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## 1 Executive Summary

### 1.1 Introduction

The Virginia Department of Transportation is requesting that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) provided supplemental approval relating to the proposed improvements for the I-95/Route 630 interchange. The original Interchange Modification Report dated June 2011 recommended Alternative A2 as the preferred alternative, a modified split diamond (MSD) on new Route 630 Alignment. Subsequently, a new alternative, Alternative F, a diverging-diamond interchange (DDI) on new Route 630 Alignment, has been developed. This document will supplement the original Interchange Modification Report and will justify the recommended improvements through analysis of forecasted conditions.

### 1.2 Purpose and Need

The purpose of the proposed interchange improvements is to enhance safety and provide additional capacity to address current and projected levels of demand at the I-95/Route 630 interchange. The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and Stafford County identified the relocation of the interchange at I-95/Route 630 as an Interstate road system improvement project under VDOT's 2009-2014 Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP). This is required due to the future growth and projected traffic volumes along Route 630. The projected development along the Route 630 corridor will further increase traffic volumes reducing the Level of Service (LOS) and causing congestion through the I-95/Route 630 interchange.

By 2037, traffic volumes are expected to increase such that the intersections along Route 630 at the I-95 Northbound On/Off Ramp and the I-95 Southbound On/Off Ramp will operate at a failing LOS during the AM and PM peak hours. This will cause queuing onto the Interstate and affect operations along the Interstate. Route 630 will be vastly congested due to the limited left-turn storage at the interchange, which will then block the through lanes. In addition, failing levels of service are anticipated at Red Oak Drive and Austin Ridge Drive along Route 630. Modifications to the I$95 /$ Route 630 interchange are necessary to accommodate the projected traffic volumes thus reducing expected congestion and motorist delay through the study area.

### 1.3 Screening of Alternatives

Six concepts (five Build alternatives and one No-Build alternative) were developed for the I-95/Route 630 Interchange Modification Report (IMR) dated June 2011. Each of the alternatives provided a four-lane typical section on Route 630 with provisions for future widening to the median to provide six lanes. The five build alternatives provided for a shared-use path for pedestrians and bicyclists to allow for access from the Stafford County Courthouse to the west either through or around the interchange. These alternatives were analyzed for traffic operations, overall environmental impacts, right-of-way impacts, utility impacts, and construction cost. Based on the analyses conducted for the June 2011 study, Build Alternative A2 was identified as the Preferred Build Alternative because it provides the best traffic operations at the lowest cost and with the fewest utility impacts.
Due to the escalation of construction costs, a more cost-effective alternative, Alternative F, is
presented here and discussed in comparison with the previous preferred alternative (Alternative A2) from the IMR, dated June 2011. The only alternatives that will be discussed in this document are Alternative A2 and the new Alternative F.

### 1.4 Summary of Findings

The new Preferred Build Alternative, Alternative F, is expected to meet the target of Level of Service (LOS) C in 2017 at all locations at and east of the interchange. By 2037, the Preferred Build Alternative is expected to operate better than Alternative A2. However, microsimulation analysis shows that by 2037, the two-lane section on southbound Wyche Road at the intersection of Route 630 is expected exceed the capacity for a two-lane roadway. As a result, improvements to Wyche Road from Route 630 to the park-and-ride entrance drive are proposed to provide a four-lane section. These improvements will be needed between 2017 and 2037.

### 1.5 FHWA Policy Requirements

The previous IMR that was developed in June 2011 and approved by FHWA did not include the eight FHWA Interstate access policy requirements for the proposed project. The FHWA Access to the Interstate System policy published in August 2010 states that the FHWA's decision to approve a request is dependent on the proposal satisfying and documenting the eight policy points. Hence, this supplement includes detailed responses for the policy requirements.

## Policy Requirement 1 - Need for the Access Point Revision

The need being addressed by the request cannot be adequately satisfied by existing interchanges to the Interstate, and/or local roads and streets in the corridor can neither provide the desired access, nor can they be reasonably improved (such as access control along surface streets, improving traffic control, modifying ramp terminals and intersections, adding turn bays or lengthening storage) to satisfactorily accommodate the design-year traffic demands.

Under existing conditions the interchange is operating acceptably except during the PM peak hour when left-turning traffic queues into the through lanes along Route 630. This impacts traffic operations at the ramp intersections and impedes through traffic along Route 630. Furthermore, Stafford County has identified the area around the Route 630 interchange as an Urban Development Area which means it is anticipated that denser development will occur in the area. The continued development will further increase traffic volumes, degrading the Level of Service (LOS) and causing congestion through the I-95/Route 630 interchange. The LOS analysis conducted in this report shows that by 2037, traffic volumes are expected to increase such that the intersections along Route 630 at the I-95 On- and Off-Ramps will operate at a failing LOS during both the AM and PM peak hours. This will cause queuing onto the Interstate and affect operations along the Interstate. The analysis presented in this report for the 2037 No-Build conditions takes into consideration all the background programmed projects in the study area, optimized signal timings, and other reasonable improvements that could be made to accommodate the growth in demand.

The adjacent interchange north of the subject interchange is located more than 2.5 miles away, and the adjacent interchange to the south is located approximately 3.5 miles away. The only other local roadway linking these interchanges is US 1, which operates at or above capacity and already
accommodates diversions from I-95 due to congestion. It is not reasonable to expect that motorists having destinations along Route 630 will use adjacent interchanges. Accordingly, the proposed project addresses the need for capacity and safety improvements at this interchange.

## Policy Requirement 2 - Reasonable Alternatives

The need being addressed by the request cannot be adequately satisfied by reasonable transportation system management (such as ramp metering, mass transit, and HOV facilities), geometric design, and alternative improvements to the Interstate without the proposed change(s) in access.

A transportation system management (TSM) option was not developed for this project due to the rural nature of the project location. However, the project does take into account the future Express Lanes along I-95 and provides for an expanded and relocated park-and-ride lot to facilitate mass transit and ride-sharing. There is a need for improvement of the interchange due to the expected significant increase in demand along Route 630 due to proposed developments in the vicinity of this interchange. VDOT and Stafford County identified the need to relocate Route 630 and this interchange to accommodate this growth and projected demand. The relocation of Route 630 aligns with the regional plans for a direct connection to US 1 at Hospital Center Boulevard and provides for a park-and-ride lot for mass transit and I-95 Express Lanes users. Any additional reasonable TSM strategies applied alone will not meet the needs at this interchange.

## Policy Requirement 3 - Operational and Collision Analysis

An operational and safety analysis has concluded that the proposed change in access does not have a significant adverse impact on the safety and operation of the Interstate facility (which includes mainline lanes, existing, new, or modified ramps, ramp intersections with crossroad) or on the local street network based on both the current and the planned future traffic projections. The analysis shall, particularly in urbanized areas, include at least the first adjacent existing or proposed interchange on either side of the proposed change in access. The crossroads and the local street network, to at least the first major intersection on either side of the proposed change in access, shall be included in this analysis to the extent necessary to fully evaluate the safety and operational impacts that the proposed change in access and other transportation improvements may have on the local street network. Requests for a proposed change in access must include a description and assessment of the impacts and ability of the proposed changes to safely and efficiently collect, distribute and accommodate traffic on the Interstate facility, ramps, intersection of ramps with crossroad, and local streets. Each request must also include a conceptual plan of the type and location of the signs proposed to support each design alternative.

The study area for the operational and safety analysis performed as part of this IMR satisfies the required extents in the FHWA requirements for roadway network analysis and is illustrated in Figure 3-1. It includes the Garrisonville Road interchange that is located more than 2.5 miles north, and the Centerport Parkway interchange that is located approximately 3.5 miles to the south of the Route 630 interchange. The study area also includes one intersection on each side of the interchanges.
Information presented in this report demonstrates that the Preferred Build Alternative will reduce the potential for vehicle crashes within the study area. As per FHWA's Informational Guide for Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI), the DDI design significantly reduces the number of vehicle-to-
vehicle conflict points compared to a conventional diamond interchange. The DDI also reduces the severity of conflicts, as conflicts between left-turning movements and the opposing through movements are eliminated. The remaining conflicts are reduced to merge conflicts for turning movements, and the reduced speed crossover conflict of the two through movements.

Analyses based on the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) presented in this report show that the Preferred Build Alternative will improve traffic operations on roadways within the study area when compared to the No-Build Alternative in the opening year and design year. Queuing analyses was also conducted using SimTraffic software to estimate the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues along the arterial network. The analysis showed no significant queuing along any of the approaches. Microsimulation analyses were also conducted using CORSIM to supplement the deterministic HCM-based analyses. It also confirmed the findings that the Preferred Build Alternative will improve the traffic operations when compared to the No-Build Alternative.

Supporting documentation also includes a functional signing plan (Figure 5-1) and assumptions used in developing a signing concept, as provided in Section 5.5.

## Policy Requirement 4 - Access Connections and Design

The proposed access connects to a public road only and will provide for all traffic movements. Less than "full interchanges" may be considered on a case-by-case basis for applications requiring special access for managed lanes (e.g., transit, HOVs, HOT lanes) or park-and-ride lots. The proposed access will be designed to meet or exceed current standards.

The Build Alternative proposed in the IMR will retain the current full directional access between I-95 and Route 630.

The design of the Preferred Build Alternative has been advanced to a conceptual level and will be further refined during subsequent stages of design activities. The design of the proposed improvements under the Preferred Alternative is intended to meet or exceed American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) design standards, where feasible. At this stage of project development, the design does not require any Design Waivers or Design Exceptions. VDOT will process any Design Waiver or Design Exception documentation during final design of the project if needed.

## Policy Requirement 5 - Land Use and Transportation Plans

The proposal considers and is consistent with local and regional land use and transportation plans. Prior to receiving final approval, all requests for new or revised access must be included in an adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan, in the adopted Statewide or Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (STIP or TIP), and the Congestion Management Process within transportation management areas, as appropriate, and as specified in 23 CFR part 450, and the transportation conformity requirements of 40 CFR parts 51 and 93.

The proposed improvements are consistent with local and regional land-use plans including the latest version of comprehensive plans prepared and adopted by Stafford County. The improvements are also consistent with the George Washington Regional Commission/Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's (GWRC/FAMPO) Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP), which was adopted in April 2013. Funding for the Project was allocated in VDOT's current

Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP 2016-2021).
The project is also included in FY2015-2018 TIP that was adopted June 16, 2014 (by FAMPO Resolution 14-14), updated June 19, 2015 and is included in FY2015-FY2018 STIP that was approved the FHWA on September 30, 2014.

## Policy Requirement 6-Future Interchanges

In corridors where the potential exists for future multiple interchange additions, a comprehensive corridor or network study must accompany all requests for new or revised access with recommendations that address all of the proposed and desired access changes within the context of a longer-range system or network plan.

FAMPO's CLRP reflects a comprehensive summary of transportation needs throughout the region, including improvements at the study interchange. The study area includes one interchange on each side of I-95 (north and south) and takes into accounts all programmed, formally documented and approved interchange access in the vicinity of this project. There will be no other planned access between Route 630 interchange and the adjacent interchanges within the study area. The traffic analysis presented in this IMR considered all of the elements in the plan that affect the project corridor. All proposed improvements and revised access points are supported by these comprehensive network study recommendations.

## Policy Requirement 7 - Coordination

When a new or revised access point is due to a new, expanded, or substantial change in current or planned future development or land use, requests must demonstrate appropriate coordination has occurred between the development and any proposed transportation system improvement. The request must describe the commitments agreed upon to assure adequate collection and dispersion of the traffic resulting from the development with the adjoining local street network and Interstate access point.

The project is not associated with any specific private development or change in land use. Rather, it is being advanced to respond to the cumulative effect of regional and local changes in land use and increasing congestion resulting from increased commuter and regional travel activity oriented to and from the Washington, DC, metropolitan area. The proposed improvements and revised access points will not be used to provide access between any new or expanded development. They were formulated to respond to forecasted travel demand in the area.

The traffic volume forecasts are based on the most recent version of the FAMPO (Version 3.0) travel demand model available at the time of the analyses. The inputs and outputs of the travel demand model were endorsed by VDOT and reflect the demand associated with all programmed land use within the model's coverage area. Additionally, new trips anticipated to be generated by several development projects including the proposed park-and-ride lot located adjacent to the interchange were also incorporated into the forecasts.

## Policy Requirement 8 - Environmental Process

The proposal can be expected to be included as an alternative in the required environmental evaluation, review and processing. The proposal should include supporting information and current status of the environmental processing.

In compliance with state and federal laws, VDOT is preparing an updated Environmental Assessment document (EA) to identify potential environmental impacts associated with the Build Alternative. The revised EA will amend or update the previously approved EA. The environmental document will include consideration of the No-Action (No-Build) alternative, as well as the Preferred Build Alternative identified in this IMR document. Environmental investigations and documentation are currently underway by VDOT.

## 2 Background

Interstate 95 (I-95) serves both Interstate through traffic as well as regional commuter traffic oriented to the Washington, DC, Fredericksburg, and Richmond metropolitan areas. The interchange of I-95/Route 630 Courthouse Road is located near Stafford, Virginia, and is one of four access points to I-95 in Stafford County. The nearest interchange along I-95 to the north is I-95/Route 610 (Garrisonville Road) interchange located more than 2.5 miles to the north of the Route 630 interchange. Approximately 3.5 miles to the south of the Route 630 interchange is the I-95/Route 8900 (Centreport Parkway) interchange.

The project for which this supplement is written involves improvements to the I-95/Route 630 interchange to increase capacity to accommodate the forecasted traffic demand in the area.

### 2.1 Purpose and Need

The purpose of the proposed interchange improvements is to enhance safety and provide additional capacity to address current and projected levels of demand at the I-95/Route 630 interchange. The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and Stafford County identified the relocation of the interchange at I-95/Route 630 as an Interstate road system improvement project under VDOT's 2009-2014 Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP). This is required due to the future growth and projected traffic volumes along Route 630. Stafford County identified the area around the Route 630 interchange as an Urban Development Area, which means it is anticipated that denser development will occur in the area. This continued development will further increase traffic volumes reducing the Level of Service (LOS) and causing congestion through the I-95/Route 630 interchange.

By 2037, traffic volumes are expected to increase such that the intersections along Route 630 at the I-95 Northbound On/Off Ramp and the I-95 Southbound On/Off Ramp will operate at a failing LOS during the AM and PM peak hours. This will cause queuing onto the Interstate and effect operations along the Interstate. Route 630 will be vastly congested due to the limited left-turn storage at the interchange, which will then block the through lanes. In addition, failing levels of service are anticipated at Red Oak Drive and Austin Ridge Drive along Route 630. Modifications to the I$95 /$ Route 630 interchange are necessary to accommodate the projected traffic volumes thus reducing expected congestion and motorist delay through the study area.

### 2.2 Related Highway/Land Development Projects

Roadway improvement projects have been identified by Stafford County and VDOT for the county's road system. The following projects are also included in the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) constrained regional long-range plan:

- Route 630 (Courthouse Road) - Widen two lanes to four lanes from Route 742 (Cedar Lane) to Route 648 (Shelton Shop Road).
- US 1 - Widen four lanes to six lanes from US 17 to Prince William County Line.
- I-95 Rest Area Access Study - Provide new interchange between Route 3 and Rappahannock River
- Route 648 (Shelton Shop Road) - Widen two lanes to four lanes from Route 610
(Garrisonville Road) to Route 627(Mountain View Road).
- Route 641 (Onville Road) - Widen two lanes to four lanes from Route 610 (Garrisonville Road) to MCB Quantico.
- Route 610 (Garrisonville Road) - Widen five lanes to six lanes from Route 648 (Shelton Shop Road) to Route 641 (Onville Road).
- I-95 - Construct two reversible Express Lanes from north of I-95 interchange \#143 to I95 interchange \#126.

Projects that are complete but were part of the original IMR include the following:

- I-95 - Construct two reversible Express Lanes from the Prince William County Line to north of I-95 interchange \#143.
- Route 610 (Garrisonville Road) - Widen two lanes to four lanes from west of Route 643 (Joshua Road) to east of Route 643 (Joshua Road).
- Route 610 (Garrisonville Road) - Widen four lanes to six lanes from Route 684 (Mine Road) to Route 641 (Onville Road).

Traffic volume projections and operational analyses conducted for this study reflect these other projects where the preceding narrative indicates it is proper to do so.

## 3 Study Area

The I-95/Route 630 interchange provides access to the Stafford and Moores Corner area of northcentral Virginia. Among the major destinations in the area is the Stafford County Courthouse area which consists of the Stafford Courthouse, County Government buildings, Stafford Hospital Center, a public safety building, fire/rescue stations, offices, shops and homes. There are several unincorporated communities in the area surrounding this interchange. Stafford is nearby, approximately 1 mile to the east. Five miles to the north of I-95 and Route 630 is the town of Aquia; Fritters Corner is located 6 miles in the southeast direction; Leeland is located 8 miles to the south; Ramoth is 4 miles to the west; and Moores Corner is located 5 miles to the northwest.

The interchange of I-95 and Route 630 is located in Stafford County in the north-central part of Virginia. It is approximately 10 miles north of Fredericksburg, approximately 40 miles south of Washington, DC, and approximately 65 miles north of Richmond.

Figure 3-1 shows the study area map.
The interchanges and intersections within the study area are listed below:

1. Centreport Pkwy(Route 8900)/I-95 interchange
2. Courthouse Rd (Route 630)/I-95 interchange
3. Garrisonville Rd (Route 610)/I-95 interchange
4. Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)/Centreport Pkwy (Route 8900) intersection
5. Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)/Hospital Center Blvd intersection
6. Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)/Courthouse Rd (Route 630) intersection
7. Courthouse Rd (Route 630)/Wyche Rd (Route 702)
8. Courthouse Rd (Route 630)/Austin Ridge Dr (Route 1486)
9. Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)/Garrisonville Rd (Route 610) intersection

Figure 3-1: Study Area


## 4 Alternatives

Under the June 2011 IMR, sketch plans of nine interchange alternatives were developed by VDOT for consideration, out of which five were carried forward for geometric refinement and detailed study. These five alternatives along with the No Build condition were evaluated based on cost and traffic operations. Alternative A2 was carried forward as the recommended preferred alternative under the June 2011 IMR. At the time, the diverging-diamond concept was not prevalent in the United States. In recent times, with the adoption of the DDI concept throughout various parts of the country and the successful implementation of the DDI concept in Virginia, VDOT has proposed to include this design as an alternative for this interchange.

This section details the original preferred alternative, Alternative A2; the new DDI concept, Alternative F; and a brief summary of comparison between the two alternatives.

### 4.1 Alternative A2: Modified Split Diamond on New Route 630 Alignment

This alternative splits Route 630 into a one-way pair from Red Oak Drive extended to relocated Austin Ridge Drive. The existing alignment of Route 630 is used for the westbound roadway through the interchange but diverges to the south around the existing intersection with Wyche Road. Eastbound Route 630 follows a new alignment that crosses over I- 95 about 800 feet south of the existing bridges. These two sections come together at the Red Oak Drive extension and continue to become the fourth leg at the existing intersection of Hospital Center Boulevard and US 1.

The ramp from I-95 northbound diverges as a single ramp that then splits into two separate ramps to carry traffic to eastbound and westbound Route 630. The I-95 southbound ramp will be a twolane diverge with the second lane starting as a choice lane from I-95. The ramps from Route 630 to southbound and northbound I-95 create independent merges onto I-95. Movements from southbound I-95 to eastbound Route 630 and from eastbound Route 630 to northbound I-95 are provided via directional ramps that converge and diverge on the left-hand side of eastbound Route 630 and create an approximate 1,000-foot-long weaving area. The intersection of Route 630 eastbound and the I-95 northbound to Route 630 westbound intersection will be signalized. The four-legged intersection of Route 630 westbound and the ramp to I-95 SB/U-turn ramp will be evaluated during design for signalization. Finally, ramps to southbound I-95 and from northbound I-95 diverge and converge from the right-hand side of eastbound Route 630.

Pedestrians and bicyclists will be provided a shared-use path along the westbound alignment of Route 630. This provides the safest route that has the least interference from free-flow interchange movements.

The park-and-ride lot stays in the same general location but is reconfigured to fit between the eastbound and westbound Route 630 roadways and the directional ramp from southbound I-95. Access will be via a left-in/left-out driveway about 500 feet west of the ramp junction. U-turn roadways are provided east and west of the interchange to provide full access to and from the lot.

Approximately 1000 feet west of the interchange, Austin Ridge Drive is relocated to a new intersection about 500 feet west of the existing intersection where the two sections of Route 630 come together. This provides a better intersection layout and meets the VDOT criteria for intersection spacing at an interchange.

Alternative A2 includes a left-hand merge and diverge area on eastbound Route 630 with the directional ramps to and from I-95.

To the east of the interchange, Wyche Road is closed just south of the eastbound Route 630 roadway. Access from the properties along Wyche Road is provided via an extension of Venture Drive that connects to Route 630 at the extension of Red Oak Drive. East of Red Oak Drive, Route 630 continues to US 1 at the existing intersection with Hospital Center Boulevard. Figure 4-1 depicts this alternative.

### 4.2 Alternative F: Diverging-Diamond Interchange on New Route 630 Alignment

Under this new alternative, new bridges would be constructed parallel to and south of the existing Route 630. This configuration would allow the existing bridges to remain in service during construction and would allow the overall project to be phased. Route 630 will follow a new alignment that crosses over I-95 about 800 feet south of the existing bridges. Route 630 will continue east to become the fourth leg at the existing intersection of Hospital Center Boulevard and US 1. Alternative $F$ is shown in Figure 4-2.

The DDI configuration involves elongated, skewed crossover intersections along the minor roadway (in this case, Route 630) and generally requires that access points be located further from the ramp termini than existing conditions allow. The Route 630 alignment shift to the south of the existing alignment would likely result in the need to acquire and relocate one additional parcel.

The existing Route 630 under I-95 will be retained for future use by pedestrians and bicyclists, which will also includes the installation of two - $10^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime}$ box culverts under the proposed north ramps. This provides the safest route that has the least interference from free-flow interchange movements.

Wyche Road is proposed to be cut for the new alignment of Route 630. A cul-de-sac is planned at the north end of the existing Wyche Road; however, Wyche Road is proposed to be relocated and intersect with the new Route 630 alignment approximately 600 feet to the east at the intersection of Red Oak Drive and newly aligned Route 630.

Off of Red Oak Drive, the park-and-ride lot is relocated to the northeast quadrant of the interchange. Access will be via a signalized intersection at Red Oak Drive/Wyche Road and the realigned Route 630 , located approximately 900 feet east of the of the interchange ramp. The park-and-ride location does not preclude the addition of spaces in the future; however, the park-and-ride will be provided with the same number of spaces as are provided by Alternative A2. A direct connection (spur) from the parking lot to Route 630 was also examined as a free-flow movement to expeditiously allow vehicles to exit the parking lot to travel west on Courthouse Road. It was determined from the traffic operations analysis that the spur was not required to meet acceptable levels of service.

Approximately 1000 feet west of the interchange, Austin Ridge Drive is relocated to a new
intersection about 500 feet west of the existing intersection. This provides a better intersection layout and meets the VDOT criteria for intersection spacing at an interchange.
The following interchange refinements proposed for Alternative F from the original preferred alternative, Alternative A2, are as follows:

- Revise interchange type from Diamond interchange to a Diverging-Diamond interchange.
- Increase northbound off-ramp to Route 630 from one lane to two lanes.
- Change from two northbound on-ramps (one lane each) to one 2-lane on-ramp.

I-95 / Route 630 Interchange Improvements
Supplement to Interchange Modification Report, June 2011

## igure 4-1: Geometric Layout of Build Alternative A2




### 4.3 Evaluation Criteria

The following described the technical criteria used by VDOT to evaluate Build Alternative F. Criteria are comparative among the alternatives studied.

## Traffic Operations

Level-of-Service (LOS) at each intersection and freeway segment were developed using the same HCM methodologies as the previous IMR to develop performance measures within the study area. These measures allow for ranking of the performance of each of the alternatives under consideration. These criteria provide an overall assessment of the degree to which each design alternative provides additional operating capacity to address current and projected traffic demand.

The Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) presented in the June 2011 IMR for alternatives evaluation used several programs. For the DDI alternative evaluation, we applied the same methodology and used the same programs/versions to stay consistent with the previous effort.

For Freeways:

- Level of Service - HCS program was used for all freeways segment types - basic, merge, diverge, and weave
- Travel Times/Speeds and \% Throughput - CORSIM was used to supplement HCS analysis for Freeways only (same 10 random seeds were used as in the previous IMR)

For Arterials:

- Intersection LOS and Delay - HCM Methodology Intersection Capacity Analysis reported from Synchro
- 95th Percentile Queues - are reported from SimTraffic (averaged over 5 iterations)


## Construction Cost

This criterion addresses the projected project development cost for each alternative. Construction costs were computed based on the quantity takeoffs for Alternative F, as shown in Figure 4-1, and the costs are presented in Table 11-1. Costs are calculated using the recent construction unit cost data published within the past year by VDOT for the Fredericksburg District.

A 12.5 percent contingency was included for roadway construction engineering and inspections services (CEI) and a 15 percent contingency was included for bridge CEI. Costs also include a 20 percent contingency for construction. Construction cost totals include construction costs, incentives, contingencies, utility relocations and environmental mitigation.

## Right-of-Way Impacts

This criterion evaluates the degree to which each alternative impacts properties currently under private ownership. Required right-of-way for each alternative was established by summating the proposed width of various roadways and roadside features such as sidewalk, buffer strips, and retaining walls. Right-of-way widths were rounded to achieve even integer width values ( 60 feet, 75 feet, 100 feet, etc.). Right-of-way acquisition costs for each alternative are shown in Table 11-1.

Required right-of-way areas were mapped and overlayed upon base mapping of existing right-ofway. Areas were then computed as the difference between existing and required rights-of-way. If a given parcel was impacted such that the remainder parcel measured less than one-half acre, the parcel was considered to be a total take. If a parcel were bisected, remnant parcels measuring less than one-half acre were assumed to be acquired. Reported values are the total areas of fee acquisition, permanent easements, and temporary easements.
The right of way costs developed were based on recent acquisitions completed, anticipated right of way costs and estimated conservative utility easements that will be required.

## 5 Roadway Geometry

### 5.1 Design Criteria

Design criteria and guidance in these documents were applied to roadways within the project limits based on the functional classification and design speed of each roadway. Table 5-1 summarizes the design criteria for each roadway within the project limits. Where these values cannot be achieved, Design Exceptions will be pursued.

Table 5-1: Design Criteria

|  | VA Route 630 | US $1^{1}$ | Ramps | Austin Ridge | Wyche Road |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Classification | Urban Major | Urban Principal | Ramp GS-R | Urban Collector GS-7 | Urban Collector GS-7 |
|  | Collector GS-7 | Arterial GS-5 |  |  |  |
| ADT | 45,000 | 39,000 | 5,500-18,000 | 12,000 | 1700 |
| Truck Percentage | 10\% | 5\% | 8\%-15\% | unknown |  |
| Design Speed | 40 mph | 50 mph | $35 \mathrm{mph}-50 \mathrm{mph}^{4}$ | 40 mph | 40 mph |
| Access Control | Partial | Partial | Full | N/A | N/A |
| Intersection Spacing ${ }^{2}$ | $660 \mathrm{ft} / 440 \mathrm{ft}$ | 2640 ft/1320 ft | None | $660 \mathrm{ft} / 440 \mathrm{ft}$ | $660 \mathrm{ft} / 440 \mathrm{ft}$ |
| Distance from Ramp Terminal to First Major Intersection ${ }^{3}$ | 1320 ft | N/A | N/A | 1320 ft | 1320 ft |
| Number of Lanes | 4-6 | 4 | 1-2 | 4 | 2 |
| Lane Width | 12 ft | 12 ft | $12 \mathrm{ft}-16 \mathrm{ft}{ }^{5}$ | 12 ft | 11 ft |
| Superelevation Standard | TC-5.11U | TC-5.11U | TC-5.11R | TC-5.11U | TC-5.11U |
|  | emax 4.0\% | emax 4.0\% | emax 8.0\% | emax 4.0\% | emax 4.0\% |
| Right-of-Way Width | $90 \mathrm{ft}-110 \mathrm{ft}$ | existing | varies | $87 \mathrm{ft}-103 \mathrm{ft}$ | 50 ft |
| Paved Shoulder Width | N/A | N/A | $8 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{RT/} 4 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{LT}$ | N/A | N/A |
| Curb and Gutter | Yes (CG-6) | Yes (CG-7) | No | Yes (CG-6) | Yes (CG-6) |
| Sidewalk Width | ```5 ft Sidewalk/ 10 ft SUP (western end only)``` | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \mathrm{ft} \text { Sidewalk/ } \\ & 10 \mathrm{ft} \text { SUP } \end{aligned}$ | None | None | None |
| Shared-Use Path (SUP) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bicycle Lane | Shared-Use Path | Shared-Use Path | None | No | No |
| Terrain | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling |
| Minimum Radius | 536' | 929' | 316' - 760' | 536' | 536' |
| Minimum Stopping Sight Distance | 305' | 425' | 250'-425 | 305' | 305' |
| Clear Zone | 10.5' | 18' | 12' - 18' | 10.5' | 10.5' |
| Slope Standard | 2:1/ 3:1 ${ }^{6}$ | 2:1 | CS-4B | 2:1/ 3:1 ${ }^{6}$ | 2:1/3:1 ${ }^{6}$ |
| Minimum Front Ditch Width | N/A | N/A | 10' | N/A | N/A |
| Minimum Front Ditch Slope | N/A | N/A | 6:1 | N/A | N/A |

1 Route 1 is classified as urban north of Route 630 and rural south of Route 630 . For purposes of this project, the urban design standards will be used.
2 Intersection spacing taken from VDOT Road Design Manual, Appendix F, Table 2-2. First number is for signalized intersections; second number is for unsignalized intersections and full-access entrances.
3 Spacing taken from VDOT Road Design Manual, Appendix F, Table 2-3 and Figure 2-9.
4 Higher range of ramp design speeds will be used for directional type ramps. Lower range will be used for loop ramps and terminals at Route 630.
512 ft will be used per lane on multi-lane ramps. Single lane ramps will be 16 ft wide.
6 3:1 and flatter slopes will be used when right-of-way is behind the sidewalk (or sidewalk space) in residential or other areas where the slope will be maintained by the property owner.

## Design Vehicle

Roadways improvements accommodate a WB-67 as the design vehicle. Use of this design vehicle requires wide pavement areas to accommodate turning movements at intersections.

## Future Interstate Widening

The proposed bridge carrying Route 630 over I- 95 will be designed to accommodate future widening of I-95 by one travel lane in each direction. The Interstate widening is identified as a regional transportation need in the GWRC/FAMPO 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan. The DDI bridges will also accommodate the future I-95 Express Lanes that are planned to be in the median

### 5.2 Design Exceptions

There are no additional anticipated Design Exceptions associated with the conceptual design of the Preferred Build Alternative.

### 5.3 Design Waivers

There are no additional anticipated Design Waivers associated with the conceptual design of the Preferred Build Alternative.

### 5.4 Proposed Limited Access Line

The project will establish a new Limited Access (L/A) line through the interchange area, as shown in Appendix B. The proposed changes to the L/A will comply with AASHTO guidance for extension of L/A lines and extend to the first intersection, in accordance with the Access Management Standards in Appendix F of the Road Design Manual .

The proposed changes to the L/A lines are considered conceptual and are subject to public review and input. Public involvement activities will allow for public review of the proposed improvements as part of the final design of the project.

### 5.5 Interchange Signage and Pavement Markings

Figure 5-1 illustrates the proposed conceptual interchange signage and pavement markings to a conceptual level for the Preferred Build Alternative. The layout was developed to comply with current MUTCD and VDOT standards for Interstates and other state highways.

The layout focuses on large-scale guide signs needed for motorist orientation and directional aid but does not identify regulatory and warning signs that will be needed. The signing and pavement marking layout is subject to refinement and further detailing during final design activities and reflects the following considerations:

- Proposed signage has been designed for Route 630 to provide directional guidance and lane use orientation to vehicles. Specifically, proposed signage provides route number, town destination, and cardinal direction information for each lane in advance of each intersection.
- Proposed pavement markings for Route 630 are coordinated with the layout and messages on the proposed overhead signage. In addition to the traditional arrow symbols, the proposed design incorporates I-95 shield graphics and cardinal direction messages for the respective
lanes. Together the proposed signage and pavement markings are designed to enhance opportunities for vehicles to orient themselves to the correct lane in advance of decision points and minimize the potential for downstream weaving and last-minute lane changes.
- Since the new ramps are much longer, the ramp terminal and advanced signing along I-95 should be shifted to accommodate the newly located gore points. Other existing signage on I95 is proposed to remain in place.

Figure 5-1: Conceptual Signage and Marking Plan for Alternative F - Exhibit A


Figure 5-2: Conceptual Signage and Marking Plan for Alternative F - Exhibit B


Figure 5-3: Conceptual Signage and Marking Plan for Alternative F - Exhibit C
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## 6 Traffic Volume Projections

This chapter provides an overview of the methodology used for forecasting traffic volumes from the existing volumes and the assumptions used in the process.

### 6.1 Traffic Analysis Years

Traffic operational analyses were performed for the same year as the previous Interchange Modification Report, dated June 2011. At that time, the construction was anticipated to be completed by 2017 which was considered as the opening year and the design year was determined to be 2037 . Since the June 2011 IMR, the schedule of the project was updated and it is now anticipated that the opening year will be 2020. However, to stay consistent with the analysis done for all other alternatives in the previous IMR, the same opening year (2017) and design year (2037) were maintained for this supplement. Traffic volumes were developed for the Alternative F for both 2017 and 2037. Volumes from the previous IMR were used to compare with Alternative F. Operational analyses were performed for AM and PM peak hour conditions for Year 2017 and 2037.

### 6.2 Traffic Data Collection

Recent traffic data was gathered from VDOT from various traffic impact studies near the I-95/Route 630 interchange to include VDOT Traffic Data.

## I-95 Traffic Count Data

The traffic data for the I-95 mainline was obtained from permanent station counts from VDOT's traffic monitoring program for the years 2010 through 2015. The data included volumes on I-95 mainline in the northbound and southbound directions for four stations for 24 hours each day of these years. The four stations include:

- I-95 Northbound - North of I-95/Route 630 Interchange
- I-95 Northbound - South of I-95/Route 630 Interchange
- I-95 Southbound - South of I-95/Route 630 Interchange
- I-95 Southbound - North of I-95/Route 630 Interchange

The latest data available was for the month of April 2015. The peak-hour volumes were identified for AM and PM peak periods for an average weekday including Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. It was identified that the level of quality of the traffic count data for two stations was poor. These include the I-95 NB - South of I-95/Route 630 Interchange and I-95 SB - South of I-95/Route 630 Interchange. Hence, data from these stations was not used for comparison purpose.

## Embrey Mill Retail Rezoning Study

Embrey Mill Retail commercial development rezoning study was used to obtain the traffic volume data for intersections in and around the interchange. The development is located on a parcel of approximately 16 acres in size within the northeast quadrant of the Courthouse Road (Route 630)/Mine Road (Route 684) intersection.

The traffic count data collected in June 2013 was used for the study. The 2013 counts were extracted from the study for the following:

- I-95 NB off-ramp to Courthouse Road
- I-95 NB on-ramp from Courthouse Road
- I-95 SB off-ramp to Courthouse Road
- I-95 SB on-ramp from Courthouse Road
- I-95 NB ramps/Courthouse Road intersection
- I-95 SB ramps/Courthouse Road intersection
- PnR Driveway/Austin Ridge Drive/Courthouse Road intersection


## George Washington Village Study

George Washington Village development study was also used to obtain the traffic volume data for the other intersections in and around the study interchange. The study used the 2011 counts for existing conditions, and that data was extracted from the study for the following:

- I-95 NB off-ramp to Centreport Parkway
- I-95 NB on-ramp from Centreport Parkway
- I-95 SB off-ramp to Centreport Parkway
- I-95 SB on-ramp from Centreport Parkway


## Westgate Center Study

Westgate Center mixed-use rezoning study is another data source that was considered to obtain the traffic counts for intersections in and around the interchange. The development is located on an approximate 73.3 -acre site in the northwest quadrant of the I-95/Courthouse Road interchange. The count data available from the study was for the year 2010 for the following:

- I-95 NB ramps/Courthouse Road
- I-95 SB ramps/Courthouse Road
- PnR/Austin Ridge Drive/Courthouse Road

More recent count data was available for these intersections from the Embrey Mill study; therefore, the data from this study was not used.

## Technical Memo

A memorandum was prepared that compared the gathered traffic counts in the study area for the I$95 /$ Route 630 interchange with the traffic volumes in the previous IMR for this interchange. The memo concluded that the traffic volumes and patterns have not changed and can be used to conduct the additional analyses for the DDI (Diverging-Diamond Interchange) design option at this interchange. This memo, dated May 21, 2015, is included in Appendix A.

### 6.3 Forecasting Methodology and Assumptions

Traffic volumes were developed from the Alternatives A2 volumes developed for the previous IMR and applied to the Alternative F concept. Traffic volumes were assigned based on the logical path vehicles would take based on where trips are originating and where they are destined to under the two alternatives. The only difference between the two alternatives is that under Alternative A2, the proposed new park-and-ride lot was located between the eastbound and westbound Rte. 630 west of the I-95 southbound off-ramp. Under the proposed Alternative F, the park-and-ride is located in the northeast quadrant of the interchange. Table 6-1 and Table 6-2 shows how the volume coming in and out of the park-and-ride ( PnR ) lot was distributed to the different destinations within the study area for the AM and PM peak hours.

Table 6-1: AM peak hour - 2037 volume calculations for the relocated PnR lot in the northeast quadrant

|  | 95 S | $\mathbf{9 5} \mathrm{~N}$ | Rte 630 E | Rte 630 W | Austin Ridge | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OUT of PnR | $15^{*}$ | $5^{*}$ | $10^{*}$ | 10 | 10 | $\mathbf{5 0}$ |
| IN to PnR | $10^{* *}$ | $35^{* *}$ | $20^{* *}$ | 40 | 25 | $\mathbf{1 3 0}$ |

* Alternative A2 volumes (30 vehicles) exiting the PnR lot proportionally distributed
${ }^{* *}$ Alternative A2 volumes ( 65 vehicles) entering the PnR lot proportionally distributed

Table 6-2: PM peak hour - 2037 volume calculations for the relocated PnR lot in the northeast quadrant

|  | 95 S | 95 N | Rte 630 E | Rte 630 W | Austin Ridge | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OUT of PnR | $150^{*}$ | $50^{*}$ | $100^{*}$ | 125 | 45 | $\mathbf{4 7 0}$ |
| IN to PnR | $20^{* *}$ | $60^{* *}$ | $40^{* *}$ | 15 | 10 | $\mathbf{1 4 5}$ |

*Alternative A2 volumes (300 vehicles) exiting the PnR lot proportionally distributed
${ }^{* *}$ Alternative A2 volumes ( 120 vehicles) entering the PnR lot proportionally distributed
Peak AM and PM traffic volumes for Alternative F are shown in Figures 6-1 through 6-4 for Years 2017 and 2037, respectively. Volumes for Alternative A2 are provided in Appendix C.

I-95 / Route 630 Interchange Improvements
Supplement to Interchange Modification Report, June 2011
Figure 6-1: 2017 Alternative F Volumes for AM peak hours


I-95 / Route 630 Interchange Improvements
Supplement to Interchange Modification Report, June 2011
Figure 6-2: 2017 Alternative F Volumes for PM peak hours


I-95 / Route 630 Interchange Improvements
Supplement to Interchange Modification Report, June 2011
Figure 6-3: 2037 Alternative F Volumes for AM peak hours
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I-95 / Route 630 Interchange Improvements
Supplement to Interchange Modification Report, June 2011
Figure 6-4: 2037 Alternative F Volumes for PM peak hours


## 7 Traffic Operational Analyses

The operational analyses were conducted for the I-95/Route 630 interchange for Alternative F keeping the methods and assumptions consistent with the previous IMR. Analyses were conducted for two future-conditions years: Opening Year (2017) and Design Year (2037) as described in Section 6.1.

### 7.1 Methodology

Level-of-Service (LOS) at each intersection and freeway segments were developed using the same HCM methodologies as the previous IMR to develop performance measures within the study area. These measures allow for ranking of the performance of each of the alternatives under consideration. These criteria provide an overall assessment of the degree to which each design alternative provides additional operating capacity to address current and projected traffic demand.

The Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) presented in the June 2011 IMR for alternatives evaluation used several programs. For the DDI alternative evaluation, the same methodology was applied; and to stay consistent, the same software programs/versions were used as with the previous effort.

For Freeways:

- Level of Service - HCS program was used for all freeways segment types - basic, merge, diverge, and weave
- Travel Times/Speeds and \% Throughput - CORSIM was used to supplement HCS analysis for Freeways only (same 10 random seeds were used as in the previous IMR)

For Arterials:

- Intersection LOS and Delay - HCM Methodology Intersection Capacity Analysis reported from Synchro
- 95th Percentile Queues - reported from SimTraffic. Models were developed based on the base Synchro files that were developed and calibrated for the previous IMR. An average of five (5) iterations of simulation runs were made following the guidance in the VDOT Traffic Operations Analysis Tool Guidebook.

The operational analyses focused on the typical weekday AM and PM peak hours in the study area. The methodology remains consistent with the previous IMR, dated June 2011, which was approved by FHWA.

### 7.2 Traffic Operations Analysis

Detailed traffic operations analyses were conducted for Alternative A2 under the previous IMR. This section details the findings of the operational analyses for the Alternative F along with a comparison analysis for the two Build Alternatives as shown in Table 7-1. Section 4.3 presents the other comparison criteria, the results of the comparison process and the identification of the Preferred Build Alternative - Alternative F. CORSIM and Synchro outputs are provided in Appendix C - Traffic Software Analysis Results.

Analysis results for the new Preferred Alternative - Alternative F, and the Preferred Alternative in the June 2011 IMR - Alternative A2, are presented in Table 7-1 and graphically in Figures 7-1

I-95 / Route 630 Interchange Improvements
Supplement to Interchange Modification Report, June 2011
through 7-4 for the years 2017 and 2037, respectively.

Table 7-1: Level of Service comparison of Alternative A2 and Alternative F

|  | Peak Hour | Alternative F |  | Alternative A2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2017 | 2037 | 2017 | 2037 |
| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rte. 630 @ Austin Ridge | AM | B | C | B | B |
|  | PM | B | B | B | C |
| Rte. 630 @ Wyche Rd/Red Oak Dr | AM | C | C | B | C |
|  | PM | B | D | B | D |
| Rte. 630 crossover @ I-95 SB Ramp | AM | C | C | - | - |
|  | PM | C | D | - | - |
| Rte. 630 EB @ Off-Ramp from l-95 SB | AM | A | A | - | - |
|  | PM | A | C | - | - |
| Rte. 630 WB @ Off-Ramp from I-95 SB | AM | A | A | - | - |
|  | PM | A | B | - | - |
| Rte. 630 crossover @ I-95 NB Ramp | AM | C | C | - | - |
|  | PM | B | C | - | - |
| Rte. 630 EB @ Off-Ramp from I-95 NB | AM | B | B | - | - |
|  | PM | A | B | - | - |
| Rte. 630 WB @ Off-Ramp from I-95 NB | AM | A | B | - | - |
|  | PM | A | B | - | - |
| Rte. 630 WB @ I-95 NB Ramp | AM | - | - | A | C |
|  | PM | - | - | B | C |
| Rte. 630 EB @ I-95 SB Ramp | AM | - | - | A | A |
|  | PM | - | - | A | A |
| Freeway Segment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diverge: I-95 NB Ramp to Rte. 630 | AM | C | A | C | C |
|  | PM | B | A | B | C |
| Diverge: I-95 SB Ramp to Rte. 630 | AM | A | A | A | A |
|  | PM | A | A | A | A |
| Merge: Rte. 630 to I-95 NB Ramp | AM | B | D | - | - |
|  | PM | A | B | - | - |
| Merge: Rte 630 to I-95 SB Ramp | AM | A | B | - | - |
|  | PM | C | C | - | - |
| Merge: Rte. 630 EB to I-95 NB Ramp | AM | - | - | D | D |
|  | PM | - | - | B | C |
| Merge: Rte. 630 WB to I-95 NB Ramp | AM | - | - | D | D |
|  | PM | - | - | C | C |
| Merge: Rte. 630 EB to I-95 SB Ramp | AM | - | - | B | C |
|  | PM | - | - | D | D |
| Merge: Rte. 630 WB to I-95 SB Ramp | AM | - | - | B | B |
|  | PM | - | - | D | C |

## Figure 7-1: Alternative F MOEs during peak hours for Opening Year (2017) Conditions



Figure 7-2: Alternative A2 MOEs during peak hours Opening Year (2017) Conditions


## Figure 7-3: Alternative F MOEs during peak hours for Design Year (2037) Conditions



## Figure 7-4: Alternative A2 MOEs during peak hours for Design Year (2037) Conditions



### 7.3 Summary of Findings

Alternative F provides acceptable operations along the I-95 northbound and southbound ramp merge and diverge (LOS C or better for both AM and PM peak hours). The LOS along the mainline and other interchanges does not change between the Modified-Diamond Interchange design and the DDI design. Alternative F performs equal to or better than Alternative A2 in most locations as per the LOS tables and graphics above, to accommodate the updated 2037 travel patterns and projected travel demand. As seen in the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue results in Appendix C, the queues on the off-ramps are less than the storage distance for the proposed ramps in Alternative F.

There are two locations where Alternative F does not operate as well as Alternative A2. During the 2017 AM peak hour at the intersection of Wyche Road and Route 630, the LOS drops from B to C, which is expected since the additional traffic is funneled through this intersection to the relocated park and ride lot. During the 2037 AM peak hour at the intersection of Route 630 and Austin Ridge Road, the LOS drops from B to C as well. Both these locations still operate an LOS C, which is an acceptable level of service.

## 8 Safety Analysis

The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) provided police reported crash data for the I-95 and Route 630 study area during a three-year period from January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2014. The data consists of reported crashes occurring along I-95 between Route 630 Ramp Terminals, from approximately 0.3 miles. Table $8-1$ below presents the crash summary.

Table 8-1: I95 Rt. 630, Stafford Crash History: 1-1-2012 through 12-31-2014

|  | Crash Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Severity |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | RE | A | H0 | SS | Non | F0 | DE | NS | F | PI | PD |
| I-95 NB On-Ramp From Route 630 Merge to 1,000 Feet North |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| I-95 NB Between Route 630 Ramp Terminals - 0.33 miles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 26 |
| I-95 NB Off-Ramp To Route 630 Merge to 1,000 Feet South |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 |
| I-95 SB On-Ramp From Route 630 Merge to 1,000 Feet South |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 14 |
| I-95 SB Between Route 630 Ramp Terminals - 0.30 miles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | 24 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 30 |
| I-95 SB Off-ramp to Route 630 Gore to 1,000 Feet North |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 |
| Route 630 at I-95 Ramps From 250 Feet East of NB Ramp Int. to 250 Feet West of SB Ramp Int. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 |
| TOTALS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 143 | 83 | 13 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 18 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 113 |

Key: RE - Rear End; HO - Head-on; SS - Sideswipe; Non - Non Collision; FO - Fixed Object Off Road;
DE - Deer; NS - Not Stated; F - Fatal; PI - Personal Injury; PD - Property Damage

The crash data collected along I-95 reveals there were 143 reported crashes within the study area during the three-year period. Of the crashes reported, 83 were rear end crashes, 18 were related to a fixed object off the road, 17 were sideswipe crashes, 13 were angle crashes, 10 were deer related, one was head-on type crashes; one crash was categorized as non-stated. Twenty-three percent of the crashes resulted in an injury. No fatalities were recorded within the study period.

The majority of the crashes on I-95 occurred in the southbound direction. This included 46 rear-end crashes and ten sideswipe crashes with most of these occurring near the merge and diverge points. These types of crashes can be associated with congestion. The projected increase in traffic will further increase congestion thereby increasing the possibility of a further increase in crashes.

The crash data collected for Route 630 indicates that there were 18 crashes reported during the study period. Of these crashes, eight were rear-end crashes, eight were angle crashes, one was same direction sideswipes and one crash was recorded as non-collision. Twenty-percent of the crashes
along Route 630 resulted in injuries. No fatalities were recorded along Route 630.

Information presented in this report demonstrates that the Preferred Build Alternative will reduce the potential for vehicle crashes within the study area. As per FHWA's Diverging Diamond Interchange Informational Guide, the DDI design significantly reduces the number of vehicle-tovehicle conflict points compared to a conventional diamond interchange. Table 8-2 (Exhibit 4-3, Diverging Diamond Interchange Informational Guide) presents the comparison of conflict points between a conventional diamond interchange and DDI. Conventional diamond interchanges have 26 conflict points, and DDIs have 14. The DDI also reduces the severity of conflicts, as conflicts between left-turning movements and the opposing through movements are eliminated. The remaining conflicts are reduced to merge conflicts for turning movements and the reduced speed crossover conflict of the two through movements.

Table 8-2: Conflict Point Comparison

|  | Crossing | Merging | Diverging | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conventional diamond | 10 | 8 | 8 | 26 |
| DDI | 2 | 6 | 6 | 14 |

All the relevant crash information is included in Appendix D.

## 9 Land Use Compatibility

The existing land uses in the study area did not change from the previously submitted IMR, dated June 2011; therefore, no additional analysis was conducted.

## 10 Environmental Compliance

As of the date of this document, VDOT is currently preparing a revised Environmental Assessment (EA) for the interchange improvement project. The EA will identify environmental resources that are expected to be impacted by the proposed improvements. Environmental commitments, if any, identified in the NEPA process will be reflected in the final design of the project.

## 11 Preferred Alternative

In the previous IMR, dated June 2011, the previous preferred alternative was Alternative A-2, a Modified Split Diamond on New Route 630 Alignment. Alternative F is a Diverging-Diamond Interchange on New Route 630 Alignment is now recommended as the preferred alternative and is the purpose of this supplement. Alternative F was analyzed to determine if this alternative was meeting or exceeding the results of the previous preferred alternative, Alternative A2, for traffic operations, overall environmental impacts, right-of-way impacts, utility impacts, and construction cost.

### 11.1 Traffic Operations

As discussed in Chapter 7, Alternative F provides acceptable operations along the I-95 northbound and southbound ramp merge and diverge (LOS C or better for both AM and PM peak hour). The LOS along the mainline and other interchanges does not change between the Alternative A2 and the Alternative F. Alternative F is suitable and better than Alternative A2 to accommodate the 2037 travel patterns and projected travel demand. The only location that the Alternative F does not operate as well as Alternative A2 is at the intersection of Wyche Road and Route 630 during the 2017 AM peak hour. The LOS drops from B to C, which is expected since the additional traffic is funneled through this intersection to the relocated park-and-ride lot.

### 11.2 Construction Costs

From the previous IMR, Alternative A2 construction cost is proposed to be $\$ 119 \mathrm{M}$; however, the proposed construction costs were refined for Alternative A2 during the design process. The values from the table below for Alternative A2 were presented at the VDOT public hearing on the interchange project on November 29, 2012 . Preliminary cost estimates were prepared for Alternative F as shown below in Table 11-1. As shown, construction cost reductions of approximately $\$ 14 \mathrm{M}$ were realized by utilizing Alternative F instead of Alternative A2. Also shown in Table 11-1, the right of way costs for Alternative F is reduced by over $\$ 19 \mathrm{M}$.

Table 11-1: Total Cost for Alternative F

|  | Alternative 2A |  | Alternative F |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| Preliminary Engineering | $\$$ | $15,872,909$ | $\$$ | $14,765,059$ |
| Right of Way | $\$$ | $57,898,687$ | $\$$ | $38,531,016$ |
| Construction | $\$ 110,051,887$ | $\$$ | $96,165,988$ |  |
| TOTAL | $\$$ | $183,823,483$ | $\$$ | $149,462,063$ |

### 11.3 Alternative F: I-95/Route 630 Interchange Layout Refinements from Alternative A2

The following layout refinements are proposed for the Diverging-Diamond interchange:

- Change interchange type from a modified Split-Diamond interchange to a Diverging-Diamond interchange.
- Increase northbound off-ramp to Route 630 from one lane to two lanes.
- Change from two northbound on-ramps (one lane each) to one 2-lane on-ramp.


### 11.4 Right-of-Way

Based on the preliminary design, conservative Right-of-Way limits were established. These limits may be adjusted as the design is advanced and more detailed topographic data is acquired. Table 11-2 shows a comparison of the right-of-way requirements for Alternative A2 and Alternative F. As seen in the table, the right-of-way requirements are much lower with Alternative F. The Commonwealth of Virginia has purchased part of the required right of way for the previously preferred alternative. The right of way purchased includes 2.8 acres of partial commercial property, 1.0 acre of partial residential, one (1) residential displacement and four (4) commercial displacements. These right of way impacts summarized below for Alternative A2 were provided in the previous IJR, dated June 2011. The design for Alternative A2 was refined during the design development process, which reduced the amount of Alternative A2 right of way impacts. For comparison, the previous IJR results for Alternative A2 are provided with the new Alternative F impacts.

Table 11-2: Right-of-Way Impacts

|  | A2 | F |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Partial Acquisitions |  |  |
| Residential (acres) | 8.7 | 12.5 |
| Commercial (acres) | 3.4 | 18.7 |
| Open Land (acres) | 76.9 | 23.7 |
| Displacements |  |  |
| Residential (each) | 12 | 5 |
| Commercial (each) | 7 | 9 |

From: Elliott.Moore@dot.gov [mailto:Elliott.Moore@dot.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 08, 2015 3:24 PM
To: Arel, William D., P.E. (VDOT)
Cc: raj.paradkar@ch3m.com; Beardsley, David (VDOT)
Subject: RE: I-95/Rt-630 IMR Traffic Volumes Memo

Bill,

Thanks for setting up the phone conference this afternoon. Based on our discussion, I don't have any further comments on the traffic volumes memorandum and I concur with its findings. Let me know if you need anything else, thanks.

## S. Elliott Moore, PE

Area Engineer for Fredericksburg and NoVA

FHWA - Virginia Division
400 N. 8th Street, Room 750
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 775-3338 (desk)
(804) 775-3356 (fax)
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/vadiv/

Print only if necessary

From: Arel, William D., P.E. (VDOT) [mailto:William.Arel@VDOT.Virginia.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 08, 2015 2:20 PM
To: Moore, Elliott (FHWA)
Subject: FW: I-95/Rt-630 IMR Traffic Volumes Memo

From: Raj.Paradkar@ch2m.com [mailto:Raj.Paradkar@ch2m.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 1:10 PM
To: Arel, William D., P.E. (VDOT); Beardsley, David (VDOT)
Cc: Lara.Hegler@CH2M.com; Marlon.Smoker@CH2M.com; Shropshire, Michelle, PE (VDOT);
Nanditha.Paradkar@ch2m.com
Subject: RE: I-95/Rt-630 IMR Traffic Volumes Memo
Bill/David,

Below are the responses to Elliott's comments. Please review them and let me know if you are okay to share with Elliott.

- Where exactly are the permanent station counters north and south of the Rte. 630 interchange? VDOT's Traffic Monitoring System (TMS) section manages over 600 permanent continuous traffic count stations (CCS) across the state. The stations north of Rt-630 are Automatic Vehicle

Classification (AVC) - which provides vehicle volume, classification and speed. Sensors are two inductance loops and one piezoeletric sensor in each lane. The stations south of Rt-630 are Wavetronix (WTX) which provides vehicle volume and speed. Sensor is radar detection installed in side-fire mode.

- Page 6 states that the data in Table 2 was "within an acceptable variability from the projected growth". How is "acceptable variability" defined? Some of these numbers were off by as much as $40-50 \%$. I do realize that most of the volumes from 2009 seem to be much higher than what's out there today, which would mean that if our updated model shows favorable results, those results could be expected to be achievable in the field.
The two locations along I-95 south of the Rt-630 interchange where the difference is showing very high in both AM and PM, is due to the quality of data from the Permanent CCS (see above). There is a footnote in the table identifying this fact. So the count data we received identified the fact that this data is not very reliable at those locations. However north of the interchange and the other ramps/intersections the difference reflects the fact that in most locations the projected IMR growth is higher (negative) than the count data in the field. So your interpretation is correct that our IMR volumes are on the higher side and if we can achieve favorable results in our models, then the findings would be conservative. So even though the variability exists between the volumes compared but it is acceptable since it is higher (negative) in the IMR compared to field.
- Two of the locations I'm concerned with (I-95 mainlines south of the Rte. 630 interchange) don't have quality data to compare to the old report. Are there any other sources of data that we can use to compare these section?
For these locations we relied more on the I-95 SB on-ramp from Courthouse Rd (-16\% in AM \& $12 \%$ in PM) and the I-95 NB off-ramp to Courthouse Rd ( $-1 \%$ in AM and $-7 \%$ in PM) data along with the mainline count data north of Courthouse (Rt-630) data. Back-calculating from the ramp data we were able to estimate the mainline data south of the Rt-630 interchange and found it to pass the reasonable conservative test. We were not able to locate a more recent count at this location from any other studies.


# I-95/Route 630 Interchange Modification Report 

PREPARED FOR: David Beardsley (VDOT)
PREPARED BY: CH2M HILL: Nanditha Paradkar, Raj Paradkar and Lara Hegler
SUBJECT: I-95/Route 630 Interchange: Comparison of Traffic Volumes
DATE: $\quad 05 / 11 / 2015$
cc: Michelle Shropshire, P.E. (VDOT); William D. Arel, P.E. (VDOT)

## I. Overview/Introduction

The purpose of this memorandum is to compare recent traffic counts in the study area for the I$95 /$ Route 630 interchange with the traffic volumes in the 2009 Interchange Modification Report (IMR) for this interchange. If the traffic volumes and patterns have not changed, they can be used to conduct the additional analyses for the DDI (Diverging-Diamond Interchange) design option at this interchange. This memo presents a comparison of the available traffic count data gathered from various traffic impact studies near the I-95/Route 630 interchange with that of traffic volumes developed for the 2009 IMR.

## II. Study Area

The interchange of I-95 and Route 630 is located in Stafford County in the north-central part of Virginia. It is approximately 10 miles north of Fredericksburg, approximately 40 miles south of Washington, D.C., and approximately 65 miles north of Richmond. Figure 1 shows the study area map.

The interchanges and intersections within the study area are listed below:

1. Centreport Pkwy/l-95 interchange
2. Courthouse Rd (Route 630)/I-95 interchange
3. Garrisonville Rd (Route 610)/I-95 interchange
4. Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)/Centreport Pkwy intersection
5. Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)/Hospital Center Blvd intersection
6. Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)/Courthouse Rd (Route 630) intersection
7. Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)/Garrisonville Rd (Route 610) intersection
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Figure 1: Study Area Map

## III. Data

The traffic count data was gathered from various data sources and studies that include:

- VDOT's Permanent Station Count Data
- Traffic Impact Analysis Study for Embrey Mill Retail Rezoning
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- Traffic Impact Analysis Study for George Washington Village
- Traffic Impact Analysis Study for Westgate Center at Stafford Courthouse


## VDOT Traffic Data

The traffic data for the I-95 mainline was obtained from permanent station counts from VDOT's traffic monitoring program for the years 2010 through 2015. The data included volumes on I-95 mainline in the northbound and southbound directions for four stations for 24 hours each day of these years. The four stations include:

- I-95 Northbound - North of I-95/Rt. 630 Interchange
- I-95 Northbound - South of I-95/Rt. 630 Interchange
- I-95 Southbound - South of I-95/Rt. 630 Interchange
- I-95 Southbound - North of I-95/Rt. 630 Interchange

The latest data available was for the month of April 2015. The peak-hour volumes were identified for AM and PM peak periods for an average weekday including Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. It was identified that the level of quality of the traffic count data for two stations was poor. These include the I-95 NB - South of I-95/Rt. 630 Interchange and I-95 SB - South of I95/Rt. 630 Interchange. Hence, data from these stations was not used for comparison purpose.

## Embrey Mill Retail Rezoning Study

Embrey Mill Retail commercial development rezoning study was used to obtain the traffic volume data for intersections in and around the interchange. The development is located on a parcel of approximately 16 acres in size within the northeast quadrant of the Courthouse Road (Route 630)/Mine Road (Route 684) intersection.

The traffic count data collected in June 2013 was used for the study. The 2013 counts were extracted from the study for the following:

- I-95 NB off-ramp to Courthouse Road
- I-95 NB on-ramp from Courthouse Road
- I-95 SB off-ramp to Courthouse Road
- I-95 SB on-ramp from Courthouse Road
- I-95 NB ramps/Courthouse Road intersection
- I-95 SB ramps/Courthouse Road intersection
- PnR Driveway/Austin Ridge Drive/Courthouse Road intersection


## George Washington Village Study

George Washington Village development study was also used to obtain the traffic volume data for the other intersections in and around the study interchange. The study used the 2011 counts for existing conditions and that data was extracted from the study for the following:

- I-95 NB off-ramp to Centreport Parkway
- I-95 NB on-ramp from Centreport Parkway
- I-95 SB off-ramp to Centreport Parkway
- I-95 SB on-ramp from Centreport Parkway
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## Westgate Center Study

Westgate Center mixed-use rezoning study is another data source that was considered to obtain the traffic counts for intersections in and around the interchange. The development is located on an approximate 73.3 acre site in the northwest quadrant of the I-95/Courthouse Road interchange. The count data available from the study was for the year 2010 for the following:

- I-95 NB ramps/Courthouse Road
- I-95 SB ramps/Courthouse Road
- PnR/Austin Ridge Drive/Courthouse Road

More recent count data was available for these intersections from the Embrey Mill study; therefore, the data from this study was not used.

## IV. Data Analysis and Findings

This section summarizes the traffic volumes that were used in the 2009 IMR and the latest count data available.

## Traffic Volumes for 2009 IMR

Existing (2009) traffic volumes were developed from the traffic counts that were conducted throughout the study area in addition to the traffic count data which was gathered from automated traffic recording stations located south of Route 630 along the mainline of I-95. Traffic counts were performed by conducting turning movement counts, video, and placing portable tubes across the roadway.

Table 1 summarizes the traffic count data from the 2009 IMR for the interchange including I-95 mainline volumes, ramps and the total intersection volumes (sum of all approaches). The table shows volumes for the existing traffic year (2009) and design year (2037) for AM and PM peak hours. The table also shows the annualized growth rate.

Table 1: Traffic Volume from Existing 2009 IMR

| Location | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | $\mathbf{2 0 3 7}$ | Annual <br> Growth | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 7}$ | Annual <br> Growth |
| I-95 Mainline Volumes | 5210 | 9015 | $3 \%$ | 3205 | 4755 | $2 \%$ |
| I-95 NB - North of I-95/Rt. 630 <br> Interchange | 5355 | 8615 | $2 \%$ | 3330 | 5080 | $2 \%$ |
| I-95 NB - South of I-95/Rt. 630 <br> Interchange | 2530 | 4230 | $2 \%$ | 5515 | 8705 | $2 \%$ |
| I-95 SB - South of I-95/Rt. 630 <br> Interchange |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| I-95 SB - North of I-95/Rt. 630 <br> Interchange | 2365 | 4005 | $2 \%$ | 5425 | 8855 | $2 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ramps |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I-95 NB off-ramp to Courthouse <br> Rd | 525 | 1275 | $5 \%$ | 385 | 1375 | $9 \%$ |
| I-95 NB on-ramp from <br> Courthouse Rd | 380 | 1675 | $12 \%$ | 260 | 1050 | $11 \%$ |
| I-95 SB off-ramp to Courthouse <br> Rd | 230 | 850 | $10 \%$ | 430 | 1775 | $11 \%$ |
| I-95 SB on-ramp from <br> Courthouse Rd | 395 | 1075 | $6 \%$ | 520 | 1625 | $8 \%$ |
| I-95 NB off-ramp to Centreport <br> Pkwy | 320 | 1150 | $9 \%$ | 185 | 1100 | $18 \%$ |
| I-95 NB on-ramp from <br> Centreport Pkwy | 585 | 1975 | $8 \%$ | 205 | 900 | $12 \%$ |
| I-95 SB off-ramp to Centreport <br> Pkwy | 125 | 650 | $15 \%$ | 425 | 1750 | $11 \%$ |
| I-95 SB on-ramp from <br> Centreport Pkwy | 205 | 550 | $6 \%$ | 270 | 1375 | $15 \%$ |
| Intersection Volumes (TOTAL) | 2195 | 6415 | $7 \%$ | 2505 | 7105 | $7 \%$ |
| I-95 NB ramps/Courthouse Rd | 1855 | 5040 | $6 \%$ | 1820 | 7295 | $11 \%$ |
| I-95 SB ramps/Courthouse Rd | 1565 | 4345 | $6 \%$ | 2025 | 6345 | $8 \%$ |
| VDOT P n R Driveway/Austin <br> Ridge Dr/Courthouse Rd | 1470 | 3835 | $6 \%$ | 1780 | 4940 | $6 \%$ |
| US 1/Courthouse Rd | 1260 | 4370 | $9 \%$ | 1070 | 4775 | $12 \%$ |
| Centreport Pkwy/I-95 NB | 675 | 2175 | $8 \%$ | 990 | 4050 | $11 \%$ |
| Centreport Pkwy/I-95 SB | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Traffic Volumes for Existing IMR vs. Latest Volumes

The latest count data is available for 2015 traffic year for I-95 mainline; 2013 traffic year for ramps of I-95/Rt. 630 interchange and Austin Ridge/Rt. 630 intersection; and 2011 traffic year for US 1/Courthouse Rd intersection and Centreport Pkwy/l-95 interchange. The volumes from the existing IMR were projected from 2009 to these latest traffic year volumes based on linear interpolation and the annual growth rate shown in Table 1. The projected volumes from the existing IMR and the latest count data are summarized in Table 2. The percentage difference in the volumes is summarized in this table. A negative number indicates that the projected IMR volumes are higher than the latest count data.
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Table 2: Traffic Volumes from Existing IMR vs. Latest Counts

| Location | AM |  |  | PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IMR Volume | Latest Counts | \% Delta | IMR <br> Volume | Latest Counts | \% Delta |
| I-95 Mainline Volumes | 2015 Counts, VDOT Permanent Station Counts |  |  |  |  |  |
| I-95 NB - North of I-95/Rt. 630 Interchange | 6080 | 4700 | -23\% | 3552 | 3651 | 3\% |
| *I-95 NB - South of I-95/Rt. 630 Interchange | 6093 | 3075 | -50\% | 3723 | 1732 | -53\% |
| *I-95 SB - South of I-95/Rt. 630 Interchange | 2917 | 1616 | -45\% | 6235 | 3168 | -49\% |
| I-95 SB - North of I-95/Rt. 630 Interchange | 2739 | 2986 | 9\% | 6203 | 4478 | -28\% |
| Ramps | 2013 Counts, Embrey Mill Retail Rezoning Study |  |  |  |  |  |
| I-95 NB off-ramp to Courthouse Rd | 641 | 633 | -1\% | 547 | 510 | -7\% |
| I-95 NB on-ramp from Courthouse Rd | 602 | 503 | -16\% | 393 | 318 | -19\% |
| I-95 SB off-ramp to Courthouse Rd | 332 | 238 | -28\% | 657 | 511 | -22\% |
| I-95 SB on-ramp from Courthouse Rd | 501 | 420 | -16\% | 697 | 610 | -12\% |
| I-95 NB off-ramp to Centreport Pkwy | 382 | 502 | 31\% | 256 | 154 | -40\% |
| I-95 NB on-ramp from Centreport Pkwy | 688 | 371 | -46\% | 258 | 198 | -23\% |
| I-95 SB off-ramp to Centreport Pkwy | 165 | 156 | -6\% | 525 | 545 | 4\% |
| I-95 SB on-ramp from Centreport Pkwy | 230 | 179 | -22\% | 355 | 394 | 11\% |
| Intersection Volumes | 2013 Counts, Embrey Mill Retail Rezoning Study |  |  |  |  |  |
| I-95 NB ramps/Courthouse Rd | 2354 | 2124 | -10\% | 2737 | 2212 | -19\% |
| I-95 SB ramps/Courthouse Rd | 2002 | 1745 | -13\% | 2716 | 2332 | -14\% |
| VDOT P n R Driveway/Austin Ridge Dr/Courthouse Rd | 1838 | 1673 | -9\% | 2276 | 2002 | -12\% |
| Intersection Volumes | 2011 Counts, George Washington Village Study |  |  |  |  |  |
| US 1/Courthouse Rd | 2507 | 2298 | -8\% | 2844 | 2499 | -12\% |
| Centreport Pkwy/I-95 NB | 1492 | 1330 | -11\% | 1351 | 1123 | -17\% |
| Centreport Pkwy/I-95 SB | 786 | 864 | 10\% | 1221 | 1230 | 1\% |

* Poor quality data from VDOT

As seen in Table 2, most of the mainline volumes, ramps, and intersections for the projected IMR volumes are higher than the latest counts in the field. The current traffic count data are within an acceptable variability from the projected growth that was assumed in the 2009 IMR. Hence, it can be concluded that using the traffic data from the 2009 IMR for the traffic operation analysis is acceptable for assessing future traffic at the I-95/Route 630 interchange.
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## V. Next Steps/Conclusion

The Virginia Department of Transportation is seeking to explore a new alternative for the reconstruction of the interchange of I-95 and Route 630 in Stafford County, Virginia. The design will be in accordance with VDOT and AASHTO design standards that are current at the time of Notice to Proceed. The interchange configuration will be based on a revised preferred alternative for a Diverging-Diamond Interchange (DDI). Based on the above findings, we conclude that the traffic volumes from the 2009 IMR will be used to assess future traffic operations and analysis of the DDI alternative. CORSIM will be utilized to conduct traffic analysis and prepare a supplement to the existing IMR, which will include highlighting the rationale and operational acceptability of the DDI as the new preferred alternative for the IMR.




## Appendix C: <br> Traffic Software Analysis Results

# Alternative F Design Speeds Truck Percentages Peak Hour Factor 



# 2037 Alternative F 

 $95^{\text {th }}$ Percentile QueuesDelays

| I-95 and Route 630 DDI Interchange: 95th Percentile Queues and Delays for 2037 Build |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection |  | Peak Hour | Approach |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Northbound | Southbound |  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
|  |  | Queue (ft) | Delay (s/v) | Queue (ft) | Delay (s/v) | Queue (ft) | Delay (s/v) | Queue (ft) | Delay (s/v) |
| 25 | Rte. 630 @ Austin Ridge |  | AM |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBL: } 354 \\ & \text { SBR: } 100 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35.2 \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBL: } 424 \\ & \text { EBT: } 1098 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.4 \\ & 23.7 \end{aligned}$ | WBT: 163 <br> WBR: 61 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 19.2 \\ & 1.9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | PM |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { SBL: } 222 \\ & \text { SBR: } 96 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 66.9 \\ 49.6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { EBL: } 152 \\ \text { EBT: } 247 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 58.1 \\ 6.6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | WBT: 218 <br> WBR: 80 | $\begin{aligned} & 9.9 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 24 | Rte. 630 crossover <br> @ I-95 SB Ramp | AM |  |  |  |  | EBT: 111 | 31.4 | WBT: 125 | 19.1 |
|  |  | PM |  |  |  |  | EBT: 106 | 30.8 | WBT: 121 | 38.6 |
| 12 | Rte. 630 WB @ I-95 SB Ramp | AM |  |  | SBR: 268 | 34.5 |  |  | WBT: 52 | 1.4 |
|  |  | PM |  |  | SBR: 296 | 42.5 |  |  | WBT: 105 | 7.6 |
| 5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rte. } 630 \text { EB @ I-95 } \\ \text { SB Ramp } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | AM |  |  | SBL: 179 | 15.4 | EBT: 90 | 6.3 |  |  |
|  |  | PM |  |  | SBL: 276 | 38.8 | EBT: 66 | 1.6 |  |  |
| 11 | Rte. 630 crossover <br> @ I-95 NB Ramp | AM |  |  |  |  | EBT: 126 | 38.4 | WBT: 49 | 22.8 |
|  |  | PM |  |  |  |  | EBT: 119 | 35.7 | WBT: 59 | 26.5 |
| 14 | Rte. 630 WB @ I-95 NB Ramp | AM | NBL: 240 | 31.5 |  |  |  |  | WBT: 66 | 3.5 |
|  |  | PM | NBL: 265 | 27.6 |  |  |  |  | WBT: 76 | 8.3 |
| 8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rte. } 630 \text { EB @ I-95 } \\ \text { NB Ramp } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | AM | NBR: 386 | 31.5 |  |  | EBT: 77 | 8.1 |  |  |
|  |  | PM | NBR: 364 | 41.4 |  |  | EBT: 99 | 3.8 |  |  |
| 35 | Rte. 630 @ Wyche Rd | AM | NBL: 134 <br> NBT/R: 120 | $\begin{aligned} & 50.7 \\ & 50.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBL: } 81 \\ & \text { SBT: } 131 \\ & \text { SBR: } /{ }^{2} /{ }^{*} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 47.5 \\ 55 \\ 0.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | EBL: 161 <br> EBT: 310 <br> EBT/R: 335 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 24 \\ 23.2 \\ 23.2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | WBL: 100 WBT: 1138 WBR: 71 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 11.6 \\ 24.8 \\ 9.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  |  | PM | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { NBL: } 198 \\ \text { NBT/R: } 954 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56.4 \\ & 62.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBL: } 147 \\ & \text { SBT: } 452 \\ & \text { SBR: N/A* } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89.1 \\ & 57.3 \\ & 0.9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | EBL: 236 <br> EBT: 660 <br> EBT/R: 195 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 112.9 \\ & 6.8 \\ & 6.8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | WBL: 84 <br> WBT: 1034 <br> WBR: 80 | $\begin{aligned} & 27.9 \\ & 59.1 \\ & 10.8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

Note: - SimTraffic outputs were used for 95\% queue results

- Synchro based HCM methodology outputs were used for delay results


## Travel Times

## \&

## Average Speeds

AM \& PM Peak



## Alternative A2 2017 \& 2037

## Volumes

AM \& PM Peak Hour



## Alternative F

## CORSIM Results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Volumes |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\otimes}{2}$ | Location Details |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 | 102 | (100, 102) | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Truslow Rd \& Centerport Pkwy Off-Ramp | Basic | 2126 | 3 |  | 5330 | 5329 | 100\% |
| 102 | 104 | $(102,104)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Truslow Rd \& Centerport Pkwy Off-Ramp | Diverge | 1446 | 3 |  | 5330 | 5327 | 100\% |
| 104 | 106 | $(104,106)$ | -95 | NB | GP | btwn Centerport Pkwy Off \& On Ramps | Basic | 1621 | 3 | 1150 | 4180 | 4169 | 100\% |
| 106 | 108 | $(106,108)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Centerport Pkwy Off \& On Ramps | Basic | 1810 | 3 |  | 4180 | 4170 | 100\% |
| 108 | 110 | $(108,110)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Centerport Pkwy On-Ramp \& NB HOT Off-Ramp | Merge | 1471 | 3 | 1975 | 6155 | 6142 | 100\% |
| 110 | 112 | (110, 112) | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Centerport Pkwy On-Ramp \& NB HOT Off-Ramp | Basic | 1695 | 3 |  | 6155 | 6142 | 100\% |
| 112 | 114 | $(112,114)$ | -95 | NB | GP | btwn Centerport Pkwy On-Ramp \& NB HOT Off-Ramp | Basic | 2099 | 3 |  | 6155 | 6146 | 100\% |
| 114 | 116 | $(114,116)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Centerport Pkwy On-Ramp \& NB HOT Off-Ramp | Diverge | 2095 | 3 |  | 6155 | 6146 | 100\% |
| 116 | 118 | $(116,118)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn NB HOT Off-Ramp \& American Legion Bridge | Basic | 1875 | 3 | 575 | 5580 | 5568 | 100\% |
| 118 | 120 | $(118,120)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn American Legion Bridge \& Rte 630 Off-Ramp | Basic | 2060 | 3 |  | 5580 | 5571 | 100\% |
| 120 | 122 | (120, 122) | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn American Legion Bridge \& Rte 630 Off-Ramp | Basic | 1950 | 3 |  | 5580 | 5572 | 100\% |
| 122 | 124 | $(122,124)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn American Legion Bridge \& Rte 630 Off-Ramp | Diverge | 2566 | 3 |  | 5580 | 5571 | 100\% |
| 124 | 126 | $(124,126)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Rte 630 Off \& On Ramp | Basic | 1274 | 3 | 1275 | 4305 | 4266 | 99\% |
| 126 | 128 | $(126,128)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Rte 630 Off \& On Ramp | Basic | 1485 | 3 |  | 4305 | 4267 | 99\% |
| 128 | 130 | $(128,130)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Rte 630 Off \& On Ramp | Basic | 1832 | 3 |  | 4305 | 4270 | 99\% |
| 130 | 132 | $(130,132)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Rte 630 Off \& On Ramp | Basic | 1909 | 3 |  | 4305 | 4272 | 99\% |
| 132 | 134 | $(132,134)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Rte 630 On-Ramp \& NB HOT Off-Ramp | Merge | 2708 | 3 | 1675 | 5980 | 5755 | 96\% |
| 134 | 136 | ( 134, 136) | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Rte 630 On-Ramp \& NB HOT Off-Ramp | Basic | 839 | 3 |  | 5980 | 5755 | 96\% |
| 136 | 138 | $(136,138)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Rte 630 On-Ramp \& NB HOT Off-Ramp | Diverge | 2007 | 3 |  | 5980 | 5752 | 96\% |
| 138 | 140 | $(138,140)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn NB HOT Off-Ramp \& NB HOT On-Ramp | Basic | 2090 | 3 | 575 | 5405 | 5180 | 96\% |
| 140 | 142 | (140, 142) | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn NB HOT On-Ramp \& US-1/Aquia Center Off-Ramp | Merge | 2050 | 3 | 425 | 5830 | 5600 | 96\% |
| 142 | 144 | $(142,144)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn NB HOT On-Ramp \& US-1/Aquia Center Off-Ramp | Diverge | 1436 | 3 |  | 5830 | 5597 | 96\% |
| 144 | 146 | ( 144,146 ) | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn US-1/Aquia Center Off-Ramp \& Garrisonville Rd EB On-Ramp | Basic | 1260 | 3 | 1175 | 4655 | 4377 | 94\% |
| 146 | 148 | $(146,148)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn US-1/Aquia Center Off-Ramp \& Garrisonville Rd EB On-Ramp | Basic | 1140 | 3 |  | 4655 | 4377 | 94\% |
| 148 | 150 | $(148,150)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Garrisonville Rd EB On-Ramp \& Garrisonville Rd WB Off-Ram | Weave | 905 | 3 | 1650 | 6305 | 6024 | 96\% |
| 150 | 152 | (150, 152) | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn Garrisonville Rd WB Off-Ramp \& US-1 On-Ramp | Basic | 785 | 3 | 950 | 5355 | 4883 | 91\% |
| 152 | 154 | $(152,154)$ | 1-95 | NB | GP | btwn US-1 On-Ramp to Russell Rd | Merge | 1735 | 3 | 1050 | 6405 | 5936 | 93\% |
| 154 | 156 | $(154,156)$ | I-95 | NB | GP | btwn US-1 On-Ramp to Russell Rd | Basic | 1695 | 3 |  | 6405 | 5934 | 93\% |
| 302 | 304 | $(302,304)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Russell Rd On-Ramp \& Garrisonville Rd WB Off-Ramp | Basic | 1771 | 3 |  | 4130 | 4128 | 100\% |
| 304 | 306 | ( 304, 306) | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Russell Rd On-Ramp \& Garrisonville Rd WB Off-Ramp | Diverge | 1768 | , |  | 4130 | 4128 | 100\% |
| 306 | 308 | $(306,308)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Garrisonville Rd WB Off \& On Ramps | Basic | 900 | 3 | 725 | 3405 | 3393 | 100\% |
| 308 | 310 | $(308,310)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Garrisonville Rd WB On-Ramp \& Garrisonville Rd EB Off-Ram | Weave | 728 | 3 | 500 | 3905 | 3891 | 100\% |
| 310 | 312 | $(310,312)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Garrisonville Rd EB Off \& On Ramps | Basic | 909 | 3 | 400 | 3505 | 3443 | 98\% |
| 312 | 314 | $(312,314)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Garrisonville Rd EB On-Ramp \& SB HOT Off-Ramp | Merge | 1500 | 3 | 500 | 4005 | 3940 | 98\% |
| 314 | 316 | $(314,316)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Garrisonville Rd EB On-Ramp \& SB HOT Off-Ramp | Basic | 1972 | 3 |  | 4005 | 3938 | 98\% |
| 316 | 318 | $(316,318)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Garrisonville Rd EB On-Ramp \& SB HOT Off-Ramp | Diverge | 1800 | 3 |  | 4005 | 3939 | 98\% |
| 318 | 320 | $(318,320)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn SB HOT Off-Ramp \& SB HOT On-Ramp | Basic | 1760 | 3 | 0 | 4005 | 3938 | 98\% |
| 320 | 322 | $(320,322)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn SB HOT On-Ramp \& Rte 630 Off-Ramp | Merge | 1983 | 3 | 0 | 4005 | 3938 | 98\% |
| 322 | 324 | $(322,324)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn SB HOT On-Ramp \& Rte 630 Off-Ramp | Basic | 1664 | 3 |  | 4005 | 3938 | 98\% |
| 324 | 326 | (324, 326) | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn SB HOT On-Ramp \& Rte 630 Off-Ramp | Diverge | 2453 | 3 |  | 4005 | 3939 | 98\% |
| 326 | 328 | $(326,328)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Rte 630 Off-Ramp to Rte 630 On-Ramp | Basic | 1448 | 3 | 850 | 3155 | 3092 | 98\% |
| 328 | 330 | $(328,330)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Rte 630 Off-Ramp to Rte 630 On-Ramp | Basic | 824 | 3 |  | 3155 | 3091 | 98\% |
| 330 | 332 | $(330,332)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Rte 630 Off-Ramp to Rte 630 On-Ramp | Basic | 1049 | 3 |  | 3155 | 3091 | 98\% |
| 332 | 334 | $(332,334)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Rte 630 Off-Ramp \& Rte 630 On-Ramp | Basic | 1648 | 3 |  | 3155 | 3094 | 98\% |
| 334 | 336 | $(334,336)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Rte 630 On-Ramp \& American Legion Bridge | Merge | 2781 | 3 | 1075 | 4230 | 3991 | 94\% |
| 336 | 338 | $(336,338)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Rte 630 On-Ramp \& American Legion Bridge | Basic | 767 | 3 |  | 4230 | 3993 | 94\% |
| 338 | 340 | $(338,340)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Rte 630 On-Ramp \& American Legion Bridge | Basic | 1957 | 3 | - | 4230 | 3990 | 94\% |
| 340 | 342 | $(340,342)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Rte 630 On-Ramp \& American Legion Bridge | Basic | 1940 | 3 |  | 4230 | 3987 | 94\% |
| 342 | 344 | $(342,344)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn American Legion Bridge \& SB HOT On-Ramp | Basic | 2040 | 3 | - | 4230 | 3992 | 94\% |
| 344 | 346 | $(344,346)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn American Legion Bridge \& SB HOT On-Ramp | Merge | 2021 | 3 | 0 | 4230 | 3991 | 94\% |
| 346 | 348 | $(346,348)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn SB HOT On-Ramp \& Centerport Pkwy Off-Ramp | Basic | 2053 | 3 |  | 4230 | 3988 | 94\% |
| 348 | 350 | $(348,350)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn SB HOT On-Ramp \& Centerport Pkwy Off-Ramp | Basic | 1919 | 3 |  | 4230 | 3990 | 94\% |
| 350 | 352 | (350, 352) | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn SB HOT On-Ramp \& Centerport Pkwy Off-Ramp | Diverge | 1525 | 3 | - | 4230 | 3989 | 94\% |
| 352 | 354 | $(352,354)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Centerport Pkwy Off \& On Ramps | Basic | 1396 | 3 | 650 | 3580 | 3367 | 94\% |
| 354 | 356 | $(354,356)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Centerport Pkwy Off \& On Ramps | Basic | 1507 | 3 |  | 3580 | 3366 | 94\% |
| 356 | 358 | $(356,358)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Centerport Pkwy On-Ramp \& Truslow Rd | Merge | 1421 | 3 | 550 | 4130 | 3907 | 95\% |
| 358 | 360 | $(358,360)$ | 1-95 | SB | GP | btwn Centerport Pkwy On-Ramp \& Truslow Rd | Basic | 2125 | 3 |  | 4130 | 3909 | 95\% |

## Alternative F

 HCM Based
## SYNCHRO Reports

2017 \& 2037
AM \& PM Peak Hours

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
5: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
8: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
11: Rt 630 \#1

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | 2 | $\ldots$ | $\longleftarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | * | $\not$ | $\rho$ | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT | SWR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4个4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 个44 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 875 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 580 | 0 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  | 0.91 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.91 |  |
| Frt |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  | 5085 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5085 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  | 5085 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5085 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 951 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 630 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 951 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 630 | 0 |
| Turn Type |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  | 26.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50.0 |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  | 26.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.56 |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.0 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  | 1469 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2825 |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  | c0.19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | c0.12 |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.22 |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  | 28.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.1 |  |
| Progression Factor |  | 1.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.43 |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Delay (s) |  | 31.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.4 |  |
| Level of Service |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 31.4 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 4.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 20.6 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | C |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.37 |  | 14.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 90.0 | Sum of lost time (s) | A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $39.8 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
12: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
14: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1




HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## 29: Old Courthouse Rd

|  | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $p$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | F |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | \% | 7 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 25 | 10 | 195 | 50 | 5 | 200 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 27 | 11 | 212 | 54 | 5 | 217 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 38 | 212 | 54 | 5 | 217 |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 0 | 212 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | -0.14 | 0.53 | 0.03 | 0.53 | -0.67 |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 5.1 | 5.6 | 5.1 | 5.8 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.05 | 0.33 | 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.28 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 663 | 616 | 673 | 586 | 736 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.4 | 10.2 | 7.3 | 7.7 | 8.3 |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.4 | 9.6 |  | 8.2 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | A |  | A |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 8.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 27.5\% |  | ICU Level of | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
31: Wyche Rd \& PnR Road



HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
5: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
8: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
11: Rt 630 \#1


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
12: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
14: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1




HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## 29: Old Courthouse Rd

|  | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\dagger$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $p$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | F |  | 7 | $\uparrow$ | \% | 7 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 55 | 10 | 245 | 30 | 10 | 185 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 60 | 11 | 266 | 33 | 11 | 201 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 71 | 266 | 33 | 11 | 201 |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 0 | 266 | 0 | 11 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | -0.06 | 0.53 | 0.03 | 0.53 | -0.67 |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 5.2 | 5.7 | 5.2 | 6.0 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.10 | 0.42 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.27 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 650 | 615 | 669 | 564 | 702 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.8 | 11.5 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 8.4 |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 8.8 | 11.0 |  | 8.4 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | B |  | A |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 9.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 30.2\% |  | ICU Level of | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
31: Wyche Rd \& PnR Road



HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
5: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
8: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
11: Rt 630 \#1


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
12: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
14: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1




HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
29: Old Courthouse Rd

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $p$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | $\stackrel{1}{ }$ |  | * | $\uparrow$ | * | 7 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 30 | 10 | 330 | 55 | 5 | 280 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 33 | 11 | 359 | 60 | 5 | 304 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 43 | 359 | 60 | 5 | 304 |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 0 | 359 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 304 |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | -0.12 | 0.53 | 0.03 | 0.53 | -0.67 |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 5.7 | 5.9 | 5.4 | 6.3 | 5.1 |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.07 | 0.59 | 0.09 | 0.01 | 0.43 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 588 | 589 | 634 | 537 | 667 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.1 | 16.0 | 7.8 | 8.2 | 10.8 |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 9.1 | 14.8 |  | 10.8 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | B |  | B |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 12.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 34.9\% |  | CU Level of | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
31: Wyche Rd \& PnR Road



HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
5: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
8: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
11: Rt 630 \#1


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
12: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D


HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
14: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1



HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
25: Rt 630 \#1 \& Austin Ridge


HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## 29: Old Courthouse Rd

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\rangle$ | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $p$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | F |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | \% | 7 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Stop | Stop |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 60 | 15 | 300 | 35 | 10 | 365 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 65 | 16 | 326 | 38 | 11 | 397 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total (vph) | 82 | 326 | 38 | 11 | 397 |  |  |
| Volume Left (vph) | 0 | 326 | 0 | 11 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right (vph) | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 397 |  |  |
| Hadj (s) | -0.09 | 0.53 | 0.03 | 0.53 | -0.67 |  |  |
| Departure Headway (s) | 6.0 | 6.3 | 5.8 | 6.4 | 5.2 |  |  |
| Degree Utilization, x | 0.14 | 0.57 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.57 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 554 | 553 | 590 | 538 | 671 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.9 | 16.0 | 7.9 | 8.3 | 13.6 |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 9.9 | 15.2 |  | 13.4 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A | C |  | B |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 13.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 33.3\% |  | CU Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
31: Wyche Rd \& PnR Road



## Alternative F SimTraffic Reports 2037 <br> AM \& PM Peak Hour

2: Ramp C \& Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | EBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total $\operatorname{Del} / \mathrm{Veh}(\mathrm{s})$ | 63.3 | 17.4 | 47.9 |

## 3: Ramp C Performance by movement

| Movement | SBT | SER | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.9 |

## 5: Rt 630 \# 1 \& Ramp D Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | SEL | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 9.2 | 14.8 | 11.1 |

## 6: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp A Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(s)$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 9.1 | 10.1 | 9.8 |

8: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | NER | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 6.3 | 20.5 | 11.8 |

## 11: Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | SWT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 22.0 | 6.5 | 15.5 |

12: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D Performance by movement

| Movement | WBT | SWR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 3.8 | 32.3 | 10.1 |

## 13: Ramp C \& Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 13.8 | 15.2 | 14.8 |

## 14: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | WBT | NWL | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 4.5 | 34.3 | 17.1 |

## 15: Ramp B Performance by movement

| Movement | NBT | NBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 10.2 | 4.1 | 6.9 |

16: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp A Performance by movement

| Movement | WBT | WBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 24.4 | 22.4 | 23.3 |

## 18: Ramp A Performance by movement

| Movement | NBT | NWR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.3 | 2.0 | 1.8 |

20: Ramp D Performance by movement

| Movement | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.3 | 2.4 | 1.0 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 1.2 | 1.8 | 1.5 |

24: Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | NWT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 21.2 | 17.5 | 19.3 |

25: Rt 630 \#1 \& Austin Ridge Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 385.5 | 387.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 3.4 | 189.3 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 108.5 | 142.1 | 9.8 | 3.2 | 50.2 | 16.9 | 68.0 |

## 27: Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | WBR | SET | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.2 | 34.1 | 18.9 |

29: Old Courthouse Rd Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 3.6 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 7.6 | 2.5 | 6.5 | 7.3 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 6.1 |

31: Wyche Rd \& PnR Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 2.8 | 5.2 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 1.9 |

35: Wyche Rd \& Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | SWR

35: Wyche Rd \& Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 44.9 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 44.1 |

38: Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | WBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.8 | 10.5 | 6.1 |

Total Network Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 130.2 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 129.1 |

Intersection: 2: Ramp C \& Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | B10 | B10 | B10 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | TR | T | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 448 | 407 | 426 | 212 | 189 | 203 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 426 | 237 | 259 | 190 | 115 | 72 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 438 | 440 | 466 | 223 | 207 | 205 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 352 | 352 | 352 | 137 | 137 | 137 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 74 | 3 | 4 | 68 | 10 | 5 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 517 | 23 | 31 | 474 | 67 | 33 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: Ramp C

| Movement | SB | SE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 41 | 23 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 26 | 9 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 184 | 190 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 5: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | SE | SE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | L | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 94 | 53 | 35 | 197 | 171 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 71 | 16 | 5 | 116 | 101 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 90 | 46 | 24 | 179 | 165 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 47 | 47 | 47 | 184 | 184 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 62 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 287 | 26 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 6: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp A

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | EB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 15 | 192 | 168 | 160 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 100 | 85 | 58 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 11 | 173 | 156 | 136 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 408 | 408 | 408 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 50 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 0 | 29 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 175 |  |  |

## Intersection: 8: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | NE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 72 | 86 | 86 | 363 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 12 | 25 | 32 | 257 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 44 | 67 | 77 | 386 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 77 | 77 | 77 | 255 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 0 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 2 | 7 | 23 | 74 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 11: Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | SW | SW | SW |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | T | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 127 | 118 | 117 | 54 | 53 | 47 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 109 | 107 | 100 | 38 | 36 | 25 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 120 | 121 | 126 | 49 | 46 | 49 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 36 | 36 | 36 | 34 | 34 | 34 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 55 | 54 | 53 | 41 | 37 | 18 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 247 | 242 | 239 | 118 | 107 | 52 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Queuing and Blocking Report

Intersection: 12: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D

| Movement | WB | WB | WB | SW |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 69 | 70 | 34 | 268 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 7 | 15 | 5 | 173 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 34 | 52 | 22 | 268 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 138 | 138 | 138 | 184 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 9 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 28 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 13: Ramp C \& Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | WB | WB | WB | WB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 59 | 368 | 385 | 366 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 105 | 125 | 88 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 23 | 307 | 321 | 278 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 413 | 413 | 413 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 23 | 16 | 7 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 50 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 15 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 59 |  |  |

Intersection: 14: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | WB | WB | WB | NW | NW |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | L | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 70 | 61 | 31 | 240 | 250 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 30 | 21 | 3 | 151 | 164 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 66 | 53 | 19 | 218 | 240 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 38 | 38 | 38 | 154 | 154 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 15 | 8 | 1 | 11 | 15 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 44 | 22 | 3 | 35 | 46 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 15: Ramp B

| Movement | NB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | $R$ |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 385 | 227 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 63 | 30 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 335 | 162 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1313 | 1313 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 16: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp A

| Movement | WB | WB | WB | WB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 288 | 268 | 319 | 76 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 187 | 151 | 285 | 75 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 299 | 266 | 320 | 76 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 289 | 289 | 289 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 3 | 0 | 4 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 18 | 3 | 26 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  | 50 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  | 5 | 71 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 49 | 204 |

Intersection: 18: Ramp A

| Movement |
| :--- |
| Directions Served |
| Maximum Queue (ft) |
| Average Queue (ft) |
| 95th Queue (ft) |
| Link Distance (ft) |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |

Intersection: 20: Ramp D

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 57 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 4 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 26 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 500 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

Intersection: 24: Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | NW | NW | NW |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | T | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 111 | 100 | 120 | 130 | 112 | 102 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 88 | 83 | 88 | 104 | 100 | 84 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 104 | 108 | 111 | 123 | 111 | 125 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 79 | 79 | 79 | 51 | 51 | 51 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 64 | 34 | 35 | 28 | 34 | 24 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 298 | 158 | 161 | 102 | 121 | 86 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 25: Rt 630 \#1 \& Austin Ridge

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | T | T | R | L | L | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 325 | 889 | 897 | 161 | 188 | 70 | 239 | 286 | 157 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 185 | 788 | 790 | 92 | 107 | 34 | 111 | 150 | 64 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 424 | 1098 | 1092 | 147 | 163 | 61 | 202 | 247 | 129 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 844 | 844 | 339 | 339 | 339 |  | 782 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 55 | 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 400 |  | 400 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 27: Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | SE | SE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 361 | 402 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 328 | 333 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 441 | 478 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 339 | 339 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 26 | 21 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 270 | 218 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 29: Old Courthouse Rd

| Movement | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | TR | L | T | L | $R$ |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 54 | 106 | 52 | 29 | 117 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 23 | 51 | 27 | 5 | 60 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 47 | 84 | 49 | 22 | 100 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 628 |  | 664 | 280 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 250 |  |  | 200 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 31: Wyche Rd \& PnR Road

| Movement | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 37 | 98 | 4 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 23 | 32 | 0 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 41 | 72 | 0 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 350 | 515 | 280 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Queuing and Blocking Report
DDI
Intersection: 35: Wyche Rd \& Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | SE | SE | SE | SE | SE | NW | NW | NW | NW | NE | NE | SW |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | L | T | T | TR | L | T | T | R | L | TR | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 186 | 188 | 284 | 327 | 355 | 124 | 979 | 993 | 75 | 153 | 153 | 118 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 70 | 100 | 135 | 180 | 208 | 45 | 904 | 947 | 20 | 71 | 48 | 31 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 136 | 161 | 256 | 310 | 335 | 100 | 1138 | 1061 | 71 | 134 | 120 | 81 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  |  | 407 | 407 | 407 |  | 950 | 950 |  |  | 758 |  |
| Upstream BIk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 13 | 51 |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 250 | 250 |  |  |  | 100 |  |  | 50 | 150 |  | 100 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 26 | 48 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 | 2 |  |  | 5 | 20 | 30 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

## Intersection: 35: Wyche Rd \& Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | SW |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 149 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 75 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 131 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 515 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 5 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 2 |

Intersection: 38: Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | WB | WB | WB | B34 | B34 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | R | R | R | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 116 | 115 | 352 | 345 | 349 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 12 | 9 | 230 | 41 | 79 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 83 | 74 | 404 | 244 | 298 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 253 | 253 | 253 | 407 | 407 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 0 |  | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 1 |  | 135 | 2 | 2 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |  |  |  |

2: Ramp C \& Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | EBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/ \operatorname{Veh}(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total $\operatorname{Del} / \mathrm{Veh}(\mathrm{s})$ | 16.6 | 5.3 | 11.8 |

## 3: Ramp C Performance by movement

| Movement | SBT | SER | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.8 |

## 5: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | SEL | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 4.7 | 27.1 | 17.2 |

## 6: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp A Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(s)$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 13.9 | 23.9 | 22.6 |

8: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | NER | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 6.8 | 28.0 | 11.4 |

## 11: Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | SWT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 12.9 | 7.2 | 10.7 |

12: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D Performance by movement

| Movement | WBT | SWR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 7.8 | 25.9 | 12.7 |

## 13: Ramp C \& Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 8.8 | 18.1 | 15.6 |

## 14: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | WBT | NWL | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 6.2 | 23.5 | 13.4 |

## 15: Ramp B Performance by movement

| Movement | NBT | NBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 10.2 | 3.1 | 7.6 |

16: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp A Performance by movement

| Movement | WBT | WBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 45.4 | 14.6 | 36.5 |

## 18: Ramp A Performance by movement

| Movement | NBT | NWR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.4 |

20: Ramp D Performance by movement

| Movement | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.7 | 1.9 | 1.1 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 11.0 | 10.1 | 10.7 |

24: Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | NWT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 15.4 | 16.2 | 15.9 |

25: Rt 630 \#1 \& Austin Ridge Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 2.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 3.4 | 0.4 |
| Total Del/Veh $(\mathrm{s})$ | 54.2 | 9.0 | 7.3 | 3.8 | 65.8 | 29.9 | 15.1 |

## 27: Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | WBT | WBR | SET | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.5 |  |

29: Old Courthouse Rd Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | NBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.2 | 3.6 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 7.8 | 3.2 | 6.2 | 7.2 | 4.8 | 0.7 | 5.3 | 5.9 |

## 31: Wyche Rd \& PnR Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 18.8 | 5.0 | 1.9 | 4.7 | 8.9 |

35: Wyche Rd \& Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | SEL | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NWR | NEL | NET | NER | SWL | SWT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | SWR

## 35: Wyche Rd \& Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 292.8 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 85.9 |

38: Rt 630 \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBT | WBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 2.4 | 27.9 | 13.1 |

Total Network Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 195.5 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 129.9 |

Intersection: 2: Ramp C \& Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | B10 | B10 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | TR | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 362 | 295 | 309 | 33 | 8 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 210 | 155 | 124 | 2 | 0 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 327 | 265 | 289 | 19 | 6 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 352 | 352 | 352 | 137 | 137 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 6 | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: Ramp C

| Movement | SB | SE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 49 | 19 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 38 | 11 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 184 | 190 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 1 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 5: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | SE | SE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | L | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 73 | 43 | 17 | 267 | 277 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 25 | 8 | 3 | 244 | 241 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 66 | 33 | 19 | 262 | 276 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 47 | 47 | 47 | 184 | 184 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 15 | 2 | 1 | 34 | 30 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 48 | 6 | 2 | 211 | 181 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 6: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp A

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | EB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 15 | 391 | 388 | 389 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 297 | 287 | 266 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 11 | 396 | 390 | 374 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 408 | 408 | 408 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 9 | 8 | 7 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 50 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 0 | 33 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 92 |  |  |

Intersection: 8: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | NE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 78 | 112 | 99 | 348 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 28 | 42 | 32 | 243 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 75 | 99 | 90 | 364 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 77 | 77 | 77 | 255 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 3 | 12 | 10 | 10 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 18 | 74 | 67 | 50 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 11: Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | SW | SW | SW |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | T | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 123 | 134 | 125 | 63 | 62 | 47 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 110 | 109 | 108 | 42 | 41 | 34 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 117 | 119 | 117 | 59 | 57 | 43 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 36 | 36 | 36 | 34 | 34 | 34 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 47 | 48 | 42 | 55 | 49 | 38 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 300 | 305 | 269 | 359 | 316 | 250 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Queuing and Blocking Report

Intersection: 12: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp D

| Movement | WB | WB | WB | SW |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 100 | 121 | 69 | 283 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 32 | 62 | 20 | 256 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 77 | 105 | 57 | 296 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 138 | 138 | 138 | 184 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  | 31 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  | 183 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 13: Ramp C \& Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | WB | WB | WB | WB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 15 | 324 | 322 | 304 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 179 | 190 | 160 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 11 | 285 | 287 | 264 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 413 | 413 | 413 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 6 | 3 | 0 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 50 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 0 | 28 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 1 | 263 |  |  |

Intersection: 14: Ramp B \& Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | WB | WB | WB | NW | NW |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | L | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 77 | 68 | 31 | 251 | 249 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 55 | 23 | 8 | 191 | 195 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 76 | 56 | 28 | 265 | 254 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 38 | 38 | 38 | 154 | 154 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 44 | 11 | 0 | 15 | 20 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 286 | 69 | 2 | 65 | 90 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 15: Ramp B

| Movement | NB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | $R$ |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 491 | 206 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 126 | 14 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 385 | 109 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1313 | 1313 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 16: Rt 630 \#1 \& Ramp A

| Movement | WB | WB | WB | WB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 308 | 319 | 332 | 76 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 295 | 219 | 224 | 68 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 303 | 337 | 357 | 97 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 289 | 289 | 289 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 55 | 5 | 5 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 505 | 45 | 47 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  | 50 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  | 28 | 8 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 220 | 54 |

Intersection: 18: Ramp A

| Movement |
| :--- |
| Directions Served |
| Maximum Queue (ft) |
| Average Queue (ft) |
| 95th Queue (ft) |
| Link Distance (ft) |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |

Intersection: 20: Ramp D

| Movement | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 334 | 311 | 309 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 142 | 102 | 115 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 293 | 261 | 276 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1213 | 1213 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 24: Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | NW | NW | NW |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T | T | T | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 97 | 111 | 104 | 138 | 125 | 124 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 87 | 88 | 75 | 108 | 103 | 98 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 100 | 106 | 106 | 121 | 113 | 118 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 79 | 79 | 79 | 51 | 51 | 51 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 37 | 26 | 12 | 35 | 45 | 36 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 120 | 85 | 40 | 220 | 288 | 229 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 25: Rt 630 \#1 \& Austin Ridge

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | T | T | T | R | L | L | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 168 | 260 | 282 | 212 | 222 | 95 | 336 | 388 | 126 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 85 | 124 | 142 | 144 | 162 | 47 | 171 | 234 | 45 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 152 | 221 | 247 | 203 | 218 | 80 | 294 | 354 | 100 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 844 | 844 | 339 | 339 | 339 |  | 782 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 400 |  | 400 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 300 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |

Intersection: 27: Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | B1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 18 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 11 |
| Link Distance (tt) | 138 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

Intersection: 29: Old Courthouse Rd

| Movement | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | TR | L | T | L | $R$ |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 65 | 94 | 49 | 34 | 127 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 31 | 45 | 24 | 6 | 62 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 51 | 74 | 49 | 27 | 105 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 628 |  | 664 | 280 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 31: Wyche Rd \& PnR Road

| Movement | EB | B33 | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | T | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 280 | 61 | 78 | 64 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 121 | 16 | 30 | 13 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 275 | 121 | 64 | 102 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 350 | 268 | 515 | 280 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 6 | 5 |  | 1 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |

Queuing and Blocking Report
DDI
7/24/2015
Intersection: 35: Wyche Rd \& Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | SE | SE | SE | SE | SE | B34 | B34 | NW | NW | NW | NW | NE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | L | T | T | TR | T | T | L | T | T | R | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 259 | 266 | 254 | 236 | 217 | 23 | 5 | 125 | 994 | 992 | 75 | 175 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 97 | 128 | 65 | 115 | 127 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 965 | 963 | 24 | 169 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 201 | 236 | 185 | 195 | 195 | 12 | 4 | 84 | 1027 | 1034 | 80 | 198 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  |  | 407 | 407 | 407 | 253 | 253 |  | 950 | 950 |  |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 73 | 75 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 250 | 250 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 78 | 73 | 50 | 150 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 20 | 37 | 1 | 104 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 3 | 16 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 35: Wyche Rd \& Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | NE | SW | SW | SW |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | TR | L | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 800 | 125 | 420 | 458 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 537 | 113 | 178 | 121 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 954 | 147 | 452 | 368 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 758 |  | 515 | 515 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 34 |  | 5 | 1 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 |  | 22 | 3 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 100 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 18 | 60 | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 38 | 15 | 0 |  |

Intersection: 38: Rt 630 \#1

| Movement | EB | WB | WB | WB | B34 | B34 | B34 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | R | R | R | T | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 7 | 357 | 274 | 290 | 432 | 467 | 483 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 0 | 330 | 48 | 61 | 413 | 429 | 432 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 5 | 345 | 200 | 227 | 467 | 498 | 572 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 207 | 253 | 253 | 253 | 407 | 407 | 407 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 73 | 1 | 2 | 23 | 25 | 20 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 668 | 12 | 19 | 214 | 230 | 185 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Network Summary

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 6993

## HCS Reports

I-95 Corridor between Centreport Pkwy and Rte 610

2017 Build - Alternative F

- Freeway Segment Analysis
- Merge Analysis
- Diverge Analysis


# I-95 Corridor between Centreport Pkwy and Rte 610 

## 2017 Build - Alternative F

Freeway Segment Analysis

















# I-95 Corridor between Centreport Pkwy and Rte 610 

2017 Build - Alternative F

## Merge Analysis








# I-95 Corridor between Centreport Pkwy and Rte 610 

## 2017 Build - Alternative F

## Diverge Analysis



| RAMPS AND RAMP JUNCTIONS WORKSHEET |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  |  |  | Site Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analyst <br> Agency or Company <br> Date Performed <br> Analysis Time Period |  | ASM <br> CH2M <br> 8/31/2015 <br> PM Peak Hour |  | Freeway/Dir of Travel <br> Junction <br> Jurisdiction <br> Analysis Year |  | I-95 Northbound <br> I-95 to Rte 630 <br> VDOT <br> Build 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description 070675_I-95 Corridor between Centerport Pkwy and Rte 610 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inputs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Upstream Adj Ramp } \\ \Gamma \text { Yes } & \Gamma \text { On } \\ \nabla \text { No } & \Gamma \text { Off } \\ \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{up}}= & \mathrm{ft} \\ \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{u}}= & \text { veh/h } \end{array}$ |  | Number of Lanes, N Acceleration Lane Length, $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}$ Deceleration Lane Length $L_{D}$ Freeway Volume, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{F}}$ Ramp Volume, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R}}$ Freeway Free-Flow Speed, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{FF}}$ Ramp Free-Flow Speed, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{FR}}$ |  | 3 <br> 1500 <br> 4100 <br> 925 <br> 70.0 <br> 50.0 |  |  |  |  |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{ll}\text { Downstream Adj } \\ \text { Ramp } & \\ \nabla \text { Yes } & \nabla \text { On } \\ \Gamma \text { No } & \Gamma \text { Off } \\ L_{\text {down }}= & 3150 \mathrm{ft} \\ \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{D}}= & 850 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}\end{array}\right\|$ |  |
| Conversion to pc/h Under Base Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (pc/h) | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{hr}) \end{gathered}$ | PHF | Terrain | \%Truck | \%Rv |  | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{HV}}$ |  | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | $\mathrm{V}=\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{PHF} \times \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{HV}} \times \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{p}}$ |  |
| Freeway | 4100 | 0.91 | Level | 13 | 0 |  | 0.939 |  | 1.00 | 4798 |  |
| Ramp | 925 | 0.95 | Level | 12 | 0 |  | 0.943 |  | 1.00 | 1032 |  |
| UpStream |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DownStream | 850 | 0.89 | Level | 12 | 0 |  | 0.943 |  | 1.00 | 10 |  |
| Merge Areas |  |  |  |  | Diverge Areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimation of $\boldsymbol{v}_{12}$ |  |  |  |  | Estimation of $\boldsymbol{v}_{12}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  $V_{12}=V_{F}\left(P_{F M}\right)$ <br> $L_{E Q}=$ (Equation 13-6 or 13-7) <br> $P_{F M}=$ using Equation (Exhibit 13-6) <br> $V_{12}=$ $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ <br> $\mathrm{V}_{3}$ or $V_{\text {av34 }}$ $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ (Equation 13-14 or 13-17) <br> Is $V_{3}$ or $V_{\text {av34 }}>2,700 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} ?$  <br> Is $\mathrm{V}_{3}$ Yes Г No  <br> If $V_{\text {av34 }}>1.5^{*} V_{12} / 2$ Г Yes Г No <br> If $Y$ Pes,$V_{12 \mathrm{a}}=$ $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ (Equation 13-16, 13-18, or |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity Checks |  |  |  |  | Capacity Checks |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Actual | Capacity |  | LOS F? |  |  | Actual |  | Capacity |  | LOS F? |
| $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{FO}}$ |  | Exhibit 13-8 |  |  | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{F}}$ |  | 4798 |  | Exhibit 13-8 | 7200 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{FO}}=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{F}}-\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R}}$ |  | 3766 |  | Exhibit 13-8 | 7200 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R}}$ |  |  | 1032 | Exhibit 13-10 | 2100 | No |
| Flow Entering Merge Influence Area |  |  |  |  | Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Actual | Max Desirable |  | Violation? |  |  | Actua | ual | Max Desirable |  | Violation? |
| $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R} 12}$ |  | Exhibit 13-8 |  |  | $\mathrm{V}_{12}$ |  | 3264 |  | Exhibit 13-8 | 4400:All | No |
| Level of Service Determination (if not F) |  |  |  |  | Level of Service Determination (if not F) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{~V}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}} \\ & \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=\quad(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}) \\ & \mathrm{LOS}=\quad(\text { Exhibit } 13-2) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}  & D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{~V}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}} \\ \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}= & 18.8(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}) \\ \text { LOS }= & B(\text { Exhibit 13-2) } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Speed Determination |  |  |  |  | Speed Determination |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{S}}=$ (Exibit 13-11) <br> $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}=$ mph (Exhibit 13-11) <br> $\mathrm{S}_{0}=$ mph (Exhibit 13-11) <br> $\mathrm{S}=$ mph (Exhibit 13-13) |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} D_{\mathrm{S}}= & 0.326 \text { (Exhibit 13-12) } \\ \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}= & 60.9 \mathrm{mph} \text { (Exhibit 13-12) } \\ \mathrm{S}_{0}= & 74.7 \mathrm{mph} \text { (Exhibit 13-12) } \\ \mathrm{S}= & 64.7 \mathrm{mph} \text { (Exhibit 13-13) } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| RAMPS AND RAMP JUNCTIONS WORKSHEET |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  |  |  | Site Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analyst <br> Agency or Company <br> Date Performed <br> Analysis Time Period |  | ASM <br> CH2M <br> 7/22/2015 <br> PM Peak Hour |  | Freeway/Dir of Travel Junction Jurisdiction Analysis Year |  | I-95 Southbound <br> I-95 to Rte 630 <br> VDOT <br> Build 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description 070675_I-95 Corridor between Centerport Pkwy and Rte 610 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inputs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Upstream Adj Ramp } \\ \Gamma \text { Yes } & \Gamma \text { On } \\ \nabla \text { No } & \Gamma \text { Off } \\ \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{up}}= & \mathrm{ft} \\ \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{u}}= & \text { veh/h } \end{array}$ |  | Number of Lanes, N Acceleration Lane Length, $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}$ <br> Deceleration Lane Length $L_{D}$ <br> Freeway Volume, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{F}}$ <br> Ramp Volume, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R}}$ <br> Freeway Free-Flow Speed, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{FF}}$ <br> Ramp Free-Flow Speed, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{FR}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \\ & 1500 \\ & 6450 \\ & 1000 \\ & 70.0 \\ & 50.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Downstream Adj  <br> Ramp  <br> $\nabla$ Yes $\nabla$ On <br> $\Gamma$ No $\Gamma$ Off <br> $L_{\text {down }}=$ 4000 ft <br> $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{D}}=$ $1100 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Conversion to pc/h Under Base Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (pc/h) | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} / \mathrm{h}) \\ (\mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{r}) \end{gathered}$ | PHF | Terrain | \%Truck | \%Rv |  | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{HV}}$ |  | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{PH}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{HV}} \times \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{p}}$ |
| Freeway | 6450 | 0.96 | Level | 8 | 0 |  | 0.962 |  | 1.00 | 69 |  |
| Ramp | 1000 | 0.92 | Level | 6 | 0 |  | 0.971 |  | 1.00 | 11 |  |
| UpStream |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DownStream | 1100 | 0.89 | Level | 6 | 0 |  | 0.971 |  | 1.00 | 12 |  |
| Merge Areas |  |  |  |  | Diverge Areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimation of $\boldsymbol{v}_{12}$ |  |  |  |  | Estimation of $\mathbf{v}_{12}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity Checks |  |  |  |  | Capacity Checks |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Actual | Capacity |  | LOS F? |  |  |  | Actual | Capacity |  | LOS F? |
|  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  | 6988 | Exhibit 13-8 | 7200 | No |
| $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{FO}}$ |  | Exhibit |  |  | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{FO}}=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{F}}$ | $V_{F}-V_{R}$ |  | 5868 | Exhibit 13-8 | 7200 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R}}$ |  |  | 1120 | Exhibit 13-10 | - 4200 | No |
| Flow Entering Merge Influence Area |  |  |  |  | Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Actual | Max Desirable |  | Violation? |  |  | Actua |  | Max Desirable |  | Violation? |
| $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R} 12}$ |  | Exhibit |  |  | $\mathrm{V}_{12}$ |  | 3761 |  | Exhibit 13-8 | 4400:All | No |
| Level of Service Determination (if not F) |  |  |  |  | Level of Service Determination (if not F) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{~V}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}} \\ & \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=\quad(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}) \\ & \mathrm{LOS}=\quad(\text { Exhibit } 13-2) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}  & \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{~V}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}} \\ \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}= & 8.4(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}) \\ \text { LOS }= & A(\text { Exhibit 13-2) } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Speed Determination |  |  |  |  | Speed Determination |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{M}_{S}= & \text { (Exibit 13-11) } \\ \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}= & \text { mph (Exhibit 13-11) } \\ \mathrm{S}_{0}= & \text { mph (Exhibit 13-11) } \\ \mathrm{S}= & \text { mph (Exhibit 13-13) } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} D_{S}= & 0.334(\text { Exhibit 13-12) } \\ S_{R}= & 60.7 \mathrm{mph}(\text { Exhibit 13-12) } \\ \mathrm{S}_{0}= & 69.0 \mathrm{mph} \text { (Exhibit 13-12) } \\ \mathrm{S}= & 64.0 \mathrm{mph} \text { (Exhibit 13-13) } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

I-95 Corridor between Centreport Pkwy and Rte 610

## 2037 Build - Alternative F

- Freeway Segment Analysis
- Merge Analysis
- Diverge Analysis


# I-95 Corridor between Centreport Pkwy and Rte 610 

2037 Build - Alternative F

## Freeway Segment Analysis
















# I-95 Corridor between Centreport Pkwy and Rte 610 

2037 Build - Alternative F

Merge Analysis





# I-95 Corridor between Centreport Pkwy and Rte 610 

2037 Build - Alternative F

Diverge Analysis




| RAMPS AND RAMP JUNCTIONS WORKSHEET |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  |  |  | Site Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analyst <br> Agency or Company <br> Date Performed <br> Analysis Time Period |  | ASM <br> CH2M <br> 7/23/2015 <br> AM Peak Hour |  | Freeway/Dir of Travel <br> Junction <br> Jurisdiction <br> Analysis Year |  | I-95 Southbound <br> I-95 to Rte 630 <br> VDOT <br> Build 2037 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description 070675_I-95 Corridor between Centerport Pkwy and Rte 610 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inputs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Upstream Adj Ramp } \\ \Gamma \text { Yes } & \Gamma \text { On } \\ \nabla \text { No } & \Gamma \text { Off } \\ \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{up}}= & \mathrm{ft} \\ \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{u}}= & \text { veh/h } \end{array}$ |  | Number of Lanes, N Acceleration Lane Length, $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{A}}$ <br> Deceleration Lane Length $L_{D}$ <br> Freeway Volume, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{F}}$ <br> Ramp Volume, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R}}$ <br> Freeway Free-Flow Speed, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{FF}}$ <br> Ramp Free-Flow Speed, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{FR}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \\ & 1500 \\ & 4005 \\ & 850 \\ & 70.0 \\ & 50.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Downstream Adj  <br> Ramp  <br> $\nabla$ Yes $\nabla$ On <br> $\Gamma$ No $\Gamma$ Off <br> $L_{\text {down }}=$ 2100 ft <br> $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{D}}=$ $1075 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Conversion to pc/h Under Base Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (pc/h) | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{hr}) \end{gathered}$ | PHF | Terrain | \%Truck | \%Rv |  | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{HV}}$ |  | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{p}}$ | $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{PH}$ | $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{HV}} \times \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{p}}$ |
| Freeway | 4005 | 0.91 | Level | 14 | 0 |  | 0.935 |  | 1.00 | 47 |  |
| Ramp | 850 | 0.89 | Level | 11 | 0 |  | 0.948 |  | 1.00 | 10 |  |
| UpStream |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DownStream | 1075 | 0.82 | Level | 7 | 0 |  | 0.966 |  | 1.00 | 13 |  |
| Merge Areas |  |  |  |  | Diverge Areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimation of $\boldsymbol{v}_{12}$ |  |  |  |  | Estimation of $\mathbf{v}_{12}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity Checks |  |  |  |  | Capacity Checks |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Actual | Capacity |  | LOS F? |  |  |  | Actual | Capacity |  | LOS F? |
|  |  |  |  |  | $V_{F}$ |  |  | 4709 | Exhibit 13-8 | 7200 | No |
| $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{FO}}$ |  | Exhibit |  |  | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{FO}}=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{F}}$ | $V_{F}-V_{R}$ |  | 3701 | Exhibit 13-8 | 7200 | No |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R}}$ |  |  | 1008 | Exhibit 13-10 | - 4200 | No |
| Flow Entering Merge Influence Area |  |  |  |  | Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Actual | Max Desirable |  | Violation? |  |  | Actua |  | Max Desirabl |  | Violation? |
| $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{R} 12}$ |  | Exhibit |  |  | $\mathrm{V}_{12}$ |  | 2673 |  | Exhibit 13-8 | 4400:All | No |
| Level of Service Determination (if not F) |  |  |  |  | Level of Service Determination (if not F) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{R}}+0.0078 \mathrm{~V}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{A}} \\ & \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=\quad(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}) \\ & \mathrm{LOS}=\quad(\text { Exhibit } 13-2) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}  & D_{R}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{~V}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{D}} \\ \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}= & -2.8(\text { pc/mi/ln }) \\ \text { LOS }= & A \text { (Exhibit 13-2) } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Speed Determination |  |  |  |  | Speed Determination |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{M}_{S}= & \text { (Exibit 13-11) } \\ \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}= & \text { mph (Exhibit 13-11) } \\ \mathrm{S}_{0}= & \text { mph (Exhibit 13-11) } \\ \mathrm{S}= & \text { mph (Exhibit 13-13) } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{S}}= & 0.324 \text { (Exhibit 13-12) } \\ \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}= & 60.9 \mathrm{mph}(\text { Exhibit 13-12) } \\ \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{O}}= & 72.8 \mathrm{mph} \text { (Exhibit 13-12) } \\ \mathrm{S}= & 65.5 \mathrm{mph} \text { (Exhibit 13-13) } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Report Selection Criteria:

Route Common Name: I-95N
Include Both Sides of the Route: N
Report Date Range: 1/1/2012 Through 12/31/2014
From: 140.44 To: 140.77
Distance in miles: 0.330
Collision Type: Not Provided
Commercial Endorsement Type: Not Provided
Commercial Motor Vehicle: Not Provided
Commercial Vehicle Configuration Type: Not Provided
Start Time: Not Provided
End Time: Not Provided
Days Of Week: Not Provided
Type of Driver Distraction: Not Provided
Driver Drinking Type: Not Provided
Driver Injury Type: Not Provided
Fatal Injury Type: Not Provided
First Crash Events: Not Provided
Location of First Harmful Events: Not Provided
Type of Intersection: Not Provided
Lighting Conditions: Not Provided
Most Harmful Events: Not Provided
Passenger Injury Type: Not Provided
Relation To Roadway: Not Provided
Roadway Surface Type: Not Provided
School Zones: Not Provided
Traffic Contol Type: Not Provided
Damage is VDOT Property: Not Provided
Vehicle Body Type: Not Provided
Weather Condition: Not Provided
Workzone Related: Not Provided
Workzone Workers Present: Not Provided
Jurisdiction Code as supplied by TREDS: Not Provided

| Length In Miles: 0.33 DVMT: 22074.76 |  |  |  |  | Death Rate: 0.00 | Injury Rate: 12.41 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |  |  |  |
| Total Crashes | 29 | 10 | 10 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Fatal Crashes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Injury Only Crashes | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Prop. Damage Only Crashes | 26 | 8 | 10 | 8 |  |  |  |
| Property Damage Amount | 166600 | 37700 | 60800 | 68100 |  |  |  |
| Persons Killed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Persons Injured | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Killed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Injured | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Collision Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 1. Rear End | 15 | 7 | 3 | 5 |  |  |  |
| 2. Angle | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 3. Head On | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 4. Sideswipe - Same Direction | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 5. Sideswipe - Opposite Direction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 6. Fixed Object in Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 7. Train | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 8. Non-Collision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 9. Fixed Object - Off Road | 8 | 1 | 5 | 2 |  |  |  |
| 10. Deer | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 11. Other Animal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 12. Ped | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 13. Bicyclist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 14. Motorcyclist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 15. Backed Into | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 16. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total | 29 | 10 | 10 | 9 |  |  |  |




| Page: 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |  |
| Surface Condition |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Dry | 20 | 9 | 6 | 5 |  |
| 2. Wet | 7 | 1 | 4 | 2 |  |
| 3. Snowy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Icy | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |
| 5. Muddy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6. Oil/Other Fluids | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Natural Debris | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Water (Standing, Moving) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Slush | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Sand, Dirt, Gravel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 29 | 10 | 10 | 9 |  |
| Weather Condition |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. No Adverse Condition (Clear/Cloudy) | 20 | 9 | 6 | 5 |  |
| 3. Fog | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Mist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Rain | 7 | 1 | 4 | 2 |  |
| 6. Snow | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |
| 7. Sleet/Hail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Smoke/Dust | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Blowing Sand, Soil, Dirt, or Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Severe Crosswinds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 29 | 10 | 10 | 9 |  |


|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:00-00:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00-01:59 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02:00-02:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03:00-03:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00-04:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00-05:59 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06:00-06:59 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00-07:59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:59 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00-10:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00-11:59 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00-12:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00-13:59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 14:00-14:59 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:59 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-19:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-20:59 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-21:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 22:00-22:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23:00-23:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 0 |

## Report Selection Criteria:

Route Common Name: I-95S
Include Both Sides of the Route: N
Report Date Range: 1/1/2012 Through 12/31/2014
From: 140.63 To: 140.93
Distance in miles: 0.300
Collision Type: Not Provided
Commercial Endorsement Type: Not Provided
Commercial Motor Vehicle: Not Provided
Commercial Vehicle Configuration Type: Not Provided
Start Time: Not Provided
End Time: Not Provided
Days Of Week: Not Provided
Type of Driver Distraction: Not Provided
Driver Drinking Type: Not Provided
Driver Injury Type: Not Provided
Fatal Injury Type: Not Provided
First Crash Events: Not Provided
Location of First Harmful Events: Not Provided
Type of Intersection: Not Provided
Lighting Conditions: Not Provided
Most Harmful Events: Not Provided
Passenger Injury Type: Not Provided
Relation To Roadway: Not Provided
Roadway Surface Type: Not Provided
School Zones: Not Provided
Traffic Contol Type: Not Provided
Damage is VDOT Property: Not Provided
Vehicle Body Type: Not Provided
Weather Condition: Not Provided
Workzone Related: Not Provided
Workzone Workers Present: Not Provided
Jurisdiction Code as supplied by TREDS: Not Provided





|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:00-00:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00-01:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02:00-02:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03:00-03:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00-04:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00-05:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06:00-06:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00-07:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:59 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00-10:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00-11:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00-12:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00-13:59 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00-14:59 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:59 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:59 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-19:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-20:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-21:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22:00-22:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23:00-23:59 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 3 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 |

## Report Selection Criteria:

Route Common Name: I-95N
Include Both Sides of the Route: N
Report Date Range: 1/1/2012 Through 12/31/2014
From: 140.25 To: 140.44
Distance in miles: 0.19
Collision Type: Not Provided
Commercial Endorsement Type: Not Provided
Commercial Motor Vehicle: Not Provided
Commercial Vehicle Configuration Type: Not Provided
Start Time: Not Provided
End Time: Not Provided
Days Of Week: Not Provided
Type of Driver Distraction: Not Provided
Driver Drinking Type: Not Provided
Driver Injury Type: Not Provided
Fatal Injury Type: Not Provided
First Crash Events: Not Provided
Location of First Harmful Events: Not Provided
Type of Intersection: Not Provided
Lighting Conditions: Not Provided
Most Harmful Events: Not Provided
Passenger Injury Type: Not Provided
Relation To Roadway: Not Provided
Roadway Surface Type: Not Provided
School Zones: Not Provided
Traffic Contol Type: Not Provided
Damage is VDOT Property: Not Provided
Vehicle Body Type: Not Provided
Weather Condition: Not Provided
Workzone Related: Not Provided
Workzone Workers Present: Not Provided
Jurisdiction Code as supplied by TREDS: Not Provided

| 0.19 DVMT: 12908.25 |  |  |  |  | Death Rate: 0.00 | Injury Rate: 21.22 | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |  |  |  |
| Total Crashes | 15 | 3 | 7 | 5 |  |  |  |
| Fatal Crashes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Injury Only Crashes | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Prop. Damage Only Crashes | 12 | 2 | 6 | 4 |  |  |  |
| Property Damage Amount | 60451 | 13950 | 25501 | 21000 |  |  |  |
| Persons Killed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Persons Injured | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Killed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Injured | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Collision Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 1. Rear End | 9 | 0 | 5 | 4 |  |  |  |
| 2. Angle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 3. Head On | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 4. Sideswipe - Same Direction | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 5. Sideswipe - Opposite Direction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 6. Fixed Object in Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 7. Train | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 8. Non-Collision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 9. Fixed Object - Off Road | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 10. Deer | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 11. Other Animal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 12. Ped | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 13. Bicyclist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 14. Motorcyclist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 15. Backed Into | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 16. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total | 15 | 3 | 7 | 5 |  |  |  |




|  |  |  |  |  | Page: 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |  |
| Surface Condition |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Dry | 11 | 2 | 5 | 4 |  |
| 2. Wet | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 3. Snowy | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Icy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Muddy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6. Oil/Other Fluids | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Natural Debris | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Water (Standing, Moving) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Slush | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Sand, Dirt, Gravel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 15 | 3 | 7 | 5 |  |
| Weather Condition |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. No Adverse Condition (Clear/Cloudy) | 11 | 2 | 5 | 4 |  |
| 3. Fog | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Mist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Rain | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 6. Snow | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Sleet/Hail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Smoke/Dust | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Blowing Sand, Soil, Dirt, or Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Severe Crosswinds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 15 | 3 | 7 | 5 |  |
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|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:00-00:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00-01:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02:00-02:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03:00-03:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00-04:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00-05:59 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06:00-06:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00-07:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:59 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00-10:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00-11:59 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00-12:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00-13:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00-14:59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-19:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-20:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-21:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22:00-22:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23:00-23:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |

## Report Selection Criteria:

Route Common Name: I-95N Ramp 140A
Include Both Sides of the Route: N
Report Date Range: 2/1/2012 Through 2/28/2015
From: 0.00 To: 0.19
Distance in miles: 0.19
Collision Type: Not Provided
Commercial Endorsement Type: Not Provided
Commercial Motor Vehicle: Not Provided
Commercial Vehicle Configuration Type: Not Provided
Start Time: Not Provided
End Time: Not Provided
Days Of Week: Not Provided
Type of Driver Distraction: Not Provided
Driver Drinking Type: Not Provided
Driver Injury Type: Not Provided
Fatal Injury Type: Not Provided
First Crash Events: Not Provided
Location of First Harmful Events: Not Provided
Type of Intersection: Not Provided
Lighting Conditions: Not Provided
Most Harmful Events: Not Provided
Passenger Injury Type: Not Provided
Relation To Roadway: Not Provided
Roadway Surface Type: Not Provided
School Zones: Not Provided
Traffic Contol Type: Not Provided
Damage is VDOT Property: Not Provided
Vehicle Body Type: Not Provided
Weather Condition: Not Provided
Workzone Related: Not Provided
Workzone Workers Present: Not Provided
Jurisdiction Code as supplied by TREDS: Not Provided





|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:00-00:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00-01:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02:00-02:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03:00-03:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00-04:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00-05:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06:00-06:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00-07:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:59 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00-10:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00-11:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 12:00-12:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00-13:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00-14:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-19:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-20:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-21:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22:00-22:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23:00-23:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

## Report Selection Criteria:

Route Common Name: I-95N
Include Both Sides of the Route: N
Report Date Range: 2/1/2012 Through 2/28/2015
From: 140.21 To: 140.44
Distance in miles: 0.23
Collision Type: Not Provided
Commercial Endorsement Type: Not Provided
Commercial Motor Vehicle: Not Provided
Commercial Vehicle Configuration Type: Not Provided
Start Time: Not Provided
End Time: Not Provided
Days Of Week: Not Provided
Type of Driver Distraction: Not Provided
Driver Drinking Type: Not Provided
Driver Injury Type: Not Provided
Fatal Injury Type: Not Provided
First Crash Events: Not Provided
Location of First Harmful Events: Not Provided
Type of Intersection: Not Provided
Lighting Conditions: Not Provided
Most Harmful Events: Not Provided
Passenger Injury Type: Not Provided
Relation To Roadway: Not Provided
Roadway Surface Type: Not Provided
School Zones: Not Provided
Traffic Contol Type: Not Provided
Damage is VDOT Property: Not Provided
Vehicle Body Type: Not Provided
Weather Condition: Not Provided
Workzone Related: Not Provided
Workzone Workers Present: Not Provided
Jurisdiction Code as supplied by TREDS: Not Provided

| Length In Miles: 0.23 DVMT: 15604.67 |  |  |  |  | Death Rate: 0.00 | Injury Rate: 45.65 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |  |  |  |
| Total Crashes | 17 | 3 | 8 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Fatal Crashes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Injury Only Crashes | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Prop. Damage Only Crashes | 12 | 1 | 7 | 4 |  |  |  |
| Property Damage Amount | 88951 | 27450 | 30501 | 31000 |  |  |  |
| Persons Killed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Persons Injured | 8 | 5 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Killed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Injured | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Collision Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 1. Rear End | 10 | 0 | 6 | 4 |  |  |  |
| 2. Angle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 3. Head On | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 4. Sideswipe - Same Direction | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 5. Sideswipe - Opposite Direction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 6. Fixed Object in Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 7. Train | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 8. Non-Collision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 9. Fixed Object - Off Road | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 10. Deer | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 11. Other Animal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 12. Ped | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 13. Bicyclist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 14. Motorcyclist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 15. Backed Into | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 16. Other | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total | 17 | 3 | 8 | 6 |  |  |  |




| Page: 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |  |
| Surface Condition |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Dry | 14 | 3 | 6 | 5 |  |
| 2. Wet | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 3. Snowy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Icy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Muddy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6. Oil/Other Fluids | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Natural Debris | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Water (Standing, Moving) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Slush | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Sand, Dirt, Gravel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 17 | 3 | 8 | 6 |  |
| Weather Condition |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. No Adverse Condition (Clear/Cloudy) | 14 | 3 | 6 | 5 |  |
| 3. Fog | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Mist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Rain | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 6. Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Sleet/Hail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Smoke/Dust | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Blowing Sand, Soil, Dirt, or Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Severe Crosswinds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 17 | 3 | 8 | 6 |  |


|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:00-00:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00-01:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02:00-02:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03:00-03:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00-04:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00-05:59 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06:00-06:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00-07:59 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:59 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00-10:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00-11:59 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00-12:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00-13:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00-14:59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-19:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-20:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-21:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22:00-22:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23:00-23:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |

## Report Selection Criteria:

Route Common Name: I-95N
Include Both Sides of the Route: N
Report Date Range: 2/1/2012 Through 2/28/2015
From: 140.77 To: 140.84
Distance in miles: 0.07
Collision Type: Not Provided
Commercial Endorsement Type: Not Provided
Commercial Motor Vehicle: Not Provided
Commercial Vehicle Configuration Type: Not Provided
Start Time: Not Provided
End Time: Not Provided
Days Of Week: Not Provided
Type of Driver Distraction: Not Provided
Driver Drinking Type: Not Provided
Driver Injury Type: Not Provided
Fatal Injury Type: Not Provided
First Crash Events: Not Provided
Location of First Harmful Events: Not Provided
Type of Intersection: Not Provided
Lighting Conditions: Not Provided
Most Harmful Events: Not Provided
Passenger Injury Type: Not Provided
Relation To Roadway: Not Provided
Roadway Surface Type: Not Provided
School Zones: Not Provided
Traffic Contol Type: Not Provided
Damage is VDOT Property: Not Provided
Vehicle Body Type: Not Provided
Weather Condition: Not Provided
Workzone Related: Not Provided
Workzone Workers Present: Not Provided
Jurisdiction Code as supplied by TREDS: Not Provided

| Length In Miles: 0.07 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |





|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:00-00:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00-01:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02:00-02:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 03:00-03:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00-04:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00-05:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06:00-06:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00-07:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00-10:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00-11:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00-12:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00-13:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00-14:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-19:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-20:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-21:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22:00-22:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23:00-23:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Report Selection Criteria:

Route Common Name: I-95N
Include Both Sides of the Route: N
Report Date Range: 1/1/2012 Through 12/31/2014
From: 140.77 To: 140.96
Distance in miles: 0.19
Collision Type: Not Provided
Commercial Endorsement Type: Not Provided
Commercial Motor Vehicle: Not Provided
Commercial Vehicle Configuration Type: Not Provided
Start Time: Not Provided
End Time: Not Provided
Days Of Week: Not Provided
Type of Driver Distraction: Not Provided
Driver Drinking Type: Not Provided
Driver Injury Type: Not Provided
Fatal Injury Type: Not Provided
First Crash Events: Not Provided
Location of First Harmful Events: Not Provided
Type of Intersection: Not Provided
Lighting Conditions: Not Provided
Most Harmful Events: Not Provided
Passenger Injury Type: Not Provided
Relation To Roadway: Not Provided
Roadway Surface Type: Not Provided
School Zones: Not Provided
Traffic Contol Type: Not Provided
Damage is VDOT Property: Not Provided
Vehicle Body Type: Not Provided
Weather Condition: Not Provided
Workzone Related: Not Provided
Workzone Workers Present: Not Provided
Jurisdiction Code as supplied by TREDS: Not Provided

| Length In Miles: 0.19 DVMT: 12709.71 |  |  |  |  | Death Rate: 0.00 | Injury Rate: 64.67 | Page: 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |  |  |  |
| Total Crashes | 9 | 4 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |
| Fatal Crashes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Injury Only Crashes | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Prop. Damage Only Crashes | 7 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |
| Property Damage Amount | 69350 | 29450 | 21500 | 18400 |  |  |  |
| Persons Killed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Persons Injured | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Killed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Injured | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Collision Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 1. Rear End | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |
| 2. Angle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 3. Head On | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 4. Sideswipe - Same Direction | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 5. Sideswipe - Opposite Direction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 6. Fixed Object in Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 7. Train | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 8. Non-Collision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 9. Fixed Object - Off Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 10. Deer | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 11. Other Animal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 12. Ped | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 13. Bicyclist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 14. Motorcyclist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 15. Backed Into | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 16. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total | 9 | 4 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |




|  |  |  |  |  | Page: 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |  |
| Surface Condition |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Dry | 8 | 4 | 2 | 2 |  |
| 2. Wet | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 3. Snowy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Icy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Muddy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6. Oil/Other Fluids | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Natural Debris | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Water (Standing, Moving) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Slush | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Sand, Dirt, Gravel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 9 | 4 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Weather Condition |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. No Adverse Condition (Clear/Cloudy) | 8 | 4 | 2 | 2 |  |
| 3. Fog | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Mist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Rain | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 6. Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Sleet/Hail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Smoke/Dust | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Blowing Sand, Soil, Dirt, or Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Severe Crosswinds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 9 | 4 | 2 | 3 |  |
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|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:00-00:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 01:00-01:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02:00-02:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 03:00-03:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00-04:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00-05:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06:00-06:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00-07:59 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00-10:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00-11:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00-12:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00-13:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 14:00-14:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-19:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-20:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-21:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22:00-22:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23:00-23:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

## Report Selection Criteria:

Route Common Name: I-95S Ramp 140A
Include Both Sides of the Route: N
Report Date Range: 2/1/2012 Through 2/28/2015
From: 0.00 To: 0.15
Distance in miles: 0.150
Collision Type: Not Provided
Commercial Endorsement Type: Not Provided
Commercial Motor Vehicle: Not Provided
Commercial Vehicle Configuration Type: Not Provided
Start Time: Not Provided
End Time: Not Provided
Days Of Week: Not Provided
Type of Driver Distraction: Not Provided
Driver Drinking Type: Not Provided
Driver Injury Type: Not Provided
Fatal Injury Type: Not Provided
First Crash Events: Not Provided
Location of First Harmful Events: Not Provided
Type of Intersection: Not Provided
Lighting Conditions: Not Provided
Most Harmful Events: Not Provided
Passenger Injury Type: Not Provided
Relation To Roadway: Not Provided
Roadway Surface Type: Not Provided
School Zones: Not Provided
Traffic Contol Type: Not Provided
Damage is VDOT Property: Not Provided
Vehicle Body Type: Not Provided
Weather Condition: Not Provided
Workzone Related: Not Provided
Workzone Workers Present: Not Provided
Jurisdiction Code as supplied by TREDS: Not Provided




| Page: 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |  |
| Surface Condition |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Dry | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 2. Wet | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3. Snowy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Icy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Muddy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6. Oil/Other Fluids | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Natural Debris | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Water (Standing, Moving) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Slush | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Sand, Dirt, Gravel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Weather Condition |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. No Adverse Condition (Clear/Cloudy) | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 3. Fog | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Mist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Rain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6. Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Sleet/Hail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Smoke/Dust | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Blowing Sand, Soil, Dirt, or Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Severe Crosswinds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |
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|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:00-00:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00-01:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02:00-02:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03:00-03:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00-04:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00-05:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06:00-06:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00-07:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00-10:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00-11:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00-12:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00-13:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00-14:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-19:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-20:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-21:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22:00-22:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23:00-23:59 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Report Selection Criteria:

Route Common Name: I-95S
Include Both Sides of the Route: N
Report Date Range: 2/1/2012 Through 2/28/2015
From: 140.93 To: 141.12
Distance in miles: 0.19
Collision Type: Not Provided
Commercial Endorsement Type: Not Provided
Commercial Motor Vehicle: Not Provided
Commercial Vehicle Configuration Type: Not Provided
Start Time: Not Provided
End Time: Not Provided
Days Of Week: Not Provided
Type of Driver Distraction: Not Provided
Driver Drinking Type: Not Provided
Driver Injury Type: Not Provided
Fatal Injury Type: Not Provided
First Crash Events: Not Provided
Location of First Harmful Events: Not Provided
Type of Intersection: Not Provided
Lighting Conditions: Not Provided
Most Harmful Events: Not Provided
Passenger Injury Type: Not Provided
Relation To Roadway: Not Provided
Roadway Surface Type: Not Provided
School Zones: Not Provided
Traffic Contol Type: Not Provided
Damage is VDOT Property: Not Provided
Vehicle Body Type: Not Provided
Weather Condition: Not Provided
Workzone Related: Not Provided
Workzone Workers Present: Not Provided
Jurisdiction Code as supplied by TREDS: Not Provided


|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Page: 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Passenger car | 16 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 0 |  |
| 2. Truck - Pick-up/Passenger Truck | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3. Van | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Truck - Single Unit Truck (2Axles) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Motor Home, Recreational Vehicle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Special Vehicle - Oversized (Veh/Earthmover/Road Equip.) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Bicycle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Moped | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Motorcycle | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12. Emergency Vehicle (Regardless of Veh Type) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 13. Bus - School Bus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 14. Bus - City Transit Bus/Privately Owned Church Bus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 15. Bus - Commercial Bus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 16. Other (Scooter, Go-cart, Hearse, Bookmobile, Golf Cart, etc.) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 18. Special Vehicle - Farm Machinery | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 19. Special Vehicle - ATV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 21. Special Vehicle - Low Speed Vehicle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 22. Truck - Sport Utility Vehicle (SUV) | 9 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 23. Truck - Single Unit Truck (3 Axles or More) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 25. Truck - Truck Tractor (BobtailNo Trailer) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 29 | 16 | 10 | 2 | 1 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |  |
| Fixed Object |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Bank Or Ledge | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2. Trees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3. Utility Pole | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Fence Or Post | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Guard Rail | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6. Parked Vehicle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Tunnel, Bridge, Underpass, Culvert, etc. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Sign, Traffic Signal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Impact Cushioning Device | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Jersey Wall | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12. Building/Structure | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 13. Curb | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 14. Ditch | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 15. Other Fixed Object | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 16. Other Traffic Barrier | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 17. Traffic Sign Support | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 18. Mailbox | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Dawn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2. Daylight | 11 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 |  |
| 3. Dusk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Darkness - Road Lighted | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Darkness - Road Not Lighted | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 6. Darkness - Unknown Road Lighting | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 15 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 1 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |  |
| Surface Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Dry | 14 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 |  |
| 2. Wet | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3. Snowy | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 4. Icy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Muddy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6. Oil/Other Fluids | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Natural Debris | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Water (Standing, Moving) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Slush | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Sand, Dirt, Gravel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 15 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Weather Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. No Adverse Condition (Clear/Cloudy) | 14 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 |  |
| 3. Fog | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Mist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Rain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6. Snow | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| 7. Sleet/Hail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Smoke/Dust | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Blowing Sand, Soil, Dirt, or Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Severe Crosswinds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 15 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 1 |  |


|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:00-00:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00-01:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 02:00-02:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03:00-03:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00-04:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00-05:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06:00-06:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00-07:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00-10:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00-11:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00-12:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00-13:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00-14:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:59 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-19:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-20:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-21:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22:00-22:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23:00-23:59 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

## Report Selection Criteria:

Route Common Name: I-95S
Include Both Sides of the Route: N
Report Date Range: 2/1/2012 Through 2/28/2015
From: 140.33 To: 140.63
Distance in miles: 0.30
Collision Type: Not Provided
Commercial Endorsement Type: Not Provided
Commercial Motor Vehicle: Not Provided
Commercial Vehicle Configuration Type: Not Provided
Start Time: Not Provided
End Time: Not Provided
Days Of Week: Not Provided
Type of Driver Distraction: Not Provided
Driver Drinking Type: Not Provided
Driver Injury Type: Not Provided
Fatal Injury Type: Not Provided
First Crash Events: Not Provided
Location of First Harmful Events: Not Provided
Type of Intersection: Not Provided
Lighting Conditions: Not Provided
Most Harmful Events: Not Provided
Passenger Injury Type: Not Provided
Relation To Roadway: Not Provided
Roadway Surface Type: Not Provided
School Zones: Not Provided
Traffic Contol Type: Not Provided
Damage is VDOT Property: Not Provided
Vehicle Body Type: Not Provided
Weather Condition: Not Provided
Workzone Related: Not Provided
Workzone Workers Present: Not Provided
Jurisdiction Code as supplied by TREDS: Not Provided


|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Type |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1. Passenger car | 28 | 6 | 5 | 14 | 3 |
| 2. Truck - Pick-up/Passenger Truck | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 3. Van | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4. Truck - Single Unit Truck (2Axles) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. Motor Home, Recreational Vehicle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Special Vehicle - Oversized (Veh/Earthmover/Road Equip.) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. Bicycle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. Moped | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11. Motorcycle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12. Emergency Vehicle (Regardless of Veh Type) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13. Bus - School Bus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14. Bus - City Transit Bus/Privately Owned Church Bus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15. Bus - Commercial Bus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16. Other (Scooter, Go-cart, Hearse, Bookmobile, Golf Cart, etc.) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18. Special Vehicle - Farm Machinery | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Special Vehicle - ATV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Special Vehicle - Low Speed Vehicle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Truck - Sport Utility Vehicle (SUV) | 13 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 0 |
| 23. Truck - Single Unit Truck (3 Axles or More) | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| 25. Truck - Truck Tractor (BobtailNo Trailer) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 57 | 14 | 12 | 27 | 4 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |  |
| Fixed Object |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Bank Or Ledge | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2. Trees | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3. Utility Pole | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Fence Or Post | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Guard Rail | 8 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 |  |
| 6. Parked Vehicle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Tunnel, Bridge, Underpass, Culvert, etc. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Sign, Traffic Signal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Impact Cushioning Device | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Jersey Wall | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12. Building/Structure | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 13. Curb | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 14. Ditch | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 15. Other Fixed Object | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 16. Other Traffic Barrier | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 17. Traffic Sign Support | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 18. Mailbox | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 10 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Dawn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2. Daylight | 23 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 1 |  |
| 3. Dusk | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Darkness - Road Lighted | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Darkness - Road Not Lighted | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 6. Darkness - Unknown Road Lighting | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 28 | 6 | 7 | 13 | 2 |  |



Page: 6

|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:00-00:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00-01:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02:00-02:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03:00-03:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00-04:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00-05:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06:00-06:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00-07:59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:59 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00-10:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00-11:59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 12:00-12:59 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 13:00-13:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 14:00-14:59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:59 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-19:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-20:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-21:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22:00-22:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23:00-23:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 0 |

## Report Selection Criteria:

Route Common Name: I-95S
Include Both Sides of the Route: N
Report Date Range: 1/1/2012 Through 12/31/2014
From: 140.44 To: 140.63
Distance in miles: 0.19
Collision Type: Not Provided
Commercial Endorsement Type: Not Provided
Commercial Motor Vehicle: Not Provided
Commercial Vehicle Configuration Type: Not Provided
Start Time: Not Provided
End Time: Not Provided
Days Of Week: Not Provided
Type of Driver Distraction: Not Provided
Driver Drinking Type: Not Provided
Driver Injury Type: Not Provided
Fatal Injury Type: Not Provided
First Crash Events: Not Provided
Location of First Harmful Events: Not Provided
Type of Intersection: Not Provided
Lighting Conditions: Not Provided
Most Harmful Events: Not Provided
Passenger Injury Type: Not Provided
Relation To Roadway: Not Provided
Roadway Surface Type: Not Provided
School Zones: Not Provided
Traffic Contol Type: Not Provided
Damage is VDOT Property: Not Provided
Vehicle Body Type: Not Provided
Weather Condition: Not Provided
Workzone Related: Not Provided
Workzone Workers Present: Not Provided
Jurisdiction Code as supplied by TREDS: Not Provided

| Length In Miles: 0.19 DVMT: 12372.31 |  |  |  |  | Death Rate: 0.00 | Injury Rate: 95.96 | Page: 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |  |  |  |
| Total Crashes | 20 | 7 | 6 | 7 |  |  |  |
| Fatal Crashes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Injury Only Crashes | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Prop. Damage Only Crashes | 14 | 5 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |
| Property Damage Amount | 177356 | 58600 | 68856 | 49900 |  |  |  |
| Persons Killed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Persons Injured | 13 | 5 | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Killed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians Injured | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Collision Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 1. Rear End | 11 | 5 | 1 | 5 |  |  |  |
| 2. Angle | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 3. Head On | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 4. Sideswipe - Same Direction | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 5. Sideswipe - Opposite Direction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 6. Fixed Object in Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 7. Train | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 8. Non-Collision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 9. Fixed Object - Off Road | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 10. Deer | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 11. Other Animal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 12. Ped | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 13. Bicyclist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 14. Motorcyclist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 15. Backed Into | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 16. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total | 20 | 7 | 6 | 7 |  |  |  |




|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Surface Condition |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1. Dry | 16 | 6 | 4 | 6 |
| 2. Wet | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. Snowy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Icy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5. Muddy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6. Oil/Other Fluids | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Natural Debris | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. Water (Standing, Moving) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. Slush | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11. Sand, Dirt, Gravel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 20 | 7 | 6 | 7 |
| Weather Condition |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1. No Adverse Condition (Clear/Cloudy) | 17 | 7 | 4 | 6 |
| 3. Fog | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Mist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5. Rain | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. Sleet/Hail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Smoke/Dust | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. Blowing Sand, Soil, Dirt, or Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11. Severe Crosswinds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 20 | 7 | 6 | 7 |

Page: 6

|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:00-00:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00-01:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02:00-02:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03:00-03:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00-04:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00-05:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06:00-06:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00-07:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00-10:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00-11:59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 12:00-12:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00-13:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 14:00-14:59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:59 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-19:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-20:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-21:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22:00-22:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23:00-23:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 |

## Report Selection Criteria:

Route Common Name: SC-630E (Stafford County)
Include Both Sides of the Route: Y
Report Date Range: 2/1/2012 Through 2/28/2015
From: 3.97 To: 4.18
Distance in miles: 0.21
Collision Type: Not Provided
Commercial Endorsement Type: Not Provided
Commercial Motor Vehicle: Not Provided
Commercial Vehicle Configuration Type: Not Provided
Start Time: Not Provided
End Time: Not Provided
Days Of Week: Not Provided
Type of Driver Distraction: Not Provided
Driver Drinking Type: Not Provided
Driver Injury Type: Not Provided
Fatal Injury Type: Not Provided
First Crash Events: Not Provided
Location of First Harmful Events: Not Provided
Type of Intersection: Not Provided
Lighting Conditions: Not Provided
Most Harmful Events: Not Provided
Passenger Injury Type: Not Provided
Relation To Roadway: Not Provided
Roadway Surface Type: Not Provided
School Zones: Not Provided
Traffic Contol Type: Not Provided
Damage is VDOT Property: Not Provided
Vehicle Body Type: Not Provided
Weather Condition: Not Provided
Workzone Related: Not Provided
Workzone Workers Present: Not Provided
Jurisdiction Code as supplied by TREDS: Not Provided



|  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |  |
| Fixed Object |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Bank Or Ledge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2. Trees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3. Utility Pole | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Fence Or Post | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Guard Rail | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6. Parked Vehicle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Tunnel, Bridge, Underpass, Culvert, etc. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Sign, Traffic Signal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Impact Cushioning Device | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Jersey Wall | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12. Building/Structure | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 13. Curb | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 14. Ditch | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 15. Other Fixed Object | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 16. Other Traffic Barrier | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 17. Traffic Sign Support | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 18. Mailbox | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Dawn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2. Daylight | 13 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 0 |  |
| 3. Dusk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Darkness - Road Lighted | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 5. Darkness - Road Not Lighted | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| 6. Darkness - Unknown Road Lighting | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 18 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 1 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |  |
| Surface Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. Dry | 15 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 |  |
| 2. Wet | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3. Snowy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Icy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Muddy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6. Oil/Other Fluids | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Natural Debris | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Water (Standing, Moving) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Slush | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Sand, Dirt, Gravel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 18 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 1 |  |
| Weather Condition |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Provided | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 1. No Adverse Condition (Clear/Cloudy) | 15 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 |  |
| 3. Fog | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4. Mist | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5. Rain | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 6. Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 7. Sleet/Hail | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8. Smoke/Dust | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 9. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 10. Blowing Sand, Soil, Dirt, or Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 11. Severe Crosswinds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Not Applicable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 18 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 1 |  |


|  | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:00-00:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01:00-01:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02:00-02:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03:00-03:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04:00-04:59 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05:00-05:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06:00-06:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:00-07:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:00-10:59 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 11:00-11:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:00-12:59 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00-13:59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14:00-14:59 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:59 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-19:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-20:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-21:59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22:00-22:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23:00-23:59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 |

