 488^{\prime} \\ 10^{\prime} \\ 155^{\prime} \\ 20^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 271^{\prime} \\ 216^{\prime} \\ 37^{\prime} \\ 98^{\prime} \\ 320^{\prime} \\ 13^{\prime} \\ 532^{\prime} \\ 35^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 Combined | Existing Geometry, Traffic Control \& Signal Timing | EBL EBL/T/R WBL/T/R NBL NBT/R SBL SBT SBR | $\begin{gathered} 483^{\prime} \\ 227^{\prime} \\ 0^{\prime} \\ 53^{\prime} \\ 508^{\prime} \\ 10^{\prime} \\ 172^{\prime} \\ 21^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 289^{\prime} \\ 220^{\prime} \\ 44^{\prime} \\ 115^{\prime} \\ 330^{\prime} \\ 12^{\prime} \\ 560^{\prime} \\ 38^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ |

## Intersection \#2: Concord Road at $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive

TABLE 3A indicates that the westbound approach of this intersection currently operates at overall LOS "B" during the AM peak hour and LOS "C" during the PM peak hour. The approach is anticipated to worsen to LOS "E" during the AM peak hour and "F" during the PM peak hour upon full buildout of the development under existing geometry and traffic control. The westbound approach currently experiences minimal traffic, with the resulting delay mainly affecting users of the development rather than other users. Several mitigation scenarios were evaluated, resulting in marginal improvements for the westbound approach but potentially worsening conditions for other approaches. Signalizing this intersection would cause unnecessary delays to Concord Road that would not exist even with the full buildout of this development. While separating the left and right lanes on the westbound approach would lead to slightly shorter delays and queue lengths, the benefits are not significant enough to justify the cost and effort involved. According to the charts by M.D. Harmelink in the TDOT - Roadway Design Guidelines, the storage warranted for the southbound left turn lane is 200 feet. However, as seen in TABLE 4A, the queue length for this movement is projected to be 25 feet under the 2026 Combined scenario.

TABLE 3A: CAPACITY ANALYSES SUMMARY - CONCORD ROAD AT $2^{N D}$ DRIVE

| SCENARIO |  | MOVEMENT/ APPROACH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM PEAK } \\ & \text { (LOS/DELAY) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PM PEAK } \\ \text { (LOS/DELAY) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 Existing | Existing Geometry \& Traffic Control | WB SBL | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B } 12.2 \\ & \text { B } 12.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C } 16.1 \\ & \text { A } 9.6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2026 Background | Existing Geometry \& Traffic Control | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SBL } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B } 12.6 \\ & \text { B } 13.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } 17.0 \\ \text { A } 9.8 \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 Combined | Existing Geometry \& Traffic Control | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SBL } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } 49.9 \\ & \text { B } 13.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F } 56.6 \\ & \text { B } 11.1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2026 Combined | Exclusive Left \& Right Turn Lanes On $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SBL } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } 35.2 \\ & \text { B } 13.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } 47.7 \\ & \text { B } 11.1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2026 Combined | Northbound Right Turn Lane On Concord Road | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SBL } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } 44.3 \\ & \text { B } 13.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F } 53.6 \\ & \text { B } 11.1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2026 Combined | Signalized | WB <br> NB <br> SB <br> Overall | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } 20.7 \\ \text { B } 16.3 \\ \text { A } 5.2 \\ \text { B } 13.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } 34.2 \\ \text { B } 13.0 \\ \text { A } 5.6 \\ \text { B } 10.5 \end{gathered}$ |

$\qquad$
TABLE 4A: 95TH PERCENTIAL QUEUE SUMMARY - CONCORD ROAD AT $2^{\text {ND }}$ DRIVE

| SCENARIO |  | MOVEMENT/ APPROACH | AM PEAK | PM PEAK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 Existing | Existing Geometry \& Traffic Control | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SBL } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0^{\prime} \\ & 0^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3^{\prime} \\ & 0^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| 2026 Background | Existing Geometry \& Traffic Control | WB <br> SBL | $\begin{aligned} & 0^{\prime} \\ & 0^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3^{\prime} \\ & 0^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| 2026 Combined | Existing Geometry \& Traffic Control | WB <br> SBL | $\begin{gathered} 118^{\prime} \\ 25^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 120^{\prime} \\ 18^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 Combined | Exclusive Left \& Right Turn Lanes On $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive | WBL <br> WBR <br> SBL | $\begin{aligned} & 78^{\prime} \\ & 13^{\prime} \\ & 25^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100^{\prime} \\ 5^{\prime} \\ 18^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 Combined | Northbound Right Turn Lane On Concord Road | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SBL } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 108^{\prime} \\ 25^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 115^{\prime} \\ 18^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 Combined | Signalized | WB <br> NB <br> SBL <br> SBT | $\begin{gathered} 79^{\prime} \\ 317^{\prime} \\ 41^{\prime} \\ 49^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 110^{\prime} \\ 222^{\prime} \\ 42^{\prime} \\ 148^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ |

## Intersection \#3: Concord Road at Northshore Drive

As indicated in TABLES 3B and 4B, the existing overall intersection LOS is an " $F$ " during the AM peak hour, primarily due to significant delays and queues on the eastbound approach. This is projected to worsen to a more severe "F" through the background and combined scenarios. During the PM peak hour, the LOS is expected to worsen from "E" to "F" due to background traffic growth, with only a marginal increase in delay and queue length attributed to the development. The queue length and approach delay are anticipated to increase more significantly because of background conditions rather than the impact of the development.

TABLE 3B: CAPACITY ANALYSES SUMMARY - CONCORD ROAD AT NORTHSHORE DRIVE

| SCENARIO |  | MOVEMENT/ APPROACH | AM PEAK (LOS/DELAY) | PM PEAK (LOS/DELAY) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 Existing | Existing Geometry \& Traffic Control | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ <br> Overall | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } 103.1 \\ \text { A } 6.5 \\ \text { A } 6.1 \\ \text { F } 56.7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { E } 36.3 \\ \text { A } 7.1 \\ \text { C } 23.0 \\ \text { C } 19.7 \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 Background | Existing Geometry \& Traffic Control | EB <br> WB <br> SB <br> Overall | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } 145.4 \\ \text { A } 7.7 \\ \text { A } 6.5 \\ \text { F } 79.1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } 58.7 \\ \text { A } 8.4 \\ \text { D } 32.3 \\ \text { D } 28.8 \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 Combined | Existing Geometry $\mathcal{G}$ Traffic Control | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { SB } \end{gathered}$ <br> Overall | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } 167.9 \\ \text { A } 7.8 \\ \text { A } 6.8 \\ \text { F } 89.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } 65.7 \\ \text { A } 8.5 \\ \text { D } 34.3 \\ \text { D } 31.2 \end{gathered}$ |

TABLE 4B: $95^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTIAL QUEUE SUMMARY - CONCORD ROAD AT NORTHSHORE DRIVE

| SCENARIO |  | MOVEMENT/ APPROACH | AM PEAK | PM PEAK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 Existing | Existing Geometry \& Traffic Control | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SBL } \\ & \text { SBR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 880^{\prime} \\ 78^{\prime} \\ 25^{\prime} \\ 15^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 298^{\prime} \\ & 120^{\prime} \\ & 198^{\prime} \\ & 135^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| 2026 Background | Existing Geometry \& Traffic Control | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SBL } \\ & \text { SBR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1148^{\prime} \\ 98^{\prime} \\ 28^{\prime} \\ 18^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 418^{\prime} \\ & 150^{\prime} \\ & 273^{\prime} \\ & 178^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |
| 2026 Combined | Existing Geometry \& Traffic Control | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SBL } \\ & \text { SBR } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1268^{\prime} \\ 100^{\prime} \\ 33^{\prime} \\ 20^{\prime} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 450^{\prime} \\ & 153^{\prime} \\ & 290^{\prime} \\ & 188^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |

## Intersection \#4: Concord Road at Site Access

As shown in TABLES 3C and 4C, the site access on Concord Road with the proposed geometry has sufficient capacity for the development. The worst approach, westbound, has a LOS of "C" during the AM peak hour and "B" during the PM peak hour under the combined traffic scenario. The proposed condition analyzed a restricted access with right turn only from Concord Road into the site and a right turn only exiting the site onto Concord Road. There is currently a right turn flare at the driveway cut that exists where the proposed site access will be located.

TABLE 3C: CAPACITY ANALYSES SUMMARY - CONCORD ROAD AT SITE ACCESS

| SCENARIO |  | MOVEMENT/ <br> APPROACH | AM PEAK <br> (LOS/DELAY) | PM PEAK <br> (LOS/DELAY) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2026 Combined |  <br> Traffic Control | WB | C 16.7 | B12.7 |

TABLE 4C: 95TH PERCENTIAL QUEUE SUMMARY - CONCORD ROAD AT SITE ACCESS

| SCENARIO |  | MOVEMENT/ <br> APPROACH | AM PEAK | PM PEAK |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2026 Combined |  <br> Traffic Control | WBR | $40^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ |

## Intersection \#5: $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive at Site Access

As shown in TABLES 3D and 4D, the site access on $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive with the proposed geometry has sufficient capacity for the development. All approaches have a LOS "A" during both peak hours under the combined traffic scenario. The proposed condition analyzed one lane servicing all movements for each approach.

TABLE 3D: CAPACITY ANALYSES SUMMARY - $2^{\text {ND }}$ DRIVE AT SITE ACCESS

| SCENARIO |  | MOVEMENT/ <br> APPROACH | AM PEAK <br> (LOS/DELAY) | PM PEAK <br> (LOS/DELAY) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2026 Combined | Proposed Geometry 8 | EB | A 7.5 | A 7.4 |
|  | Traffic Control | SB | A8.9 | A8.9 |

TABLE 4D: $95^{\text {TH }}$ PERCENTIAL QUEUE SUMMARY $-2^{\text {ND }}$ DRIVE AT SITE ACCESS

| SCENARIO |  | MOVEMENT/ <br> APPROACH | AM PEAK | PM PEAK |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2026 Combined | Proposed Geometry \& | EBL | $13^{\prime}$ |  |
|  | Traffic Control | SB | $13^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ |

## TURN LANE WARRANT EVALUATIONS

Turn lane evaluations were conducted for a potential right lane entering the site from Concord Road and potential left and right lanes entering from $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive under combined volume scenarios, as well as a potential right turn lane from Concord Road onto $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive. The methods employed for the turn lane evaluation on $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive were those developed by M.D. Harmelink, as provided by in a series of tables from the Knox County publication Access Control and Driveway Design Policy. The results of these evaluations were that neither right nor left turn lanes are warranted on $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive entering the proposed development's access.

EZ STOP CONCORD ROAD TIS
CONSULTING ENGINEERS. FIELD SURVEYORS

The methods used for determining if turn lanes are warranted on Concord Road are the tables provided in TDOT's Highway Systems Access Manual Volume 3. A right turn lane into the site access from Concord Road and a right turn lane onto $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive from Concord Road were found to be warranted. Additional information can be found on the turn lane evaluation worksheets contained in APPENDIX D. Because a left turn lane exists from Concord Road onto $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive, a left turn lane warrant was not analyzed at this location.

## SIGNAL WARRANT EVALUATIONS

A signal warrant evaluation was performed for the intersection of Concord Road at $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive using the methods provided in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. None of the four hours of traffic data collected meet the warrant for existing and background conditions at this intersection. Under the combined condition, both AM and PM peak hours meet the signal warrant for Concord Road at $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive. An 8-hour warrant has not been evaluated; however, due to not having enough data. Additional information can be found on the signal warrant evaluation worksheets contained in APPENDIX E.

## SIGHT DISTANCE ASSESSMENT

Intersection sight distance was evaluated at the proposed intersections of Concord Road at the site access and 2nd Drive at the site access through field measurements. Measurements were taken looking right and left from the proposed site access approach at each location. According to AASHTO's A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets sight distance requirements for 40 mph roadways, 445 feet of sight distance is necessary when looking right and 385 feet is necessary when looking left from the proposed site access onto Concord Road. The sight distance looking left extends to the intersection with Northshore Drive. Sight distance looking right was not measured due to only having a right turn out of the site.

For 25 mph roadways, Knox County mandates 250 feet of sight distance looking left and right from the proposed site access onto 2 nd Drive. The sight distance looking right onto 2 nd Drive extends to the intersection of Concord Road. However, the sight distance looking left is obstructed to 225 feet due to a horizontal curve caused by vegetation and the current elevation of the corner of the proposed property. These issues can be mitigated by clearing and grading the proposed site to achieve a sight distance of at least 250 feet.

## CONCLUSIONS \& RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary conclusion of this study is that the traffic generated from the proposed development will have only minor impacts at the study intersections. Major congestion issues during peak hours do currently exist at the intersection of Concord Road at Northshore Drive, but the additional development impacts to this intersection would be marginal. The largest operational impacts would occur at the intersection of Concord Roat at $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive on the westbound $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive approach. This approach currently has very little traffic, and the majority of delay would be to users of the new development. The Knox County Engineering Department requested that the minimum width of 2nd Drive be increased to at least 20 feet. This width was deemed adequate, as heavy trucks are not expected to use this access into and out of the site. Turn lanes were warranted along Concord Road at the proposed site access and at $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive, and some were found to improve the operations of their respective intersections. Although a right turn lane is warranted into the site access from Concord Drive, there is currently a driveway flare that should be sufficient to serve the development. Furthermore, constructing of a right turn lane would require the relocation of a new large transmission pole. The signal warrant analysis at Concord Road at 2nd Drive determined that both peak hours meet the warrant under the combined scenario. However, because of the intersection's adequate performance as a side-street stop-controlled intersection, it is not recommended to install a signal at this time. Additionally, the southbound left turn volumes theoretically warrant an increase of the storage length to 200 feet, but the projected queue length is only around 25 feet. This being said, no changes to the existing turn lane are recommended.

Based on the above conclusions and other discussions throughout the report, the following is a list of recommendations developed with this traffic impact study:

1) A northbound right turn lane onto $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive from Concord Road should be constructed with a storage length of 50 feet and a taper length of 120 feet.
2) Ensure that grading, landscaping, signing, and other site features do not restrict lines of sight exiting the development. The sight distance looking left when exiting the site onto $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive should be improved to at least 250 feet.
3) The lanes on $2^{\text {nd }}$ Drive should be widened to at least 10 feet per Knox County requirements.
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## APPENDIX A - TRAFFIC DATA

## TRAFFIC GROWTH



| Count Year | Volume | Growth Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2003 |  | \#DIV/O! |
| 2004 |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 2005 | 9125 | \#DIV/0! |
| 2006 | 9399 | 3.00 |
| 2007 | 13128 | 39.67 |
| 2008 | 8232 | -37.29 |
| 2009 | 9390 | 14.07 |
| 2010 | 9072 | -3.39 |
| 2011 | 9996 | 10.19 |
| 2012 | 10402 | 4.06 |
| 2013 | 11048 | 6.21 |
| 2014 | 11529 | 4.35 |
| 2015 | 11898 | 3.20 |
| 2016 | 12462 | 4.74 |
| 2017 | 10070 | -19.19 |
| 2018 | 11530 | 14.50 |
| 2019 | 11464 | -0.57 |
| 2020 | 12037 | 5.00 |
| 2021 | 11905 | -1.10 |
| 2022 | 15482 | 30.05 |
| 2023 |  |  |



| Source: | TDOT |
| :--- | :---: |
| Location: | S. Northshore Dr. |
| Southeast of Farragut |  |
| Route \#: |  |
| Route Type: |  |
| Station: | 47000361 |
| Capacity: |  |


| Count Year | Volume | Growth Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2003 | 9036 |  |
| 2004 | 8820 | -2.39 |
| 2005 | 10107 | 14.59 |
| 2006 | 9769 | -3.34 |
| 2007 | 9429 | -3.48 |
| 2008 | 9411 | -0.19 |
| 2009 | 8802 | -6.47 |
| 2010 | 9802 | 11.36 |
| 2011 | 9621 | -1.85 |
| 2012 | 9372 | -2.59 |
| 2013 | 10453 | 11.53 |
| 2014 | 11846 | 13.33 |
| 2015 | 12099 | 2.14 |
| 2016 | 12576 | 3.94 |
| 2017 | 13709 | 9.01 |
| 2018 | 13682 | -0.20 |
| 2019 | 13523 | -1.16 |
| 2020 | 13793 | 2.00 |
| 2021 | 17152 | 24.35 |
| 2022 | 15495 | -9.66 |
| 2023 | 15305 | -1.23 |


| Avg. 1 Year Rate 2003-2023 | 2.98 |
| :---: | ---: |
| Avg. 1 Year Rate 2013-2023 | 4.25 |
| Avg. 1 Year Rate 2018-2023 | 2.86 |



| Count Year | Volume | Growth Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2003 | 1441 |  |
| 2004 | 1484 | 2.98 |
| 2005 | 1629 | 9.77 |
| 2006 | 1487 | -8.72 |
| 2007 | 1708 | 14.86 |
| 2008 | 1828 | 7.03 |
| 2009 | 1526 | -16.52 |
| 2010 | 1676 | 9.83 |
| 2011 | 1831 | 9.25 |
| 2012 | 1915 | 4.59 |
| 2013 | 1823 | -4.80 |
| 2014 | 2050 | 12.45 |
| 2015 | 2213 | 7.95 |
| 2016 | 2423 | 9.49 |
| 2017 | 2969 | 22.53 |
| 2018 | 2889 | -2.69 |
| 2019 | 2664 | -7.79 |
| 2020 | 2264 | -15.02 |
| 2021 | 4453 | 96.69 |
| 2022 | 4404 | -1.10 |
| 2023 | 3062 | -30.47 |


| Avg. 1 Year Rate 2003-2023 | 6.02 |
| :---: | ---: |
| Avg. 1 Year Rate 2013-2023 | 7.93 |
| Avg. 1 Year Rate 2018-2023 | 8.46 |



|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |



SR 332/Concord Rd \& Turkey Crk Rd/Summerdale Dr
Peak Hour Turning Movement Count


## National Data \& Surveying Services <br> Intersection Turning Movement Count



Prepared by National Data \& Surveying Services

## SR 332/Concord Rd \& 2nd Dr/2nd St

Peak Hour Turning Movement Count
ID: $24-190012-002$
City: Knoxville

City: Knoxville


Totals (NOON)


Totals (PM)



SOUTHBOUND



NOO

| AM | 0 | 403 | 2 | 1 | 918 | AM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOON | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NOON |
|  | PM | 0 | 956 | 2 | 0 | 756 |
| PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Day: Wednesday
Date: 3/20/2024


Totals (NOON)


Totals (PM)


## National Data \& Surveying Services <br> Intersection Turning Movement Count




Prepared by National Data \& Surveying Services

## SR 332/Concord Rd \& S Northshore Dr



## National Data \& Surveying Services <br> Intersection Turning Movement Count

| Location: SR 332/Concord Rd \& S Northshore Dr <br> City: Knoxville <br> Control: 3-Way Yield(SB/EB/WB) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ject ID: Date: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4-190012- } \\ & / 20 / 2024 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data - Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NS/ EW Streets: | SR 332/Concord Rd |  |  |  | SR 332/Concord Rd |  |  |  | S Northshore Dr |  |  |  | S Northshore Dr |  |  |  |  |
| AM | NORTHBOUND |  |  |  | SOUTHBOUND |  |  |  | EASTBOUND |  |  |  | WESTBOUND |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \mathrm{NL} \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \mathrm{NU} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \text { SL } \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | WR | 0WU | TOTAL |
|  |  | NT | NR |  |  | ST | SR | SU | EL | ET | ER | EU | WL | WT |  |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 65 | 165 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 52 | 0 | 350 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 88 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 68 | 0 | 441 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 34 | 1 | 153 | 113 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 92 | 102 | 1 | 549 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 159 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 120 | 1 | 594 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 169 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 55 | 0 | 496 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 80 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 88 | 0 | 436 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 75 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 93 | 0 | 477 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 48 | 1 | 81 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 79 | 0 | 432 |
|  | NL | NT | NR | NU | SL | ST | SR | SU | EL | ET | ER | EU | WL | WT | WR | WU | TOTAL |
| TOTAL VOLUMES : | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 401 | 0 | 290 | 2 | 870 | 994 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 558 | 657 | 2 | 3775 |
| APPROACH \% 's : |  |  |  |  | 57.86\% | 0.00\% | 41.85\% | 0.29\% | 46.65\% | 53.30\% | 0.00\% | 0.05\% | 0.00\% | 45.85\% | 53.99\% | 0.16\% |  |
| PEAK HR : |  | 7:15 AM | 8:15 A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 200 | 0 | 138 | 1 | 569 | 512 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 312 | 345 | 2 | 2080 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.820 | 0.000 | 0.750 | 0.250 | 0.842 | 0.684 | 0.000 | 0.250 | 0.000 | 0.796 | 0.719 | 0.500 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.79 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.7 |  |  | 0.875 |


| PM | NORTHBOUND |  |  |  | SOUTHBOUND |  |  |  | EASTBOUND |  |  |  | WESTBOUND |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0$N L$ | 0NT | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \text { NR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \mathrm{NU} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \text { SL } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \mathrm{ST} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \mathrm{SR} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \text { SU } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \text { EL } \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{\text {ET }}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \text { ER } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \text { EU } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \text { WL } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ W T \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \text { WR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \text { WU } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 55 | 84 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 120 | 95 | 0 | 563 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 50 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 101 | 1 | 572 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 72 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 102 | 0 | 602 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 52 | 1 | 52 | 92 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 149 | 104 | 1 | 595 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 117 | 0 | 63 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 116 | 1 | 677 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 | 0 | 136 | 0 | 71 | 81 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 157 | 127 | 3 | 709 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 53 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 130 | 7 | 697 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 0 | 92 | 1 | 65 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 121 | 1 | 625 |
|  | NL | NT | NR | NU | SL | ST | SR | SU | EL | ET | ER | EU | WL | WT | WR | WU | TOTAL |
| TOTAL VOLUMES: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 984 | 0 | 805 | 2 | 481 | 741 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1114 | 896 |  | 5040 |
| APPROACH \% 's : |  |  |  |  | 54.94\% | 0.00\% | 44.95\% | 0.11\% | 39.27\% | 60.49\% | 0.00\% | 0.24\% | 0.00\% | 55.04\% | 44.27\% | 0.69\% |  |
| PEAK HR : |  | 5:00 P1 | 06:00 P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| PEAK HR VOL : | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 510 | 0 | 445 | 1 | 252 | 390 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 603 | 494 | 12 | 2708 |
| PEAK HR FACTOR : | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.867 | 0.000 | 0.818 | 0.250 | 0.887 | 0.894 | 0.000 | 0.250 | 0.000 | 0.960 | 0.950 | 0.429 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.9 |  |  | 0.955 |

## APPENDIX B - TRIP GENERATION INFORMATION

# Land Use: 934 <br> Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window 

## Description

This land use includes any fast-food restaurant with a drive-through window. This type of restaurant is characterized by a large drive-through and large carry-out clientele, long hours of service (some are open for breakfast, all are open for lunch and dinner, some are open late at night or 24 hours a day) and high turnover rates for eat-in customers. The restaurant does not provide table service. A patron generally orders from a menu board and pays before receiving the meal. A typical duration of stay for an eat-in patron is less than 30 minutes. Fast casual restaurant (Land Use 930), high-turnover (sit-down) restaurant (Land Use 932), fast-food restaurant without drive-through window (Land Use 933), and fast-food restaurant with drive-through window and no indoor seating (Land Use 935) are related uses.

## Additional Data

Users should exercise caution when applying statistics during the AM peak periods, as the sites contained in the database for this land use may or may not be open for breakfast. In cases where it was confirmed that the sites were not open for breakfast, data for the AM peak hour of the adjacent street traffic were removed from the database.

If the restaurant has outdoor seating, its area is not included in the overall gross floor area. For a restaurant that has significant outdoor seating, the number of seats may be more reliable than GFA as an independent variable on which to establish a trip generation rate.

The technical appendices provide supporting information on time-of-day distributions for this land use. The appendices can be accessed through either the ITETripGen web app or the trip generation resource page on the ITE website (https://www.ite.org/technical-resources/topics/trip-and-parking-generation/).

The sites were surveyed in the 1980s, the 1990s, the 2000s, and the 2010s in Alaska, Alberta (CAN), California, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin.

## Source Numbers

$163,164,168,180,181,241,245,278,294,300,301,319,338,340,342,358,389,438,502,552$, $577,583,584,617,640,641,704,715,728,810,866,867,869,885,886,927,935,962,977,1050$, 1053, 1054

# Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window (934) 

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday

## Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban

Number of Studies: 71
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 3
Directional Distribution: 50\% entering, 50\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 467.48 | $98.89-1137.66$ | 238.62 |

Data Plot and Equation


- Institute of Transportation Engineers


# Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window (934) 

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 96
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 4
Directional Distribution: 51\% entering, 49\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 44.61 | $1.05-164.25$ | 27.14 |

Data Plot and Equation


- Institute of Transportation Engineers


# Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window (934) 

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 190
Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA: 3
Directional Distribution: 52\% entering, 48\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33.03 | $8.77-117.22$ | 17.59 |

Data Plot and Equation


- Institute of Transportation Engineers


# Land Use: 945 Convenience Store/Gas Station 

## Description

A convenience store/gas station is a facility with a co-located convenience store and gas station. The convenience store sells grocery and other everyday items that a person may need or want as a matter of convenience. The gas station sells automotive fuels such as gasoline and diesel.

A convenience store/gas station is typically located along a major thoroughfare to optimize motorist convenience. Extended hours of operation (with many open 24 hours, 7 days a week) are common at these facilities.

The convenience store product mix typically includes pre-packaged grocery items, beverages, dairy products, snack foods, confectionary, tobacco products, over-the-counter drugs, and toiletries. A convenience store may sell alcohol, often limited to beer and wine. Coffee and premade sandwiches are also commonly sold at a convenience store. Made-to-order food orders are sometimes offered. Some stores offer limited seating.

The sites in this land use include both self-pump and attendant-pumped fueling positions and both pre-pay and post-pay operations.

Convenience store (Land Use 851), gasoline/service station (Land Use 944), and truck stop (Land Use 950) are related uses.

## Land Use Subcategory

Multiple subcategories were added to this land use to allow for multi-variable evaluation of sites with single-variable data plots. All study sites are assigned to one of three subcategories, based on the number of vehicle fueling positions (VFP) at the site: between 2 and 8 VFP , between 9 and 15 VFP, and between 16 and 24 VFP. For each VFP range subcategory, data plots are presented with GFA as the independent variable for all time periods and trip types for which data are available. The use of both GFA and VFP (as the independent variable and land use subcategory, respectively) provides a significant improvement in the reliability of a trip generation estimate when compared to the single-variable data plots in prior editions of Trip Generation Manual.

Further, the study sites were also assigned to one of three other subcategories, based on the gross floor area (GFA) of the convenience store at the site: between 2,000 and 4,000 square feet, between 4,000 and 5,500 square feet, and between 5,500 and 10,000 square feet. For each GFA subcategory range, data plots are presented with VFP as the independent variable for all time periods and trip types for which data are available. The use of both VFP and GFA (as the independent variable and land use subcategory, respectively) provides a significant improvement in the reliability of a trip generation estimate when compared to the single-variable data plots in prior editions of Trip Generation Manual.

When analyzing the convenience store/gas station land use with each combination of GFA and VFP values as described above, the two sets of data plots will produce two estimates of sitegenerated trips. Both values can be considered when determining a site trip generation estimate.

Data plots are also provided for three additional independent variables: AM peak hour traffic on adjacent street, PM peak hour traffic on adjacent street, and employees. These independent variables are intended to be analyzed as single independent variables and do not have subcategories associated with them. Within the data plots and within the ITETripGen web app, these plots are found under the land use subcategory "none."

## Additional Data

ITE recognizes there are existing convenience store/gas station sites throughout North America that are larger than the sites presented in the data plots. However, the ITE database does not include any site with more than 24 VFP or any site with gross floor area greater than 10,000 square feet. Submission of trip generation data for larger sites is encouraged.

The technical appendices provide supporting information on time-of-day distributions for this land use. The appendices can be accessed through either the ITETripGen web app or the trip generation resource page on the ITE website (https://www.ite.org/technical-resources/topics/trip-and-parking-generation/).

The sites were surveyed in the 1980s, the 1990s, the 2000s, and the 2010s in Alberta (CAN), Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin.

## Source Numbers

$221,245,274,288,300,340,350,351,352,355,359,385,440,617,718,810,813,844,850,853$, $864,865,867,869,882,883,888,904,926,927,936,938,954,960,962,977,1004,1024,1025$, 1027, 1052

# Convenience Store/Gas Station - GFA (5.5-10k) (945) 

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Vehicle Fueling Positions
On a: Weekday

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 1
Avg. Num. of Vehicle Fueling Positions: 12
Directional Distribution: 50\% entering, 50\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Vehicle Fueling Position

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 345.75 | $345.75-345.75$ | $*$ |

Data Plot and Equation
Caution - Small Sample Size


- Institute of Transportation Engineers


## Convenience Store/Gas Station - GFA (5.5-10k) (945)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Vehicle Fueling Positions
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 29
Avg. Num. of Vehicle Fueling Positions: 14
Directional Distribution: 50\% entering, 50\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Vehicle Fueling Position

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31.60 | $12.58-49.31$ | 9.10 |

Data Plot and Equation


- Institute of Transportation Engineers


# Convenience Store/Gas Station - GFA (5.5-10k) (945) 

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Vehicle Fueling Positions
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 29
Avg. Num. of Vehicle Fueling Positions: 14
Directional Distribution: 50\% entering, 50\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Vehicle Fueling Position

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26.90 | $15.50-45.25$ | 6.87 |

## Data Plot and Equation



- Institute of Transportation Engineers

| NCHRP 684 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Project Name: | E-Z Stop Concord | Organization: | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. |  |
| Project Location: | Knoxville, TN | Performed By: | WDR |  |
| Scenario Description: | Full Buildout | Date: | $4 / 10 / 2024$ |  |
| Analysis Year: | 2026 | Checked By: |  |  |
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour | Date: |  |  |


| Table 1-A: Base Vehicle-Trip Generation Estimates (Single-Use Site Estimate) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Development Data (For Information Only) |  |  | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | ITE LUCs ${ }^{1}$ | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 945 | 7,015sf | n/a | 442 | 221 | 221 |
| Restaurant | 934 | 5,600sf | n/a | 250 | 128 | 122 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 692 | 349 | 343 |


| Table 2-A: Mode Split and Vehicle Occupancy Estimates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Entering Trips |  |  | Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. ${ }^{4}$ | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized | Veh. Occ. ${ }^{4}$ | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Table 3-A: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Table 4-A: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 0 |  | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 17 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 5-A: Computations Summary |  |  |  | Table 6-A: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| All Person-Trips | 692 | 349 | 343 | Office | N/A | N/A |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 13\% | 13\% | 13\% | Retail | 8\% | 13\% |
|  |  |  |  | Restaurant | 23\% | 14\% |
| External Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{5}$ | 600 | 303 | 297 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A |
| External Transit-Trips ${ }^{6}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Residential | N/A | N/A |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ${ }^{6}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A |

[^0]| Project Name: | E-Z Stop Concord |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |
| Table 7-A: Conversion of Vehicle-Trip Ends to Person-Trip Ends |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Table 7-A (D): Entering Trips |  |  | Table 7-A (O): Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* |
| Office | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1.00 | 221 | 221 | 1.00 | 221 | 221 |
| Restaurant | 1.00 | 128 | 128 | 1.00 | 122 | 122 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 8-A (0): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Origin) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 64 |  | 29 | 0 | 31 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 38 | 17 |  | 0 | 5 | 4 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 8-A (D): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Destination) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  | 71 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 0 |  | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 18 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 38 | 26 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 9-A (D): Internal and External Trips Summary (Entering Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Destination Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 17 | 204 | 221 | 204 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 29 | 99 | 128 | 99 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 9-A (O): Internal and External Trips Summary (Exiting Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 29 | 192 | 221 | 192 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 17 | 105 | 122 | 105 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

[^1]| NCHRP 684 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Project Name: | E-Z Stop Concord |  | Organization: | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. |
| Project Location: | Knoxville, TN | Performed By: | WDR |  |
| Scenario Description: | Full Buildout | Date: | $4 / 10 / 2024$ |  |
| Analysis Year: | 2026 | Checked By: |  |  |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour | Date: |  |  |


| Table 1-P: Base Vehicle-Trip Generation Estimates (Single-Use Site Estimate) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Development Data (For Information Only) |  |  | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | ITE LUCs ${ }^{1}$ | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 945 | 7,015sf | n/a | 377 | 188 | 189 |
| Restaurant | 934 | 5,600sf | n/a | 184 | 96 | 88 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 561 | 284 | 277 |


| Table 2-P: Mode Split and Vehicle Occupancy Estimates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Entering Trips |  |  | Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. ${ }^{4}$ | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized | Veh. Occ. ${ }^{4}$ | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Table 3-P: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Table 4-P: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 0 |  | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 36 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 5-P: Computations Summary |  |  |  | Table 6-P: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| All Person-Trips | 561 | 284 | 277 | Office | N/A | N/A |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 23\% | 23\% | 23\% | Retail | 19\% | 15\% |
|  |  |  |  | Restaurant | 29\% | 41\% |
| External Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{5}$ | 433 | 220 | 213 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A |
| External Transit-Trips ${ }^{6}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Residential | N/A | N/A |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ${ }^{6}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A |

[^2]| Project Name: | E-Z Stop Concord |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |
| Table 7-P: Conversion of Vehicle-Trip Ends to Person-Trip Ends |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Table 7-P (D): Entering Trips |  |  | Table 7-P (O): Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* |
| Office | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1.00 | 188 | 188 | 1.00 | 189 | 189 |
| Restaurant | 1.00 | 96 | 96 | 1.00 | 88 | 88 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 1.00 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 8-P (O): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Origin) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 4 |  | 55 | 8 | 49 | 9 |
| Restaurant | 3 | 36 |  | 7 | 16 | 6 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 8-P (D): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Destination) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 0 |  | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 94 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 8 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 19 | 13 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 9-P (D): Internal and External Trips Summary (Entering Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Destination Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 36 | 152 | 188 | 152 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 28 | 68 | 96 | 68 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 9-P (O): Internal and External Trips Summary (Exiting Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 28 | 161 | 189 | 161 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 36 | 52 | 88 | 52 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

[^3]${ }^{2}$ Person-Trips
${ }^{3}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

## FULL BUILD-OUT TRIP GENERATION

| Land Use | ITE Code | Size | Weekday <br> (Trips / Day) | AM Peak Hour (Trips/HR) | PM Peak Hour (Trips/HR) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Convenience Store/Gas Stat | 945 | 7,015 sf | 4,841 | 442 | 377 |
| Entering Trips | 70\% | Pass-by | 2,420 | 221 | 188 |
| Exiting Trips |  |  | 2,421 | 221 | 189 |
| Fast Food Restaurant with [ | 934 | 5,600 sf | 2,618 | 250 | 184 |
| Entering Trips | 40\% | Pass-by | 1,309 | 128 | 96 |
| Exiting Trips |  |  | 1,309 | 122 | 88 |
| n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |
| Entering TripsExiting Trips |  |  |  |  |  |
| n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |
| Entering Trips Exiting Trips |  |  |  |  |  |
| n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |
| Entering Trips Exiting Trips |  |  |  |  |  |
| n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |
| Entering Trips Exiting Trips |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL TRIPS |  |  | 7,459 | 692 | 561 |
| Entering Trips |  |  | 3,729 | 349 | 284 |
| Exiting Trips |  |  | 3,730 | 343 | 277 |
| INTERNAL TRIPS |  |  |  | 90 | 129 |
| Entering Trips |  |  |  | 45 | 65 |
| Exiting Trips |  |  |  | 45 | 64 |
| NET EXTERNAL TRIPS |  |  | 7,459 | 602 | 432 |
| Entering Trips |  |  | 3,729 | 304 | 219 |
| Exiting Trips |  |  | 3,730 | 298 | 213 |
| NET EXTERNAL TRIPS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass-by Trips |  |  | 4,194 | 387 | 319 |
| Entering Trips |  |  | 2,097 | 195 | 161 |
| Exiting Trips |  |  | 2,097 | 192 | 158 |
| Non-Pass-by Trips |  |  | 3,265 | 215 | 113 |
| Entering Trips |  |  | 1,632 | 109 | 58 |
| Exiting Trips |  |  | 1,633 | 106 | 55 |

## APPENDIX C - CAPACITY ANALYSES

## CAPACITY AND LEVEL-OF-SERVICE CONCEPTS

In a general sense, a roadway is similar to a pipeline or other material carrying conduit in that it has a certain capacity for the amount of material (vehicles) that it can efficiently carry. As the number of vehicles in a given time period gradually increases, the quality of traffic flow gradually decreases. On roadway sections this results in increasing turbulence in the traffic stream, and at intersections it results in increasing stops and delay. As the volumes begin to approach the capacity of the facility, these problems rapidly magnify, with resulting serious levels of congestion, stops, delay, excess fuel consumption, pollutant emissions, etc.

The Transportation Research Board has published the Year 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM2010), which establishes theoretical techniques to quantify the capacity conditions on all types of roadways, intersections, ramps, pedestrian facilities, etc. A basic concept that is applicable to most of these techniques is the idea of level of service (LOS). This concept establishes a rating system that quantifies the quality of traffic flow, as perceived by motorists and/or passengers. The general system is similar to a school grade scale, and is outlined as follows:


LOS CRITERIA: SIGNALIZED \& UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

| LOS | CONTROL DELAY (S/VEH) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SIGNALIZED | UNSIGNALIZED | ROUNDABOUT |
| A | $\leq 10$ | $\leq 10$ | $\leq 10$ |
| B | $>10-20$ | $>10-15$ | $>10-15$ |
| C | $>20-35$ | $>15-25$ | $>15-25$ |
| D | $>35-55$ | $>25-35$ | $>25-35$ |
| E | $>55-80$ | $>35-50$ | $>35-50$ |
| F | $>80$ | $>50$ | $>50$ |

Another measure of intersection capacity that is often used in the evaluation of intersection operations is the volume to capacity $(\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C})$ ratio. This ratio is defined as "the ratio of flow rate to capacity", and is a good measure of how much of an intersection's available capacity has been used up by the analysis volumes. Conversely, it also provides an indication of the reserve capacity available for future growth in traffic volumes.

The Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) is another measure that expresses a value similar to the V/C ratio. Specifically, the ICU method "sums the amount of the time required to serve all movements at saturation for a given cycle length and divides by that reference cycle length." The ICU is considered a more accurate measure of volume to capacity conditions for a signalized intersection, primarily because it accounts for the effects of the signal timing on intersection capacity.

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | 性 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 个 $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 512 | 0 | 73 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 33 | 941 | 5 | 6 | 343 | 186 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 512 | 0 | 73 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 33 | 941 | 5 | 6 | 343 | 186 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.962 |  |  | 0.902 |  |  | 0.999 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 | 0.964 |  |  | 0.987 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1681 | 1641 | 0 | 0 | 1658 | 0 | 1770 | 3536 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 | 0.964 |  |  | 0.987 |  | 0.478 |  |  | 0.149 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1681 | 1641 | 0 | 0 | 1658 | 0 | 890 | 3536 | 0 | 278 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 205 |  |  | 217 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 211 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) | 42\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 338 | 327 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 38 | 1075 | 0 | 7 | 390 | 211 |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  | Split | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |  | pm+pt | NA | $\mathrm{pm}+\mathrm{ov}$ |
| Protected Phases | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| Detector Phase | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial ( s ) | 8.0 | 8.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 15.0 |  | 6.0 | 15.0 | 8.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 14.0 | 24.0 |  | 13.0 | 24.0 | 16.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 38.0 | 38.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 28.0 | 59.0 |  | 17.0 | 59.0 | 38.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 27.0\% | 27.0\% |  | 11.3\% | 11.3\% |  | 19.9\% | 41.8\% |  | 12.1\% | 41.8\% | 27.0\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 4.0 | 5.5 |  | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 7.5 | 7.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  | 7.5 | 9.0 |  | 7.0 | 9.0 | 7.5 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lead |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | Min |  | None | Min | None |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 28.2 | 28.2 |  |  | 6.4 |  | 42.5 | 39.7 |  | 39.4 | 34.1 | 75.9 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.30 | 0.30 |  |  | 0.07 |  | 0.45 | 0.42 |  | 0.42 | 0.36 | 0.81 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.67 | 0.51 |  |  | 0.11 |  | 0.08 | 0.72 |  | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.16 |
| Control Delay | 40.0 | 15.6 |  |  | 0.7 |  | 15.4 | 26.9 |  | 15.2 | 24.7 | 1.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 40.0 | 15.6 |  |  | 0.7 |  | 15.4 | 26.9 |  | 15.2 | 24.7 | 1.1 |
| LOS | D | B |  |  | A |  | B | C |  | B | C | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 28.0 |  |  | 0.7 |  |  | 26.5 |  |  | 16.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 198 | 62 |  |  | 0 |  | 14 | 298 |  | 2 | 107 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | \#404 | 178 |  |  | 0 |  | 31 | 443 |  | 10 | 145 | 19 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 497 |  |  | 673 |  |  | 435 |  |  | 693 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70 |  |  | 95 |  | 475 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 579 | 700 |  |  | 379 |  | 616 | 2439 |  | 291 | 2001 | 1312 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.58 | 0.47 |  |  | 0.09 |  | 0.06 | 0.44 |  | 0.02 | 0.19 | 0.16 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 141
Actuated Cycle Length: 93.6
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.72

| Intersection Signal Delay: 24.0 | Intersection LOS: C |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 64.2\% | ICU Level of Service C |

## Analysis Period (min) 15

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 1: Concord Drive \& Turkey Creek Road/Summerdale Drive


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ＊ | 中 $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ |  | \％ | 个4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 251 | 1 | 97 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 125 | 659 | 10 | 8 | 888 | 375 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 251 | 1 | 97 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 125 | 659 | 10 | 8 | 888 | 375 |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.913 |  |  | 0.903 |  |  | 0.998 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 | 0.980 |  |  | 0.992 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1681 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1669 | 0 | 1770 | 3532 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 | 0.980 |  |  | 0.992 |  | 0.157 |  |  | 0.370 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1681 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1669 | 0 | 292 | 3532 | 0 | 689 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 45 |  |  | 18 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 417 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） | 28\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 201 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 139 | 743 | 0 | 9 | 987 | 417 |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  | Split | NA |  | pm＋pt | NA |  | pm＋pt | NA | pm＋ov |
| Protected Phases | 3 | 3 |  | ， | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| Detector Phase | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial（s） | 8.0 | 8.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 15.0 |  | 6.0 | 15.0 | 8.0 |
| Minimum Split（s） | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 14.0 | 24.0 |  | 13.0 | 24.0 | 16.0 |
| Total Split（s） | 38.0 | 38.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 28.0 | 59.0 |  | 17.0 | 59.0 | 38.0 |
| Total Split（\％） | 27．0\％ | 27．0\％ |  | 11．3\％ | 11．3\％ |  | 19．9\％ | 41．8\％ |  | 12．1\％ | 41．8\％ | 27．0\％ |
| Yellow Time（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 4.0 | 5.5 |  | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 |
| All－Red Time（s） | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 7.5 | 7.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  | 7.5 | 9.0 |  | 7.0 | 9.0 | 7.5 |
| Lead／Lag | Lead | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lead |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | Min |  | None | Min | None |
| Act Effct Green（s） | 19.9 | 19.9 |  |  | 7.0 |  | 58.5 | 54.8 |  | 47.6 | 38.9 | 68.5 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |  | 0.07 |  | 0.58 | 0.54 |  | 0.47 | 0.38 | 0.68 |
| v／c Ratio | 0.61 | 0.54 |  |  | 0.19 |  | 0.44 | 0.39 |  | 0.02 | 0.72 | 0.35 |
| Control Delay | 48.7 | 36.4 |  |  | 33.3 |  | 16.6 | 16.7 |  | 13.2 | 31.7 | 1.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 48.7 | 36.4 |  |  | 33.3 |  | 16.6 | 16.7 |  | 13.2 | 31.7 | 1.5 |
| LOS | D | D |  |  | C |  | B | B |  | B | C | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 42.8 |  |  | 33.3 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 22.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th（tt） | 134 | 92 |  |  | 5 |  | 44 | 148 |  | 3 | 302 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th（tt） | 248 | 193 |  |  | 36 |  | 92 | 293 |  | 12 | 468 | 33 |
| Internal Link Dist（tt） |  | 497 |  |  | 673 |  |  | 435 |  |  | 693 |  |
| Turn Bay Length（ t ） |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70 |  |  | 95 |  | 475 |
| Base Capacity（vph） | 546 | 544 |  |  | 193 |  | 491 | 2334 |  | 468 | 1884 | 1356 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v／c Ratio | 0.37 | 0.34 |  |  | 0.13 |  | 0.28 | 0.32 |  | 0.02 | 0.52 | 0.31 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 141
Actuated Cycle Length: 101.1
Natural Cycle: 75
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.72

| Intersection Signal Delay: 23.7 | Intersection LOS: $C$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $68.1 \%$ | ICU Level of Service C |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Concord Drive \& Turkey Creek Road/Summerdale Drive


## General Information

| Analyst | WDR | Intersection | Concord Road at 2nd Drive |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Town of Farragut |
| Date Performed | $4 / 10 / 2024$ | East/West Street | 2nd Drive |
| Analysis Year | 2024 | North/South Street | Concord Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2024 Existing AM Peak |  |  |

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 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  | T | TR |  | L | T |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 4 |  |  | 913 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 403 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |  | 6.4 | 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 6.86 |  | 6.96 |  |  |  |  | 6.46 | 4.16 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.53 |  | 3.33 |  |  |  |  | 2.53 | 2.23 |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## General Information

| Analyst | WDR | Intersection | Concord Road at 2nd Drive |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Town of Farragut |
| Date Performed | $4 / 10 / 2024$ | East/West Street | 2nd Drive |
| Analysis Year | 2024 | North/South Street | Concord Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2024 Existing PM Peak |  |  |

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 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  | T | TR |  | L | T |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 3 |  |  | 752 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 956 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 6.86 |  | 6.96 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.16 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.53 |  | 3.33 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics

| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Number of Lanes ( N ) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Assignment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (V), veh/h | 1 | 569 | 512 |  | 2 |  | 312 | 345 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 200 |  | 138 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| Flow Rate (Vpce), pc/h | 1 | 666 | 599 |  | 2 |  | 365 | 404 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 234 |  | 162 |
| Right-Turn Bypass | None |  |  |  | Non-Yielding |  |  |  | None |  |  |  | Yielding |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Crossing, p/h | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Proportion of CAVs | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Critical and Follow-Up Headway Adjustment

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Critical Headway, s |  | 4.9763 |  |  | 4.9763 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.9763 | 4.9763 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s |  | 2.6087 |  |  | 2.6087 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.6087 | 2.6087 |

Flow Computations, Capacity and v/c Ratios

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Entry Flow (ve), pc/h |  | 1266 |  |  | 367 | 404 |  |  |  |  | 235 | 162 |
| Entry Volume, veh/h |  | 1229 |  |  | 356 | 392 |  |  |  |  | 228 | 157 |
| Circulating Flow (vc), pc/h | 237 |  |  | 668 |  |  | 1503 |  |  | 368 |  |  |
| Exiting Flow (Vex), pc/h | 835 |  |  | 366 |  |  | 667 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Capacity (cpce), pc/h |  | 1084 |  |  | 698 |  |  |  |  |  | 948 | 950 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h |  | 1052 |  |  | 678 |  |  |  |  |  | 921 | 922 |
| v/c Ratio (x) |  | 1.17 |  |  | 0.53 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.25 | 0.17 |
| Delay and Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Lane Control Delay (d), s/veh |  | 103.1 |  |  | 13.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.4 | 5.6 |
| Lane LOS |  | F |  |  | B | A |  |  |  |  | A | A |
| 95\% Queue, veh |  | 35.2 |  |  | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0 | 0.6 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 103.1 |  |  | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.1 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 56.7 |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |



## Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics

| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Number of Lanes ( N ) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Assignment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (V), veh/h | 1 | 252 | 390 |  | 12 |  | 603 | 494 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 510 |  | 445 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| Flow Rate (VpCE), pc/h | 1 | 273 | 423 |  | 13 |  | 654 | 536 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 553 |  | 482 |
| Right-Turn Bypass | None |  |  |  | Non-Yielding |  |  |  | None |  |  |  | Yielding |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Crossing, p/h | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Proportion of CAVs | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Critical and Follow-Up Headway Adjustment

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Critical Headway, s |  | 4.9763 |  |  | 4.9763 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.9763 | 4.9763 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s |  | 2.6087 |  |  | 2.6087 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.6087 | 2.6087 |

## Flow Computations, Capacity and v/c Ratios

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Entry Flow ( $\mathrm{ve}_{\text {e }}$, pc/h |  | 697 |  |  | 667 | 536 |  |  |  |  | 554 | 482 |
| Entry Volume, veh/h |  | 677 |  |  | 648 | 520 |  |  |  |  | 538 | 468 |
| Circulating Flow ( $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{c}}$, $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 567 |  |  | 275 |  |  | 1264 |  |  | 668 |  |  |
| Exiting Flow (Vex), pc/h | 989 |  |  | 655 |  |  | 274 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Capacity ( $\mathrm{cpce}^{\text {) , pc/h }}$ |  | 774 |  |  | 1042 |  |  |  |  |  | 698 | 708 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h |  | 751 |  |  | 1012 |  |  |  |  |  | 678 | 687 |
| v/c Ratio (x) |  | 0.90 |  |  | 0.64 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.79 | 0.68 |

## Delay and Level of Service

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Lane Control Delay (d), s/veh |  | 36.3 |  |  | 12.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 26.5 | 19.1 |
| Lane LOS |  | E |  |  | B | A |  |  |  |  | D | C |
| 95\% Queue, veh |  | 11.9 |  |  | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.9 | 5.4 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 36.3 |  |  | 7.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 23.0 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | E |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 19.7 |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  | \％ | 个全 |  | ${ }_{1}$ | 性 | 7 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 548 | 0 | 78 | 9 | 0 | 22 | 35 | 1008 | 5 | 6 | 367 | 199 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 548 | 0 | 78 | 9 | 0 | 22 | 35 | 1008 | 5 | 6 | 367 | 199 |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.962 |  |  | 0.904 |  |  | 0.999 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 | 0.964 |  |  | 0.986 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1681 | 1641 | 0 | 0 | 1660 | 0 | 1770 | 3536 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 | 0.964 |  |  | 0.986 |  | 0.463 |  |  | 0.121 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1681 | 1641 | 0 | 0 | 1660 | 0 | 862 | 3536 | 0 | 225 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 205 |  |  | 217 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 226 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） | 42\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 361 | 351 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 40 | 1151 | 0 | 7 | 417 | 226 |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  | Split | NA |  | pm＋pt | NA |  | pm＋pt | NA | $\mathrm{pm}+\mathrm{ov}$ |
| Protected Phases | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| Detector Phase | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial（s） | 8.0 | 8.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 15.0 |  | 6.0 | 15.0 | 8.0 |
| Minimum Split（s） | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 14.0 | 24.0 |  | 13.0 | 24.0 | 16.0 |
| Total Split（s） | 38.0 | 38.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 28.0 | 59.0 |  | 17.0 | 59.0 | 38.0 |
| Total Split（\％） | 27．0\％ | 27．0\％ |  | 11．3\％ | 11．3\％ |  | 19．9\％ | 41．8\％ |  | 12．1\％ | 41．8\％ | 27．0\％ |
| Yellow Time（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 4.0 | 5.5 |  | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 |
| All－Red Time（s） | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 7.5 | 7.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  | 7.5 | 9.0 |  | 7.0 | 9.0 | 7.5 |
| Lead／Lag | Lead | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lead |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | Min |  | None | Min | None |
| Act Efft Green（s） | 30.9 | 30.9 |  |  | 6.2 |  | 46.4 | 43.5 |  | 43.1 | 37.7 | 81.5 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |  | 0.06 |  | 0.46 | 0.44 |  | 0.43 | 0.38 | 0.82 |
| v／c Ratio | 0.70 | 0.54 |  |  | 0.11 |  | 0.09 | 0.75 |  | 0.04 | 0.31 | 0.17 |
| Control Delay | 42.5 | 17.5 |  |  | 0.8 |  | 15.2 | 28.3 |  | 15.0 | 24.8 | 1.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 42.5 | 17.5 |  |  | 0.8 |  | 15.2 | 28.3 |  | 15.0 | 24.8 | 1.0 |
| LOS | D | B |  |  | A |  | B | C |  | B | C | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 30.2 |  |  | 0.8 |  |  | 27.9 |  |  | 16.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th（tt） | 229 | 81 |  |  | 0 |  | 15 | 330 |  | 2 | 116 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th（ft） | \＃445 | 206 |  |  | 0 |  | 32 | 488 |  | 10 | 155 | 20 |
| Internal Link Dist（tt） |  | 497 |  |  | 673 |  |  | 435 |  |  | 693 |  |
| Turn Bay Length（tt） |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70 |  |  | 95 |  | 475 |
| Base Capacity（vph） | 527 | 655 |  |  | 365 |  | 599 | 2219 |  | 260 | 1820 | 1312 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v／c Ratio | 0.69 | 0.54 |  |  | 0.10 |  | 0.07 | 0.52 |  | 0.03 | 0.23 | 0.17 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 141
Actuated Cycle Length: 100
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.75

| Intersection Signal Delay: 25.3 | Intersection LOS: $\mathbf{C}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 67.1\% | ICU Level of Service C |

## Analysis Period (min) 15

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 1: Concord Drive \& Turkey Creek Road/Summerdale Drive


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Cycle Length: 141
Actuated Cycle Length: 106.5
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.76

| Intersection Signal Delay: 25.1 | Intersection LOS: C |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 71.0\% | ICU Level of Service C |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Concord Drive \& Turkey Creek Road/Summerdale Drive


## General Information

| Analyst | WDR | Intersection | Concord Road at 2nd Drive |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Town of Farragut |
| Date Performed | $4 / 16 / 2024$ | East/West Street | 2nd Drive |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Concord Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2026 Background AM Peak |  |  |

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 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  | T | TR |  | L | T |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 4 |  |  | 978 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 432 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |  | 6.4 | 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 6.86 |  | 6.96 |  |  |  |  | 6.46 | 4.16 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.53 |  | 3.33 |  |  |  |  | 2.53 | 2.23 |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | WDR | Intersection | Concord Road at 2nd Drive |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Town of Farragut |
| Date Performed | $4 / 16 / 2024$ | East/West Street | 2nd Drive |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Concord Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2026 Background PM Peak |  |  |

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 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  | T | TR |  | L | T |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 3 |  |  | 806 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1024 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 6.86 |  | 6.96 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.16 |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.53 |  | 3.33 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.23 |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics

| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Number of Lanes ( N ) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Assignment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (V), veh/h | 1 | 610 | 548 |  | 2 |  | 334 | 370 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 214 |  | 148 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| Flow Rate (VPCE), pc/h | 1 | 714 | 641 |  | 2 |  | 391 | 433 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 250 |  | 173 |
| Right-Turn Bypass | None |  |  |  | Non-Yielding |  |  |  | None |  |  |  | Yielding |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Crossing, p/h | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Proportion of CAVs | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Critical and Follow-Up Headway Adjustment

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Critical Headway, s |  | 4.9763 |  |  | 4.9763 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.9763 | 4.9763 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s |  | 2.6087 |  |  | 2.6087 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.6087 | 2.6087 |

## Flow Computations, Capacity and v/c Ratios

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Entry Flow (ve), pc/h |  | 1356 |  |  | 393 | 433 |  |  |  |  | 251 | 173 |
| Entry Volume, veh/h |  | 1317 |  |  | 382 | 420 |  |  |  |  | 244 | 168 |
| Circulating Flow ( $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ), $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 253 |  |  | 716 |  |  | 1609 |  |  | 394 |  |  |
| Exiting Flow (Vex), $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 893 |  |  | 392 |  |  | 715 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Capacity ( $\mathrm{cpce}^{\text {) , }} \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  | 1066 |  |  | 665 |  |  |  |  |  | 923 | 925 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h |  | 1035 |  |  | 645 |  |  |  |  |  | 896 | 898 |
| v/c Ratio (x) |  | 1.27 |  |  | 0.59 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.27 | 0.19 |
| Delay and Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Lane Control Delay (d), s/veh |  | 145.4 |  |  | 16.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.9 | 5.9 |
| Lane LOS |  | F |  |  | C | A |  |  |  |  | A | A |
| 95\% Queue, veh |  | 45.9 |  |  | 3.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | 0.7 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 145.4 |  |  | 7.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.5 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 79.1 |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |



## Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics

| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Number of Lanes ( N ) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Assignment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (V), veh/h | 1 | 270 | 418 |  | 13 |  | 646 | 529 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 546 |  | 477 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| Flow Rate (VPCE), pc/h | 1 | 293 | 453 |  | 14 |  | 700 | 574 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 592 |  | 517 |
| Right-Turn Bypass | None |  |  |  | Non-Yielding |  |  |  | None |  |  |  | Yielding |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Crossing, p/h | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Proportion of CAVs | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Critical and Follow-Up Headway Adjustment

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Critical Headway, s |  | 4.9763 |  |  | 4.9763 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.9763 | 4.9763 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s |  | 2.6087 |  |  | 2.6087 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.6087 | 2.6087 |

## Flow Computations, Capacity and v/c Ratios

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Entry Flow (ve), pc/h |  | 747 |  |  | 714 | 574 |  |  |  |  | 593 | 517 |
| Entry Volume, veh/h |  | 725 |  |  | 693 | 557 |  |  |  |  | 576 | 502 |
| Circulating Flow ( $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{c}}$, $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 607 |  |  | 295 |  |  | 1354 |  |  | 715 |  |  |
| Exiting Flow (vex), pc/h | 1059 |  |  | 701 |  |  | 294 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Capacity ( cpee $^{\text {) }}$, pc/h |  | 743 |  |  | 1021 |  |  |  |  |  | 666 | 675 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h |  | 721 |  |  | 992 |  |  |  |  |  | 646 | 655 |
| v/c Ratio (x) |  | 1.01 |  |  | 0.70 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.89 | 0.77 |

## Delay and Level of Service

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Lane Control Delay (d), s/veh |  | 58.7 |  |  | 15.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 38.8 | 25.0 |
| Lane LOS |  | F |  |  | C | A |  |  |  |  | E | C |
| 95\% Queue, veh |  | 16.7 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 10.9 | 7.1 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 58.7 |  |  | 8.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 32.3 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 28.8 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \＄ |  | \％ | 个 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 548 | 0 | 111 | 14 | 0 | 22 | 67 | 1035 | 10 | 6 | 395 | 199 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 548 | 0 | 111 | 14 | 0 | 22 | 67 | 1035 | 10 | 6 | 395 | 199 |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Fit |  | 0.949 |  |  | 0.918 |  |  | 0.999 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 | 0.968 |  |  | 0.981 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1681 | 1626 | 0 | 0 | 1678 | 0 | 1770 | 3536 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 | 0.968 |  |  | 0.981 |  | 0.407 |  |  | 0.112 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1681 | 1626 | 0 | 0 | 1678 | 0 | 758 | 3536 | 0 | 209 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 205 |  |  | 217 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 226 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） | 39\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 380 | 369 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 76 | 1187 | 0 | 7 | 449 | 226 |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  | Split | NA |  | pm＋pt | NA |  | pm＋pt | NA | pm＋ov |
| Protected Phases | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| Detector Phase | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial（s） | 8.0 | 8.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 15.0 |  | 6.0 | 15.0 | 8.0 |
| Minimum Split（s） | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 14.0 | 24.0 |  | 13.0 | 24.0 | 16.0 |
| Total Split（s） | 38.0 | 38.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 28.0 | 59.0 |  | 17.0 | 59.0 | 38.0 |
| Total Split（\％） | 27．0\％ | 27．0\％ |  | 11．3\％ | 11．3\％ |  | 19．9\％ | 41．8\％ |  | 12．1\％ | 41．8\％ | 27．0\％ |
| Yellow Time（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 4.0 | 5.5 |  | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 |
| All－Red Time（s） | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 7.5 | 7.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  | 7.5 | 9.0 |  | 7.0 | 9.0 | 7.5 |
| Lead／Lag | Lead | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lead |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | Min |  | None | Min | None |
| Act Efft Green（s） | 31.2 | 31.2 |  |  | 6.1 |  | 47.5 | 44.3 |  | 41.1 | 34.5 | 76.8 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.30 | 0.30 |  |  | 0.06 |  | 0.46 | 0.43 |  | 0.40 | 0.33 | 0.74 |
| v／c Ratio | 0.75 | 0.58 |  |  | 0.14 |  | 0.18 | 0.79 |  | 0.04 | 0.38 | 0.18 |
| Control Delay | 46.7 | 19.6 |  |  | 0.9 |  | 16.6 | 30.7 |  | 15.2 | 28.9 | 1.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 46.7 | 19.6 |  |  | 0.9 |  | 16.6 | 30.7 |  | 15.2 | 28.9 | 1.2 |
| LOS | D | B |  |  | A |  | B | C |  | B | C | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 33.3 |  |  | 0.9 |  |  | 29.9 |  |  | 19.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th（tt） | 253 | 97 |  |  | 0 |  | 28 | 345 |  | 2 | 128 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th（tt） | \＃483 | 227 |  |  | 0 |  | 53 | 508 |  | 10 | 172 | 21 |
| Internal Link Dist（ft） |  | 497 |  |  | 673 |  |  | 435 |  |  | 693 |  |
| Turn Bay Length（tt） |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70 |  |  | 95 |  | 475 |
| Base Capacity（vph） | 505 | 632 |  |  | 361 |  | 555 | 2126 |  | 242 | 1743 | 1231 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v／c Ratio | 0.75 | 0.58 |  |  | 0.11 |  | 0.14 | 0.56 |  | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.18 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 141
Actuated Cycle Length: 103.7
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.79

| Intersection Signal Delay: 27.8 | Intersection LOS: C |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 78.7\% | ICU Level of Service D |

## Analysis Period (min) 15

\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 1: Concord Drive \& Turkey Creek Road/Summerdale Drive


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \％ | 中 ${ }^{2}$ |  | \％ | 个4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 269 | 1 | 121 | 7 | 3 | 17 | 150 | 720 | 14 |  | 965 | 402 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 269 | 1 | 121 | 7 | 3 | 17 | 150 | 720 | 14 | 9 | 965 | 402 |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.904 |  |  | 0.914 |  |  | 0.997 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 | 0.982 |  |  | 0.987 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1681 | 1571 | 0 | 0 | 1680 | 0 | 1770 | 3529 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 | 0.982 |  |  | 0.987 |  | 0.127 |  |  | 0.344 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1681 | 1571 | 0 | 0 | 1680 | 0 | 237 | 3529 | 0 | 641 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 57 |  |  | 19 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 447 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） | 25\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 224 | 210 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 167 | 816 | 0 | 10 | 1072 | 447 |
| Turn Type | Split | NA |  | Split | NA |  | pm＋pt | NA |  | pm＋pt | NA | pm＋ov |
| Protected Phases | 3 | 3 |  | ， | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| Detector Phase | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial（s） | 8.0 | 8.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 15.0 |  | 6.0 | 15.0 | 8.0 |
| Minimum Split（s） | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 14.0 | 24.0 |  | 13.0 | 24.0 | 16.0 |
| Total Split（s） | 38.0 | 38.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 |  | 28.0 | 59.0 |  | 17.0 | 59.0 | 38.0 |
| Total Split（\％） | 27．0\％ | 27．0\％ |  | 11．3\％ | 11．3\％ |  | 19．9\％ | 41．8\％ |  | 12．1\％ | 41．8\％ | 27．0\％ |
| Yellow Time（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 4.0 | 5.5 |  | 4.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 |
| All－Red Time（s） | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 2.5 | 2.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |  | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Lost Time Adjust（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 7.5 | 7.5 |  |  | 6.0 |  | 7.5 | 9.0 |  | 7.0 | 9.0 | 7.5 |
| Lead／Lag | Lead | Lead |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lead |
| Lead－Lag Optimize？ | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Recall Mode | None | None |  | None | None |  | None | Min |  | None | Min | None |
| Act Effct Green（s） | 22.4 | 22.4 |  |  | 7.2 |  | 64.5 | 60.8 |  | 51.6 | 43.0 | 75.0 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |  | 0.07 |  | 0.59 | 0.55 |  | 0.47 | 0.39 | 0.68 |
| v／c Ratio | 0.65 | 0.58 |  |  | 0.24 |  | 0.55 | 0.42 |  | 0.03 | 0.77 | 0.37 |
| Control Delay | 53.2 | 37.9 |  |  | 37.6 |  | 19.9 | 17.3 |  | 13.9 | 35.9 | 1.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 53.2 | 37.9 |  |  | 37.6 |  | 19.9 | 17.3 |  | 13.9 | 35.9 | 1.7 |
| LOS | D | D |  |  | D |  | B | B |  | B | D | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 45.8 |  |  | 37.6 |  |  | 17.8 |  |  | 25.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th（tt） | 171 | 114 |  |  | 8 |  | 58 | 181 |  | 3 | 370 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th（tt） | 289 | 220 |  |  | 44 |  | 115 | 330 |  | 12 | 560 | 38 |
| Internal Link Dist（tt） |  | 497 |  |  | 673 |  |  | 435 |  |  | 693 |  |
| Turn Bay Length（ t ） |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70 |  |  | 95 |  | 475 |
| Base Capacity（vph） | 497 | 505 |  |  | 180 |  | 444 | 2205 |  | 435 | 1717 | 1327 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v／c Ratio | 0.45 | 0.42 |  |  | 0.17 |  | 0.38 | 0.37 |  | 0.02 | 0.62 | 0.34 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 141
Actuated Cycle Length: 109.8
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.77

| Intersection Signal Delay: 26.1 | Intersection LOS: C |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 72.8\% | ICU Level of Service C |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: Concord Drive \& Turkey Creek Road/Summerdale Drive


## General Information

| Analyst | FDR | Intersection | Concord Road at 2nd Drive |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Town of Farragut |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2024$ | East/West Street | 2nd Drive |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Concord Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2026 Combined AM Peak |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Critical and Follow-up Headways


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## General Information

| Analyst | WDR | Intersection | Concord Road at 2nd Drive |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Town of Farragut |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2024$ | East/West Street | 2nd Drive |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Concord Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2026 Combined PM Peak |  |  |

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 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  | T | TR |  | L | T |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |  | 111 |  | 28 |  |  | 775 | 55 | 0 | 128 | 935 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \\| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## General Information

| Analyst | FDR | Intersection | Concord Road at 2nd Drive |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Town of Farragut |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2024$ | East/West Street | 2nd Drive |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Concord Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2026 Combined AM Peak Exclusive Left and Right |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Critical and Follow-up Headways


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## General Information

| Analyst | FDR | Intersection | Concord Road at 2nd Drive |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Town of Farragut |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2024$ | East/West Street | 2nd Drive |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Concord Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2026 Combined PM Peak Exclusive Left and Right |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Critical and Follow-up Headways


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## General Information

| Analyst | FDR | Intersection | Concord Road at 2nd Drive |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Town of Farragut |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2024$ | East/West Street | 2nd Drive |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Concord Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2026 Combined AM Peak Northbound Right |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Critical and Follow-up Headways


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## General Information

| Analyst | FDR | Intersection | Concord Road at 2nd Drive |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Town of Farragut |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2024$ | East/West Street | 2nd Drive |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Concord Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2026 Combined PM Peak Northbound Right |  |  |

## Lanes



## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Critical and Follow-up Headways


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


|  |  |  |  |  | $1$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | * |  | 中\% |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 95 | 55 | 925 | 92 | 131 | 375 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 95 | 55 | 925 | 92 | 131 | 375 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 |
| Frt | 0.950 |  | 0.986 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.969 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1715 | 0 | 3490 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.969 |  |  |  | 0.146 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1715 | 0 | 3490 | 0 | 272 | 3539 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | 50 |  | 19 |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 163 | 0 | 1105 | 0 | 142 | 408 |
| Turn Type | Prot |  | NA |  | pm+pt | NA |
| Protected Phases | 8 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |
| Detector Phase | 8 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 8.0 |  | 15.0 |  | 5.0 | 15.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 23.5 |  | 23.5 |  | 10.5 | 23.5 |
| Total Split (s) | 23.5 |  | 25.9 |  | 10.6 | 36.5 |
| Total Split (\%) | 39.2\% |  | 43.2\% |  | 17.7\% | 60.8\% |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 |  | 3.5 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.5 |  | 5.5 |  | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  | Lag |  | Lead |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None |  | C-Max |  | None | C-Max |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.1 |  | 32.1 |  | 41.6 | 42.7 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.17 |  | 0.54 |  | 0.69 | 0.71 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.50 |  | 0.59 |  | 0.38 | 0.16 |
| Control Delay | 20.7 |  | 16.3 |  | 7.6 | 4.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 20.7 |  | 16.3 |  | 7.6 | 4.4 |
| LOS | C |  | B |  | A | A |
| Approach Delay | 20.7 |  | 16.3 |  |  | 5.2 |
| Approach LOS | C |  | B |  |  | A |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 38 |  | 156 |  | 15 | 24 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 79 |  | \#317 |  | 41 | 49 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 739 |  | 696 |  |  | 696 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  | 65 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 549 |  | 1876 |  | 371 | 2519 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.30 |  | 0.59 |  | 0.38 | 0.16 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 60
Actuated Cycle Length: 60
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:NBT and $6:$ SBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.59

| Intersection Signal Delay: 13.3 | Intersection LOS: B |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 58.1\% | ICU Level of Service B |

Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 2: Concord Rd \& 2nd Dr



Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Length: 80
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2:NBT and $6:$ SBTL, Start of Green
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.55
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Intersection Signal Delay: 10.5 } & \text { Intersection LOS: B } \\ \text { Intersection Capacity Utilization 51.9\% } & \text { ICU Level of Service A }\end{array}$
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 2: Concord Rd \& 2nd Dr



## Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics

| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Number of Lanes ( N ) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Assignment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (V), veh/h | 1 | 626 | 548 |  | 2 |  | 334 | 392 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 236 |  | 164 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| Flow Rate (VPCE), pc/h | 1 | 733 | 641 |  | 2 |  | 391 | 459 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 276 |  | 192 |
| Right-Turn Bypass | None |  |  |  | Non-Yielding |  |  |  | None |  |  |  | Yielding |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Crossing, p/h | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Proportion of CAVs | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Critical and Follow-Up Headway Adjustment

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Critical Headway, s |  | 4.9763 |  |  | 4.9763 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.9763 | 4.9763 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s |  | 2.6087 |  |  | 2.6087 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.6087 | 2.6087 |

Flow Computations, Capacity and v/c Ratios

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Entry Flow ( $\mathrm{ve}_{\text {e }}$, pc/h |  | 1375 |  |  | 393 | 459 |  |  |  |  | 277 | 192 |
| Entry Volume, veh/h |  | 1335 |  |  | 382 | 446 |  |  |  |  | 269 | 186 |
| Circulating Flow ( $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{c}}$, $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 279 |  |  | 735 |  |  | 1654 |  |  | 394 |  |  |
| Exiting Flow (Vex), pc/h | 919 |  |  | 392 |  |  | 734 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Capacity ( cpce ), $^{\text {pc/h }}$ |  | 1038 |  |  | 652 |  |  |  |  |  | 923 | 925 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h |  | 1008 |  |  | 633 |  |  |  |  |  | 896 | 898 |
| v/c Ratio (x) |  | 1.32 |  |  | 0.60 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.30 | 0.21 |

## Delay and Level of Service

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Lane Control Delay (d), s/veh |  | 167.9 |  |  | 16.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.2 | 6.1 |
| Lane LOS |  | F |  |  | C | A |  |  |  |  | A | A |
| 95\% Queue, veh |  | 50.7 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | 0.8 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 167.9 |  |  | 7.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.8 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 89.3 |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |



## Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics

| Approach | EB |  |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  |  |  | SB |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Number of Lanes ( N ) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Assignment |  |  | LT |  |  |  | T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | L |  |
| Volume (V), veh/h | 1 | 279 | 418 |  | 13 |  | 646 | 541 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 557 |  | 485 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| Flow Rate (VpCE), pc/h | 1 | 302 | 453 |  | 14 |  | 700 | 587 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 604 |  | 526 |
| Right-Turn Bypass | None |  |  |  | Non-Yielding |  |  |  | None |  |  |  | Yielding |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Crossing, p/h | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Proportion of CAVs | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Critical and Follow-Up Headway Adjustment

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Critical Headway, s |  | 4.9763 |  |  | 4.9763 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.9763 | 4.9763 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s |  | 2.6087 |  |  | 2.6087 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.6087 | 2.6087 |

## Flow Computations, Capacity and v/c Ratios

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Entry Flow (ve), pc/h |  | 756 |  |  | 714 | 587 |  |  |  |  | 605 | 526 |
| Entry Volume, veh/h |  | 734 |  |  | 693 | 570 |  |  |  |  | 587 | 511 |
| Circulating Flow ( $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{c}}$, $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ | 619 |  |  | 304 |  |  | 1375 |  |  | 715 |  |  |
| Exiting Flow (vex), pc/h | 1071 |  |  | 701 |  |  | 303 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Capacity ( $\mathrm{cpce}^{\text {) , pc/h }}$ |  | 734 |  |  | 1012 |  |  |  |  |  | 666 | 675 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h |  | 713 |  |  | 983 |  |  |  |  |  | 646 | 655 |
| v/c Ratio (x) |  | 1.03 |  |  | 0.71 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.91 | 0.78 |

## Delay and Level of Service

| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass | Left | Right | Bypass |
| Lane Control Delay (d), s/veh |  | 65.7 |  |  | 15.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 41.6 | 26.0 |
| Lane LOS |  | F |  |  | C | A |  |  |  |  | E | D |
| 95\% Queue, veh |  | 18.0 |  |  | 6.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 11.6 | 7.5 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 65.7 |  |  | 8.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 34.3 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh \| LOS | 31.2 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |

## General Information

| Analyst | WDR | Intersection | Concord Road at Site Access |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Town of Farragut |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2024$ | East/West Street | Site Access |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Concord Road |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2026 Combined AM Peak |  |  |

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 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | R |  |  | T | TR |  |  | T |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 152 |  |  | 895 | 85 |  |  | 506 |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \\| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | FDR | Intersection | Concord Road at Site Access |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Town of Farragut |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2024$ | East/West Street | Site Access |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Concord Road |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2026 Combined PM Peak |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Critical and Follow-up Headways


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## General Information

| Analyst | WDR | Intersection | 2nd Drive at Site Access |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Knox County |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2024$ | East/West Street | 2nd Drive |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Site Access |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2026 Combined AM Peak |  |  |

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 | 1U | 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 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LT |  |  |  |  |  | TR |  |  |  |  |  |  | LR |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 219 | 4 |  |  |  | 4 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 146 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 6.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 4.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.43 |  | 6.23 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 2.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.53 |  | 3.33 |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service
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## General Information

| Analyst | FDR | Intersection | 2nd Drive at Site Access |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Cannon \& Cannon, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Knox County |
| Date Performed | $5 / 20 / 2024$ | East/West Street | 2nd Drive |
| Analysis Year | 2026 | North/South Street | Site Access |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak | Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | 2026 Combined PM Peak |  |  |

Lanes


## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments



Critical and Follow-up Headways


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


Copyright © 2024 University of Florida. All Rights Reserved.

## APPENDIX D - TURN LANE WARRANT EVALUATIONS

TABLE 4A
KNOX COUNTY LEFT-TURN LANE VOLUME THRESHOLDS FOR 2-LANE ROADWAYS WITH A PREVAILING SPEED OF 0 TO 35 MPH

Project No: 01634-0010
Project Name: EZ Stop Concord Notes: 2nd Drive at Site Access
(If the left-turn volume exceeds the table value a left-turn lane is needed)

| OPPOSING | THROUGH VOLUME PLUS RIGHT-TURN VOLUME * |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VOLUME | 100-149 | 150-199 | 200-249 | 250-299 | 300-349 | 350-399 |
| 100-149 | 300 | 235 | 185 | 145 | 120 | 100 |
| 150-199 | 245 | 200 | 160 | 130 | 110 | 90 |
| 200-249 | 205 | 170 | 140 | 115 | 100 | 80 |
| 250-299 | 175 | 150 | 125 | 105 | 90 | 70 |
| 300-349 | 155 | 135 | 110 | 95 | 80 | 65 |
| 350-399 | 135 | 120 | 100 | 85 | 70 | 60 |
| 400-449 | 120 | 105 | 90 | 75 | 65 | 55 |
| 450-499 | 105 | 90 | 80 | 70 | 60 | 50 |
| 500-549 | 95 | 80 | 70 | 65 | 55 | 50 |
| 550-599 | 85 | 70 | 65 | 60 | 50 | 45 |
| 600-649 | 75 | 65 | 60 | 55 | 45 | 40 |
| 650-699 | 70 | 60 | 55 | 50 | 40 | 35 |
| 700-749 | 65 | 55 | 50 | 45 | 35 | 30 |
| 750 or More | 60 | 50 | 45 | 40 | 35 | 30 |


| OPPOSING | THROUGH VOLUME PLUS RIGHT-TURN VOLUME * |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VOLUME | 350-399 | 400-449 | 450-499 | 500-549 | 550-599 | $=/>600$ |
| 100-149 | 100 | 80 | 70 | 60 | 55 | 50 |
| 150-199 | 90 | 75 | 65 | 55 | 50 | 45 |
| 200-249 | 80 | 72 | 60 | 55 | 50 | 45 |
| 250-299 | 70 | 65 | 55 | 50 | 45 | 40 |
| 300-349 | 65 | 60 | 50 | 50 | 45 | 40 |
| 350-399 | 60 | 55 | 50 | 45 | 40 | 40 |
| 400-449 | 55 | 50 | 45 | 45 | 40 | 35 |
| 450-499 | 50 | 45 | 45 | 40 | 35 | 35 |
| 500-549 | 50 | 45 | 40 | 40 | 35 | 35 |
| 550-599 | 45 | 40 | 40 | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| 600-649 | 40 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 30 |
| 650-699 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| 700-749 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| 750 or More | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |

* Or through volume only if a right-turn lane exists

| Intersection | Time Period | Opposing Volume | Through Volume | Left-Turn Volume | Warrant <br> Threshold | Left-Turn Lane Warranted (Yes / No) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2nd at Site Drivewa, | AM Peak | 4 | 4 | 219 | >300 | No |
| 2nd at Site Drivewa, | PM Peak | 8 | 5 | 178 | >300 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Knox County Department of Engineering and Public Works "Access Control and Driveway Design Policy"

TABLE 4B
KNOX COUNTY RIGHT-TURN LANE VOLUME THRESHOLDS FOR 2-LANE ROADWAYS WITH A PREVAILING SPEED OF 0 TO 35 MPH

Project No: 01634-0010
Project Name: EZ Stop Concord
Notes: 2nd Drive at Site Access

| RIGHT-TURN | THROUGH VOLUME PLUS LEFT-TURN VOLUME * |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VOLUME | < 100 | 100-199 | 200-249 | 250-299 | 300-349 | 350-399 |
| Fewer Than 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25-49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50-99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100-149 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 150-199 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 200-249 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 250-299 |  |  |  |  |  | Yes |
| 300-349 |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |
| 350-399 |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 400-449 |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 450-499 |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 500-549 |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 550-599 |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 600 or More | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |


| RIGHT-TURN | THROUGH VOLUME PLUS LEFT-TURN VOLUME * |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VOLUME | 350-399 | 400-449 | 450-499 | 500-549 | 550-599 | $=/>600$ |
| Fewer Than 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25-49 |  |  |  |  |  | Yes |
| 50-99 |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |
| 100-149 |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 150-199 |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 200-249 |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 250-299 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 300-349 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 350-399 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 400-449 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 450-499 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 500-549 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 550-599 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 600 or More | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

* Or through volume only if a left-turn lane exists

| Intersection | Time Period | Through <br> Volume | Right-Turn <br> Volume | Right-Turn Lane <br> Warranted <br> (Yes / No) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2nd Dr at Site Driveway | AM Peak | 4 | 0 | No |
| 2nd Dr at Site Driveway | PM Peak | 8 | 0 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |



Figure B.4: Right-Turn Lane Warrant for Two-Way or Four-Way Roadway (Unsignalized Intersection with


Figure B.4: Right-Turn Lane Warrant for Two-Way or Four-Way Roadway (Unsignalized Intersection with

Concord Road at 2nd Drive 2026 Background AM Peak Right-Turn Warrant Right-Turn Lane NOT Warranted


Figure B.4: Right-Turn Lane Warrant for Two-Way or Four-Way Roadway (Unsignalized Intersection with

Concord Road at 2nd Drive 2026 Background PM Peak Right-Turn Warrant Right-Turn Lane NOT Warranted


Figure B.4: Right-Turn Lane Warrant for Two-Way or Four-Way Roadway (Unsignalized Intersection with


Figure B.4: Right-Turn Lane Warrant for Two-Way or Four-Way Roadway (Unsignalized Intersection with


Figure B.4: Right-Turn Lane Warrant for Two-Way or Four-Way Roadway (Unsignalized Intersection with


Figure B.4: Right-Turn Lane Warrant for Two-Way or Four-Way Roadway (Unsignalized Intersection with


Figure B.4: Right-Turn Lane Warrant for Two-Way or Four-Way Roadway (Unsignalized Intersection with

## APPENDIX E - SIGNAL WARRANT EVALUATIONS

TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS - VOLUME WARRANTS


TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS - VOLUME WARRANTS




[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Land Use Codes (LUCs) from Trip Generation Manual , published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.
    ${ }^{2}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator.
    ${ }^{3}$ Enter trips assuming no transit or non-motorized trips (as assumed in ITE Trip Generation Manual).
    ${ }^{4}$ Enter vehicle occupancy assumed in Table 1-A vehicle trips. If vehicle occupancy changes for proposed mixed-use project, manual adjustments must be made to Tables 5-A, 9-A (O and D). Enter transit, non-motorized percentages that will result with proposed mixed-use project complete.
    ${ }^{5}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A.

    ## ${ }^{6}$ Person-Trips

    *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.
    Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A\&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A
    ${ }^{2}$ Person-Trips
    ${ }^{3}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator
    *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Land Use Codes (LUCs) from Trip Generation Manual , published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.
    ${ }^{2}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator.
    ${ }^{3}$ Enter trips assuming no transit or non-motorized trips (as assumed in ITE Trip Generation Manual).
    ${ }^{4}$ Enter vehicle occupancy assumed in Table 1-P vehicle trips. If vehicle occupancy changes for proposed mixed-use project, manual adjustments must be ${ }^{5}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P.
    ${ }^{6}$ Person-Trips
    *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.
    Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A\&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P

