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## 1. Executive Summary

The Reimagine I-10 Study looked at current and future transportation needs along the l-10 corridor in El Paso County from the New Mexico state line in the northwest to FM 3380 near Tornillo in the southeast. This 55-mile corridor was broken into four segments, which share unique characteristics and needs. The four segments are as follows:

- Segment 1: Northern Gateway (New Mexico State Line to Executive Center Boulevard - 16 miles)
- Segment 2: Downtown (Executive Center Boulevard to Raynolds Street - 7 miles)
- Segment 3: Airport (Raynolds Street to Eastlake Boulevard - 12 miles)
- Segment 4: Southern Gateway (Eastlake Boulevard to FM 3380-20 miles)

The following goals and objectives for the corridor were identified through collaboration with TxDOT, stakeholders, and the public:

1. Mobility \& Circulation: Facilitate movement through and within the corridor
2. Environmental: Design to minimize impacts to the human and natural environment
3. Multimodal: Offer innovative transportation alternatives
4. Design: Comply with accepted design standards to improve safety along the corridor
5. Value: Ensure that improvements are sustainable and balanced with respect to costs and benefits

Five international ports of entry exist within the study area, including the third busiest truck port in the United States in 2017. Combined rail and truck traffic is expected to increase 50\% between 2016 and 2025, and projections estimate 4,300 daily truck border crossings by 20451. I-10 is a critical freight route for the United States, running over 2,400 miles from Los Angeles, CA to Jacksonville, FL. $\mathrm{I}-10$ is used more intensely for freight movement during colder months, when other east-west routes like I-40 experience undesirable driving conditions due to winter weather.

I-10 between downtown and US 54 is the $86^{\text {th }}$ most congested roadway in Texas (with an annual cost of delay of $\$ 11.93$ million), and $75^{\text {th }}$ most congested in terms of truck delay (with an annual cost of truck delay of $\$ 2.02$ million) ${ }^{2}$. Traffic analysis concluded that if improvements are not implemented on I-10, delays and user costs will significantly increase over the next 20 years. As congestion on I10 worsens, it will likely spread onto arterials and local streets as drivers seek alternative routes.

The most severe traffic congestion on l-10 occurs in the event of a crash or broken-down vehicle. Incident management tends to be more difficult and delays tend to be more pronounced where frontage roads are discontinuous or non-existent. Continuous frontage roads could provide additional

[^0]capacity when mainlanes are compromised and could make it easier for drivers to access alternative routes.

The l-10 corridor currently lacks bike and pedestrian friendly infrastructure along many cross streets and frontage roads. Transit vehicles traveling along the l-10 corridor are not separated from car traffic, making travel times unreliable and arrival/departure times difficult to predict. Improvements to bike and pedestrian infrastructure and transit service could lead to more transportation options for people traveling within the El Paso region.

Of the 202 bridge structures along l-10 within the study area, 31 bridges are classified as functionally obsolete (meaning they are no longer being used as originally intended because traffic exceeds design volumes) and 28 bridges do not meet minimum clearance. Compliance with clearance requirements is critical for freight movement, as failure to comply can lead to costly detours. The study area has a high percentage of bridges that are aging, with $64 \%$ of bridges older than 50 years (compared to 44\% statewide). Infrastructure age also affects l-10 pavement. Geotechnical analysis indicates numerous areas with less than 10 years of remaining service life and areas with unacceptable ride quality along the corridor, primarily between the SH 20 (Mesa Street) interchange in Segment 1 and the Lomaland Drive interchange in Segment 3.

Bridge and pavement deficiencies are currently creating high maintenance costs. TxDOT El Paso District spent $\$ 4,944,816$ in 2019 on non-contracted maintenance for I-10 within the study area for emergency repairs. This was 55\% of the District's total non-contracted maintenance budget, and includes $\$ 1,804,000$ on bridges and $\$ 762,000$ on pavement. Maintenance will continue to become more costly if deficiencies are left unaddressed.

Estimated future traffic volumes were developed based on historic and projected travel demand in the El Paso region. These future traffic volumes were used to evaluate alternatives. Recommendations for operational improvements to better accommodate estimated future traffic volumes included ramp consolidation, X-ramp configuration, auxiliary/speed-change lanes, intersection improvements, and continuous frontage roads. New configurations were recommended at Artcraft Road, Thorn Avenue, SH 20 (Mesa Street), Schuster Avenue, downtown, Cotton Street, US 54, Buffalo Soldier Road, Airway Boulevard, Hawkins Boulevard, Yarbrough Drive, Zaragoza Road, Eastlake Boulevard, and Horizon Boulevard.

Four corridor-wide typical cross sections were developed with study goals and objectives in mind. These typical sections addressed anticipated corridor capacity needs. Alternative 1 added a lane of capacity in each direction. Alternative 2 added a lane of capacity and a 15 -foot wide inside multi-use shoulder in each direction. Alternative 3 added a lane of capacity and a buffer separated adaptive lane for designated uses in each direction. Alternative 4 added a lane of capacity and a barrier separated adaptive lane for designated uses in each direction. Alternative 3 was ultimately chosen as the recommended concept due to the multimodal benefit it could offer and reduced right-of-way (ROW) footprint when compared with Alternative 4.

Additional recommendations related to technology included updates to existing corridor technology infrastructure and five potential pilot projects: truck parking and port of entry reservation, 5G, corridor electrification, unmanned aircraft (drone) system incident management, and truck platooning. These recommendations are expected to further alleviate traffic congestion and delay if applied. Bicycle and pedestrian recommendations, particularly in the downtown area, provide missing connections and are intended to improve the usefulness and user experience of the multimodal network in and around El Paso. The El Paso Bike Plan is accommodated between the l-10 frontage roads at each cross street.

Recommendations were compiled into a recommended concept called the "Build" scenario and evaluated against the "No Build" scenario. The recommended concept performed better from a traffic and safety standpoint, and addresses other corridor needs. This recommended concept will be further evaluated in future phases of design. The purpose of the Reimagine I-10 Study was to determine the feasibility of recommendations. The next phase will divide the recommended concept into projects and involve more in-depth analysis and design, including an environmental process. The final project phases are detailed design and construction.

Lastly, recommendations were grouped into projects and prioritized based on stakeholder feedback, needs, benefits, costs, and dependence on other projects. "Interim improvements" are relatively low cost projects that can address more pressing corridor needs until funding is obtained for larger, more costly projects. "Break Out Projects" are components of the recommended concept that can be built over time. "Interim Improvements" and "Break Out Projects" were categorized as short, mid, or long term, indicating their priority.

## 2. Introduction

### 2.1 Study Overview

Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), in coordination with El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), City of El Paso, and El Paso County, is conducting a study of the Interstate Highway 10 (l-10) Corridor from the New Mexico Stateline to FM 3380 (Aguilera International Highway) (Figure 2-1). The study's purpose is to analyze current and future transportation needs for the El Paso l-10 Corridor.


Figure 2-1. Reimagine l-10 Study Limits

### 2.2 Study Context

To better evaluate the elements of the corridor, the corridor was broken into four segments, or context areas, to identify unique characteristics and needs specific to that segment which may not be applicable to the entire project area. The four segments are as follows:

- Segment 1: Northern Gateway (New Mexico State Line to Executive Center Boulevard - 16 miles)
- Segment 2: Downtown (Executive Center Boulevard to Raynolds Street - 7 miles)
- Segment 3: Airport (Raynolds Street to Eastlake Boulevard - 12 miles)
- Segment 4: Southern Gateway (Eastlake Boulevard to FM 3380-20 miles)

Figure 2-2 shows the breakdown of each segment along l-10.


Figure 2-2. I-10 Segments
(a) Segment 1: Northern Gateway

In Segment 1, l-10 is a four-lane divided highway from the New Mexico state line to SH 20 (Mesa Street) and a six-lane separated highway from SH 20 (Mesa Street) to Executive Center Boulevard. This section has a posted speed limit of 75 miles per hour (mph) from Antonio Street to Redd Road where the speed limit decreases to 60 mph . This section has continuous frontage roads from Antonio Street to SH 20 (Mesa Street) with a posted speed limit of 55 mph .

Land use in this segment is primarily residential with several industrial sites and a few major entertainment and retail attractions. These attractions include Wet ' $N$ ' Wild Waterworld near the New Mexico state line, the Outlet Shoppes at El Paso just north of the Loop 375 interchange, and Sunland Park Mall between Sunland Park Drive and the US 85 interchange. Long stretches of undeveloped land border I-10 north of Loop 375, but some major development is taking place around the Loop 375 interchange. South of Artcraft Road/Paseo del Norte density increases and land use is primarily residential. The two-mile stretch along I-10 between the SH 85 interchange and Executive Center Boulevard is undeveloped with uneven terrain.

The north end of Segment 1 has a wide unpaved median, frontage roads, and two mainlanes in each direction. In the immediate vicinity of the Redd Road interchange, the median is paved. South of SH 20 (Mesa Street) there are no frontage roads and three mainlanes in each direction. The GO 10 project added mainlanes and collector-distributor (CD) roads to the corridor between SH 20 (Mesa Street) and Executive Center Boulevard.
(b) Segment 2: Downtown

In Segment 2, l-10 is primarily an eight-lane highway from Executive Center Drive to Prospect Street and is reduced to six lanes through downtown El Paso. East of downtown El Paso, l-10 increases to a ten-lane highway and then reduces to an eight-lane highway from Copia Street to Raynolds Street. The posted speed limit for this section is 60 mph . The westbound frontage road exists east of downtown, and the eastbound frontage road exists east of Piedras Street. The mainlanes are depressed through downtown with steep walls connecting the outside shoulder edges to ground level.

Land use in this segment is extremely varied but dominated by commercial, industrial, and residential uses. Major trip attractors include downtown, the Bridge of the Americas Port of Entry, and The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP). Segment 2 is densely developed with the exception of the 1.5 mile stretch between Executive Center Boulevard and UTEP. Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) rail lines run along the eastbound side of I-10 for the majority of Segment 2 and a UPRR rail yard exists between downtown and Piedras Street.
(c) Segment 3: Airport

In Segment 3, l-10 is an eight-lane highway from Raynolds Street to McRae Boulevard and a six-lane highway from Mc Rae Boulevard to Eastlake Boulevard with continuous frontage roads throughout the entire section. The posted speed limit for the mainlanes is 60 mph and the posted speed limit
for the frontage roads is 45 mph . The median is paved and inside shoulders are narrow at spots. Several recent studies have been conducted in this segment regarding additional north-south connectivity and capacity.

Land use in this segment is dominated by commercial and residential with the exception of a very large industrial area on the eastbound side of I-10 between Marlow Road and Tony Lama Street. A few additional industrial sites are scattered throughout the remainder of Segment 3. Major attractions in this segment include the El Paso International Airport, Fort Bliss, the Fountains at Farah, Cielo Vista Mall, University Medical Center, the Zaragoza Port of Entry, and Bassett Place.
(d) Segment 4: Southern Gateway

In Segment 4, I-10 is a four-lane highway from Eastlake Boulevard to FM 3380 with a posted speed limit of 75 mph . There are continuous frontage roads from Eastlake Boulevard to FM 1110 (Darrington Road) that have a posted speed limit of 55 mph .

The Loop 375 interchange is surrounded by commercial, industrial and agricultural zones. The remainder of this segment is primarily residential with small businesses interspersed. Major trip attractors are Horizon area truck stops. There is very little development along l-10 in Segment 4 except at the Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard interchanges.

### 2.3 Previous Studies

Several studies have been prepared for I-10 and its adjacent roadways. More information on these studies can be found in Appendix A. This section summarizes recommendations from these studies that were incorporated into the Reimagine I-10 Study.
(a) Analysis of Mitigation Strategies for I-10 Corridor Hot Spots (August 2007)

It is recommended that the westbound US 62 (Paisano Drive) entrance ramp to l-10 be permanently closed. Currently, the amount of vehicles traveling on the far right lane (destined for US 54/Mexico) interacting with vehicles entering the freeway creates a bottleneck location on the freeway which disrupts the balanced flow of traffic. Ramp closure would reduce weaving, improve freeway traffic congestion and increase mainlane speed at both upstream and downstream locations (creating a more balanced flow of traffic). This recommendation was incorporated into the Reimagine l-10 Study.

An additional lane is needed in both the eastbound and westbound directions on l-10 between Sunland Park Drive and Executive Center Boulevard to accommodate traffic volumes. This recommendation was incorporated into the Reimagine I-10 Study.
(b) I-10 and Loop 375 Corridor Simulation Study (August 25, 2009)

At the FM 1905/Mountain Pass Boulevard interchange with I-10, the westbound Mountain Pass Boulevard approach currently has one channelized right turn and one through lane. Adding one through lane would improve operations and reduce queuing. The eastbound FM 1905 approach experiences congestion due to the high right turning volume passing through the signalized
intersection. Channelization of this movement and the addition of an acceleration lane would improve operation of the eastbound approach. The l-10 southbound entrance ramp is less than 200 feet from the FM 1905/S Desert Boulevard intersection. This is extremely close and relocating this ramp further south would increase the weaving distance available, thus improving traffic operations on this segment. These recommendations were incorporated into the Reimagine I-10 Study.

At the Vinton Road/Westway Boulevard interchange with I-10, traffic operation on the northbound approach is adversely affected by the proximity of the northbound exit ramp to Vinton Road/Westway Boulevard. This results in inadequate weaving distance, which could be increased by moving the ramp south. On the eastbound Vinton Road approach, high right turn demand and the existing unchannelized right turn results in extensive queuing. A channelized right turn will improve approach operation. A right turn lane is recommended in the Reimagine l-10 Study, but it is not channelized.
(c) Zaragoza Preliminary Improvement Concepts (September 11, 2009)

Tight diamond interchanges were proposed along l-10 at Pendale Road and at Don Haskins Drive/Alza Drive to offer alternate routes. A Pendale Road interchange is recommended in the Reimagine l-10 Study.

### 2.4 Goals and Objectives

The following goals and objectives were identified for the Reimagine l-10 Study:

1. Mobility \& Circulation: Facilitate movement through and within the corridor
2. Environmental: Design to minimize impacts to the human and natural environment
3. Multimodal: Offer innovative transportation alternatives
4. Design: Comply with accepted design standards to improve safety along the corridor
5. Value: Ensure that improvements are sustainable and balanced with respect to costs and benefits
6. Technology: Leverage advancing technologies to address corridor issues

### 2.5 Study Development Process

The following sections of this report will discuss the process for this corridor study. The phases of the study process are outlined below.

## Table 2-1. Study Development Process

| Step 1 | Determine Existing Conditions: An assessment of the general study area and roadway network was conducted to develop a project baseline to measure against in the alternative development and analysis steps of the study. This step included a traffic analysis that included traffic projections and an origin and destination (O\&D) study. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Step 2 | Public Outreach Round I: Meetings with the public and stakeholders were conducted to gain awareness of issues along the $\mathrm{I}-10$ corridor. |
| Step 3 | Refine Goals and Objectives and Develop Preliminary Alternatives: Public input was used to clarify and prioritize goals and objectives. Preliminary alternatives were developed and evaluated using qualitative constraints data and the baseline information that was established in determining the existing conditions. |
| Step 4 | Public Outreach Round II: Preliminary alternatives and traffic analysis findings were presented to the public. These meetings provided the public and stakeholders an opportunity to ask questions and comment in detail about the preliminary alternatives and evaluation process. |
| Step 5 | Refine Alternatives and Identify Recommended Alternative: Based on public comments and traffic analysis, refinements were made to the preliminary alternatives and a recommended alternative was established. |
| Step 6 | Public Outreach Round III: The recommended alternative and traffic analysis findings were presented to the public, along with viable technology applications and bike/pedestrian improvements. The layout of a potential downtown deck plaza was also shown to gauge public interest*. |
| Step 7 | Refine Preferred Alternative and Develop Implementation Plan: Coordination with stakeholders continued throughout this step, and several one-on-one meetings were held. Two internal workshops were held to prioritize break out projects and interim improvements. Geotechnical, economic and technology reports were created to accompany the overall feasibility report. |

*Deck plaza construction, maintenance and amenities would require financial partnerships.

## 3. Public Involvement

Public feedback helped shape the goals and objectives for the Reimagine l-10 Study and contributed to many design decisions. The following section gives an overview of past opportunities for stakeholders and the public to learn more about the study and give input.

### 3.1 Summary of Outreach Efforts

The Reimagine l-10 Study began in early 2017. Throughout the study's progress, TxDOT and the study team (HDR and Blanton \& Associates), have conducted several rounds of outreach efforts, including work group meetings, public meetings, one-on-one meetings, and community engagement efforts.
(a) Outreach Round I

## Work Group Meetings:

- UTEP Physical Plant Complex \#113, Building A
- TxDOT EI Paso District Office

June 2, 2017
June 2, 2017

## Public Meetings:

- Vinton City Hall

July 26, 2017

- UTEP

July 27, 2017

- El Paso Multipurpose Recreation Center
- Rio Vista Community Center

August 9, 2017
August 8, 2017

## Additional Outreach:

- Published notices in El Paso Times and El Diario de El Paso newspapers
- Purchased banner advertisement on elpasoinc.com
- Mailed letters to 175 work group members
- Mailed postcards to 1,322 adjacent property owners
- Manned information booth at an El Paso Chihuahuas baseball game on July 25, 2017
- Posted meeting information on www.txdot.gov (Hearings, Meetings and Notices Schedule)
- Updated meetings pages with meeting materials
- Regularly updated Reimagine I-10 Study page on www.txdot.gov


## General Outcome/Feedback from Outreach:

During this round of outreach, the team received input from the study work group that there may be push back from the public, that there needs to be an emphasis on incident management, and that mobility, congestion, and connectivity are top priorities for I-10. In response to public outreach efforts, 294 comments were received during this round. Comments at this stage included concerns about lighting, traffic congestion and chokepoints, ramp and exit/entrance locations, truck bypasses, incident management, multi-modal transportation options, adaptive lanes, and signage.


Figure 3-1. Fountains at Farah and EI Paso Chihuahuas Game
(b) Outreach Round II

## Work Group Meetings:

- TxDOT EI Paso District Office

February 13, 2018

- UTEP Physical Plant Complex \#113, Building A

February 14, 2018

## Public Meetings:

- El Paso Community College Northwest Campus
- Mesita Elementary School Gymnasium
- El Paso Multipurpose Recreation Center
- Fabens High School

March 6, 2018
March 7, 2018
March 13, 2018
March 14, 2018

## Additional Outreach:

- Published notice on TxDOT Website
- Sent emails to 142 work group members
- Mailed postcards to 1,043 adjacent property owners
- Distributed flyers to 10 libraries/community centers throughout study area, and high schools
- Aired movie trailer advertising study and meetings for four weeks at three local cinemas
- Included flyers in the El Paso Marathon runner's packets
- Manned informational booth at the El Paso Poppy Festival on March 31, 2018
- Utilized Twitter and Facebook to provide project information and advertise event dates
- Sent email broadcast via GovDelivery to 208 recipients ( 98.6 percent open rate)
- Posted meeting information on www.txdot.gov (Hearings, Meetings and Notices Schedule)
- Updated meetings pages with meeting materials
- Regularly updated Reimagine l-10 Study page on www.txdot.gov
- Posted MetroQuest survey on Reimagine l-10 Study page


## General Outcome/Feedback from Outreach:

During this round of outreach, the workgroup asked and provided input about priority areas, deck plaza options, adaptive lanes, funding, and the use of technology. In response to public outreach efforts, 129 comments were received from the public during this round. These comments included concerns about exit/entrance ramp locations, lighting, the potential removal of the Porfirio Diaz exit, access and impacts to the Sunset Heights neighborhood, questions about deck plaza concept, multimodal transportation including rapid transit, and comments about bicycle and pedestrian facilities.


Figure 3-2. Work Group Meeting and Public Meeting
(c) Outreach Round III

## Work Group Meetings:

- TxDOT EL Paso District
- UTEP Physical Plant Complex \#113, Building A


## Public Meetings:

- El Paso Community Foundation
- Ysleta ISD Central Office

January 22, 2019
January 9, 2019
January 10, 2019

January 24, 2019

## Additional Outreach:

- Advertised meetings online in El Paso Times and El Diario de El Paso
- Sent email to 499 work group members and interested parties
- Mailed postcard to 1,039 adjacent property owners
- Manned informational booths at
- the El Paso Holiday Market on November 18, 2018
- the El Paso WinterFest on December 15, 2018
- Utilized Twitter and Facebook to provide project information and advertise event dates
- Posted meeting information on www.txdot.gov (Hearings, Meetings and Notices Schedule)
- Updated meetings pages with meeting materials
- Regularly updated Reimagine l-10 Study page on www.txdot.gov
- Posted MetroQuest survey on Reimagine I-10 Study page


## General Outcome/Feedback from Outreach:

During this round of outreach, the work group provided comments and suggestions primarily focused around the proposed adaptive lanes, the conceptual improvements in and around the downtown area, incident management, and truck traffic/port of entry considerations. In response to the public outreach efforts this round, approximately 113 comments were received. These comments included concerns about downtown bridge removals, access to and from the Sunset Heights neighborhood, the deck plaza concept, bicycle and pedestrian access and accommodations, ROW and displacements, traffic noise, and funding.


Figure 3-3. Public Meeting and Poppy Festival

## (d) Additional Outreach Efforts and One-on-One Meetings

In addition to the work group and public outreach meetings, TxDOT and the study team also conducted several one-on-one meetings with local agencies and stakeholders to provide updates on the study and receive input.

02/13/2017: Meeting with HDR and TTI to discuss available datasets, statistics and previous and on-going border research for El Paso.

10/18/2017: Meeting with UPRR, HDR, and TxDOT to coordinate options for I-10 and adjacent rail lines east of the downtown area.

11/07/2017: Meeting with City of El Paso, HDR, and TxDOT to discuss goals and objectives of the study, existing problem areas, current/future traffic growth, and current/future projects.

11/07/2017: Meeting with SunMetro, HDR, and TxDOT to discuss goals and objectives of the study and identify future transit projects within the corridor.

11/08/2017: Meeting with City of Socorro, San Elizario, Town of Horizon City, Town of Clint, HDR, and TxDOT to discuss goals and objectives of the study, existing problem areas, current/future traffic growth, and current/future projects.

11/09/2017: Meeting with El Paso County, HDR, and TxDOT to discuss goals and objectives of the study, existing problem areas, current/future traffic growth, and current/future projects.

11/09/2017: Meeting with El Paso MPO, HDR, and TxDOT to discuss goals and objectives of the study, existing problem areas, current/future traffic growth, and current/future projects.

02/14/2018: Meeting with UPRR, HDR, and TxDOT to review and discuss options for I-10 and adjacent rail lines east of the downtown area.

04/19/2018: Presentation to Greater Chamber of Commerce by HDR and TxDOT to provide update on Reimagine l-10 Study.

04/20/2018: Presentation to El Paso MPO by HDR and TXDOT to provide update on Reimagine I-10 Study.

04/30/2018: Meeting with City of EI Paso, HDR, and TxDOT to discuss downtown alternatives.
05/01/2018: Meeting with Medical Center of the Americas, HDR, and TxDOT to discuss ramping configurations east of US 54.
$06 / 13 / 2018$ : Meeting with Sunset Heights HOA, HDR, and TxDOT to provide an update on the study and discuss options in the downtown area.

06/14/2018: Presentation to El Paso Hispanic Chamber of Commerce by TxDOT to provide update on Reimagine l-10 Study.

06/15/2018: Presentation to Central Business Association by HDR and TxDOT to provide update on Reimagine I-10 Study.

08/02/2018: Presentation to International Bridges Steering Committee by TxDOT to provide update on Reimagine l-10 Study.

09/06/2018: Follow-up Presentation to International Bridges Steering Committee by HDR and TxDOT to provide update on Reimagine I-10 Study.

09/25/2018: Meeting with UPRR, HDR, and TxDOT to review and discuss alternatives for I-10 and adjacent rail lines at Cotton St.

12/04/2018: Meeting with SunMetro, HDR and TxDOT to discuss recommended alternative and identify areas of potential concern.

12/05/2018: Meeting with City of El Paso, HDR and TxDOT to discuss recommended alternative and identify areas of potential concern.

1/9/19: Meeting with TxDOT, HDR, and representatives from St. Clements School regarding potential impacts to school property.

01/16/2019: Meeting with St Clements School, HDR, and TxDOT to discuss to discuss recommended alternative and identify areas of potential concern.

01/25/2019: Presentation to El Paso MPO by HDR and TXDOT to provide update on Reimagine I-10 Study.

03/14/19: Presentation to Central Business Association by TxDOT to provide update on Reimagine I-10 Study.

7/10/19: Presentation and question/answer session with the Sunset Heights Neighborhood Association.

## 4. Existing Conditions

### 4.1 Roadway

I-10 within the study area serves as the backbone of the El Paso region, responsible for $2.7 \%$ of total centerline miles and $6.2 \%$ of total lane miles but $32 \%$ of vehicle miles traveled. Due to natural and cultural constraints as well as the international border with Mexico, the El Paso region is limited in alternative routes. There are three major system interchanges which exist within the study area. State Loop (SL) 375 intersects l-10 in two locations, once in Segment 1 and second in Segment 3. The third system interchange is US 54 in Segment 2.

Segments 2 and 3 are located in urbanized and developed areas and have a relatively high ramp densities ( 2.21 and 2.25 ramps/mile respectively) when compared to the rural Segments 1 and 4 which are not as dense ( 1.16 and $0.47 \mathrm{ramps} /$ mile respectively). These higher ramp densities, along with higher travel demand, lead to lower free flow speeds and reduce the traffic level of service (LOS) of the I-10 facility.

### 4.2 Right-of-Way

Along the l-10 El Paso Corridor, ROW width varies between 220 feet and 760 feet. ROW width increases near undeveloped plots of land and where frontage roads shift out away from the highway (often at interchanges). ROW is limited in other areas by developments along l-10, particularly in urban segments.

ROW width in Segment 2 is the most constrained, varying between 220 feet and 470 feet. There is little room for expansion within existing ROW in this segment due to development bordering l-10.

### 4.3 Bridges

There are approximately 202 bridge class structures along l-10 within the project limits. For analysis purposes, PonTex reports were utilized to determine any potential structural deficiencies. PonTex is a bridge inspection data management program intended to replace but not retire the Bridge Inventory, Inspection, and Appraisal Program (BRINSAP). Within the report, 31 bridges are classified as Functionally Obsolete. FHWA classifies bridges Functionally Obsolete if it fails to meet its design criteria either by its deck geometry, its load-carrying capacity, its vertical and horizontal clearances, or the approach roadway alignment to the bridge. Over half of the structures within the corridor were built before 1970, during the construction of the interstate system.

Even though over half of the structures were built before 1970, $85 \%$ of all of the structures have a sufficiency rating over 80.

### 4.4 International Economy

The El Paso Border Region is the most active for personally owned vehicle (POV) and pedestrian border crossings in Texas and is the second most active for truck border crossings in Texas according
to 2018 data. The Santa Teresa, Bridge of the Americas, and Ysleta-Zaragoza Ports of Entry saw $114,996,270,846$, and 540,027 truck border crossings respectively in 2018. Freight from these ports uses I-10 to access the El Paso region and beyond. I-10 is a critical freight route for the United States, running over 2,400 miles from Los Angeles, CA to Jacksonville, FL. I-10 is used more intensely for freight movement during colder months, when other east-west routes like l-40 experience undesirable driving conditions due to winter weather.

The Borderplex Alliance (which includes El Paso, TX, Ciudad Juarez, MX, and Las Cruces, NM) makes up "the seventh largest manufacturing hub in North America and a globally competitive advanced manufacturing center, with over 340 significant manufacturing operations, employing over 275,000 individuals in the region." ${ }^{3}$ The high numbers of POV $(14,358,390)$ and pedestrian $(7,657,974)$ border crossings in the El Paso Border Region in 2018 are indicative of the connected economies of El Paso and Ciudad Juárez.

See Appendix A for a detailed description of existing conditions. See Appendix B for maps showing environmental constraints.

[^1]
## 5. Proposed Alternatives

For the purposes of this feasibility study, conceptual designs and recommendations are referred to as "alternatives". Projects that move forward into the next phase of project development will go through a separate alternatives development and evaluation process that is part of the formal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process.

### 5.1 Operational Improvements

(a) X-Ramp Configuration

Conversion from diamond to X-ramp configuration is desirable for urban areas such as El Paso. Xramp configurations provide frontage road intersection bypasses if an auxiliary lane is built between entrance and exit ramps. This can add throughput capacity, reduce through traffic on frontage roads at frontage road intersections, and provide better routes for vehicles if incidents occur ${ }^{4}$. Additionally, X-ramp configurations increase storage area for queuing along frontage roads, improve access to frontage road development, and move weaving from the mainlanes to the frontage road ${ }^{5}$.
(b) Ramp Safety Improvements

In order to determine the safety impact of various entrance ramp designs, predictive crash analysis was performed using the Interchange Safety Analysis Tool Enhanced (ISATe, a Highway Safety Manual based spreadsheet) for three scenarios: direct merge, merge lane, and auxiliary lane. The auxiliary lane scenario performed best, followed by the merge lane scenario. Detailed results and descriptions of how the predictive crash analysis was performed can be found in Appendix C.

Direct merges/diverges are not desirable and were eliminated from the corridor by adding auxiliary lanes or acceleration/deceleration lanes. Additional information regarding the locations and justification for the ramping improvements are discussed later in this report. These upgrades increase safety and reduce congestion by decreasing speed differentials at merge/diverge points and providing more space for merging/diverging.

## (c) Other Operational Improvements

Highway Capacity Software (HCS) analysis of the 2042 No Build scenario (which includes improvements mentioned in the Amended El Paso MPO's Horizon 2040 plan) shows almost all mainlane weaving segments as failing (LOS F). For this reason, ramp locations in high volume areas throughout the corridor were modified to avoid weaving segments by providing sufficient distance between entrance and exit ramps.

[^2]
## (d) Adaptive Lanes

Adaptive lanes build in flexibility to the l-10 Corridor by allowing for a variety of potential future uses. Adaptive lanes would likely be restricted to certain vehicle types, such as truck and transit vehicles, high occupancy vehicles, or electric vehicles, allowing TxDOT to incentivize and facilitate certain modes of travel. Adaptive lane users would be removed from mainlane congestion and would have a more reliable trip (in terms of travel time) through the corridor. In the future, these adaptive lanes could be outfitted with technology (sensors, 5G, inductive charging) to maximize the benefits of connected, autonomous, and electric vehicles, thus increasing the capacity and sustainability of the corridor. Adaptive lanes (one in each direction) are recommended along a 23-mile segment of I-10 between Redd Road and Loop 375. Figure 5-1 shows a map of these limits.


Figure 5-1. Adaptive Lane Limits
Adaptive lanes allowing transit use could assist with proposed flexible bus routes in the northern and eastern parts of El Paso County. These routes are shown as dark blue lines in Figure 5-26. Buses could use the adaptive lanes to more quickly travel to/from downtown El Paso, El Paso International Airport, and other destinations in El Paso.

[^3]

Figure 5-2. Proposed Transit Service Scenario

### 5.2 Corridor-Wide Alternatives

Four different cross section concepts were developed for corridor-wide alternatives.
Alternative 1 includes changes in ramping, auxiliary lanes, and additional capacity in some areas. Full lane widths ( 12 feet) and shoulder widths ( 10 feet) are provided along with continuous frontage roads and desirable border width ( 20 feet) for sidewalks and utilities. The main advantage of this alternative is more lanes available for all road users. Disadvantages include a wider ROW footprint and lack of lanes with designated uses that could provide a reliable trip through the corridor.


## Additional Capacity

Figure 5-3. Corridor-Wide Alternative 1
Alternative 2 includes all of the improvements from Alternative 1 with a 15 -foot wide inside multi-use shoulder. This alternative provides more lanes available for all road users. The wide inside shoulder improves safety, allows for more effective incident management, and could be used as a peak period or special purpose lane in the future. Disadvantages include a wider ROW footprint and lack of lanes with designated uses that could provide a reliable trip through the corridor. There is also the possibility that the wide inside shoulder could be used incorrectly by impatient or confused drivers.


## Additional Capacity \& Enhanced Shoulder

Figure 5-4. Corridor-Wide Alternative 2
Alternative 3 includes all of the improvements from Alternative 1, except the inside most lane is separated from the other lanes by a two-foot buffer. This adaptive lane could be designated for special uses to benefit trucks or transit and remove these larger vehicles from mainlane traffic. Examples of truck and transit lanes are l-394 in Minneapolis (where transit buses and light commercial vehicles are allowed to use the high-occupancy toll lanes), l-595 express lanes in Fort Lauderdale (where trucks are allowed on express lanes), and the TEXpress Lanes on I-820 and I-635 in DFW (where trucks can get discounted tolls if carrying multiple passengers, although tolls are still very high) ${ }^{7}$. The I-595, I-820, and I-635 lanes were built specifically to accommodate heavy trucks. Elevated T-ins or flyovers could be used to provide direct access for trucks and transit vehicles and prevent weaving across multiple lanes. The downside of buffer separation is that vehicles can access the adaptive lane at any point, which could lead to safety issues. However, buffer separation also makes these lanes more accessible for incident management and requires a narrower ROW footprint than barrier separation.

[^4]This alternative provides more lanes available for all road users and adaptive lanes that could provide a reliable trip. These lanes could accommodate specific uses in the future as technology advances. There may be opportunities to obtain funding from the private sector in exchange for use of adaptive lanes. Continuous access to adaptive lanes is less expensive than designated built in access points with physical separation elsewhere. Disadvantages include a wider ROW footprint and a chance that adaptive lanes are used incorrectly by impatient or confused drivers. Restricted use could be viewed negatively by drivers who aren't allowed to use the adaptive lanes.


Figure 5-5. Corridor-Wide Alternative 3
Alternative 4 includes all of the improvements from Alternative 3, except the inside most lane is separated from the other lanes by a barrier. The barrier separated lane has a ten foot outside shoulder and a four foot inside shoulder. Similar to the buffer separated lane, T-ins or flyovers could be used to provide direct access for trucks and transit vehicles. One benefit of barrier separation is that access is limited to designated points (instead of continuous access). This provides more comfort for drivers, because they don't have to worry about vehicles merging from the mainlanes, but also makes the adaptive lane less useful for incident management.

This alternative provides more lanes available for all road users and adaptive lanes that could provide a reliable trip. These lanes could accommodate specific uses in the future as technology advances. There may be opportunities to obtain funding from the private sector in exchange for use of adaptive lanes. This alternative has the widest ROW footprint. Restricted access may decrease the number of potential users of the adaptive lanes, and restricted use could be viewed negatively by drivers who aren't allowed to use the adaptive lanes. The presence of a barrier between mainlanes and adaptive lanes could lead to more crashes.


Figure 5-6. Corridor-Wide Alternative 4
Figure 5-7 shows the detailed typical section for each corridor-wide alternative. Alternative 3 was chosen as the recommended corridor wide alternative due to the potential benefits and flexibility available with an adaptive lane. Alternative 3 was preferred over Alternative 4 due to its smaller ROW footprint, especially in certain areas where impacts are narrowly avoided.


Figure 5-7. Corridor-Wide Detailed Alternative Typical Sections

### 5.3 Recommended Alternative

Alternative 3 was recommended between Redd Road and Loop 375 due to the benefits and flexibility that an adaptive lane provides. Alternative 2 was recommended in the remainder of the corridor, where traffic volumes are not projected to be high enough to justify an adaptive lane.

### 5.4 Additional Considerations

Additional options along the corridor were considered to reduce demand on I-10 and/or mitigate ROW impacts. To reduce demand on l-10, light rail was considered. This light rail line would run parallel to l-10, with stops in high demand areas such as downtown and The Fountains at Farah. Due to expense and concerns with projected ridership, this alternative was eliminated. To mitigate ROW impacts, a stacked (or double deck) freeway option was considered. This configuration made ramp design difficult and is not aesthetically pleasing. It is also expensive and further divides the two sides of the freeway.

Lastly, a tunnel option was considered which would provide a bypass of Segment 2 via a four-lane tunnel under the Franklin Mountains. Potential tunnel alignments are shown in Figure 5-8.


Figure 5-8. Potential Tunnel Alignments
This option would reduce traffic on Segment 2 and provide a more direct route through El Paso on I10 by eliminating several curves but was eliminated due to high cost. More information about the two tunnel options, including the percentage of existing car and truck trips that could bypass the existing downtown segment, is shown in Table 5-1.

## Table 5-1. Potential Tunnel Alignment Information

| Option | Facility | Tunnel Distance (miles) | \|-10 <br> Distance (miles) | *EB/WB Average OD - Personal | *EB/WB Average OD - Trucks | **Cost (Approx. \$100k/Foot) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 4-Lane Tunnel | 4.75 | 6.87 | 41\% | 73\% | \$ 2.5 Billion |
| 2 | 4-Lane Tunnel | 8.10 | 10.75 | 33\% | 66\% | \$ 4.3 Billion |
| *OD Data is for an all-day average of an average weekday defined as 12 am to 12 am Tuesday to Thursday. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 5.5 Technology Improvements

Please see Section 9 for details on corridor technology recommendations.

### 5.6 Segment 1 Improvements

Segment 1 includes l-10 between the New Mexico state line and Executive Center Boulevard.
Alternatives 2 and 3 were proposed for Segment 1. Alternative 2 was proposed due to its potential safety benefits, and because the 15 -foot inside shoulder could aid with incident management and provide opportunities for future use. Alternative 3 was proposed due to its adaptive lane and ability to provide road users a reliable trip through the segment. Alternative 4 would provide an even more reliable trip but was eliminated due to its wide footprint, which would require the reconstruction of GO 10 improvements. Alternative 3 differs from Alternative 2 in that buffer separated adaptive lanes are provided in both directions from SH 20 (Mesa Street) through Segment 2. Direct connectors to/from these adaptive lanes could be provided to make them more accessible for trucks. The proposed future left entrance and exit to/from US 85 that are part of the GO 10 project are removed in Alternative 3, as the buffer separated adaptive lanes continue along l-10.

Along this entire segment (from the New Mexico state line to Executive Center Boulevard) a minimum of three mainlanes are provided in each direction. In order to accommodate a wider mainlane footprint and recommended ramps, frontage roads were pushed out in many areas. A new interchange was added near Mile Marker (MM) 4.5, and frontage road intersection bypasses were provided at Loop 375, Thorn Avenue and SH 20 (Mesa Street). Frontage roads are continuous throughout Segment 1. Improvements from the I-10 third lane (CSJ 2121-01-094), SH 178 (CSJ 3592-01-009), Mesa Street - SH 20 Corridor Study (CSJ 0001-02-059), GO 10 (CSJ 2121-02-137), and Mesa Park (CSJ 2121-02-150) projects were incorporated to the greatest extent possible.

Table 5-2 lists recommended ramping changes, Table 5-3 lists recommended lane additions, and Table 5-4 lists recommended intersection improvements.

Table 5-2. Recommended Ramping Changes

| Ramp | Direction | New Gore Station | Old Gore Station | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valley Chili Rd Exit | EB | 1014+25 | 1036+00 | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Antonio St <br> Entrance | EB | 1082+75 | $1019+00$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Vinton Rd Exit | EB | 1105+00 | $1141+25$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Valley Chili Rd Entrance | EB | $1150+50$ | $1108+25$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| New Interchange Exit | EB | $1172+00$ | N/A | Needed for new interchange |
| Vinton Rd <br> Entrance | EB | $1225+50$ | $1171+25$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Loop 375 Exit | EB | 1246+50 | $1310+00$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| New Interchange Entrance | EB | $1310+50$ | N/A | Needed for new interchange |
| Loop 375 DC <br> Entrance | EB | $1366+75$ | $1366+50$ | Matched SH 178 schematic |
| Artcraft Rd DC Exit | EB | $1391+50$ | 1401+75 | Matched SH 178 schematic |
| Loop 375 <br> Entrance | EB | $1420+00$ | $1355+25$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Redd Rd Exit | EB | 1434+50 | 1461+75 | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Artcraft Rd DC Entrance | EB | 1457+00 | N/A | Matched SH 178 schematic |
| Artcraft Rd Entrance | EB | $1479+25$ | $1448+25$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Thorn Ave Exit | EB | $1507+50$ | N/A | Provide x-ramp configuration and utilize Thorn Ave frontage road bypass |
| Redd Rd <br> Entrance | EB | Removed | $1532+50$ | Not needed due to Thorn Ave frontage road bypass |
| Thorn Ave Entrance | EB | 1577+00 | N/A | Provide x-ramp configuration and utilize Thorn Ave frontage road bypass |


| Ramp | Direction | New Gore Station | Old Gore Station | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 20 Exit | EB | Removed | $1573+50$ | Not needed due to Thorn Ave frontage road bypass |
| SH 20 Entrance | EB | 1614+00 | 1618+00 | Shifted to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Sunland Park Dr Exit | EB | $1643+75$ | $1641+75$ | Shifted to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Sunland Park Dr Entrance | EB | $1762+75$ | $1772+00$ | Shifted to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Mesa Park Dr Exit | EB | 1793+25 | $1802+25$ | Shifted to give more space before intersection |
| Executive Center Dr Entrance | EB | 1859+50 | $1862+25$ | Ties in at different location due to wide inside shoulder |
| Executive Center Dr Exit | WB | 1861+75 | 1859+00 | Larger radius used on ramp |
| Mesa Park Dr Entrance | WB | 1796+50 | $1802+00$ | Shifted to give more space from intersection to ramp |
| Sunland Park Dr Exit | WB | 1752+50 | $1752+50$ | Ties in at different location due to wide inside shoulder |
| Sunland Park Dr Entrance | WB | $1645+75$ | $1641+75$ | Shifted to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| SH 20 Exit | WB | $1615+25$ | $1620+25$ | Shifted to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Thorn Ave Exit | WB | $1582+00$ | N/A | Provide x-ramp configuration and utilize Thorn Ave frontage road bypass |
| SH 20 Entrance | WB | Removed | $1571+75$ | Not needed due to Thorn Ave frontage road bypass |
| Redd Rd Exit | WB | Removed | $1542+75$ | Not needed due to Thorn Ave frontage road bypass |
| Thorn Ave Entrance | WB | $1511+50$ | N/A | Provide x-ramp configuration and utilize Thorn Ave frontage road bypass |
| Paseo del Norte Exit | WB | 1489+25 | $1448+00$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |


| Ramp | Direction | New Gore <br> Station | Old Gore <br> Station | Justification |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Artcraft DC Exit | WB | $1459+50$ | N/A | Matched SH 178 schematic |
| Redd Rd <br> Entrance | WB | $1437+00$ | $1463+50$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Loop 375 Exit | WB | $1421+25$ | $1354+00$ | Matched SH 178 schematic |
| Artcraft DC <br> Entrance | WB | $1400+50$ | $1387+75$ | Matched SH 178 schematic |
| Loop 375 DC Exit | WB | $1367+00$ | $1365+75$ | Shifted due to wider mainlanes |
| New Interchange <br> Exit | WB | $1322+25$ | N/A | Needed for new interchange |
| Loop 375 <br> Entrance | WB | $1246+50$ | $1308+50$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Westway Blvd Exit | WB | $1224+75$ | $1181+75$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| New Interchange <br> Entrance | WB | $1175+00$ | N/A | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Kingsway Dr Exit | WB | $1151+00$ | N/A | Provide access to new development |
| Westway Blvd <br> Entrance | WB | $1104+50$ | $1143+00$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Antonio St Exit | WB | $1084+50$ | $1084+50$ | Ties in at different location due to <br> wide inside shoulder |
| Colonia Vista | WB | $1021+50$ | N/A | Provide access to new development |
| Entrance |  |  |  |  |

Table 5-3. Recommended Lane Additions

| Lane Type | Direction | From |  | To | Length <br> (ft) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mainlane | EB | New Mexico <br> State Line | SH 20 | 61700 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | SH 20 | New Mexico <br> State Line | 62050 | Increase capacity |
| Auxiliary | EB | FM 1905 <br> (Antonio St) | SH 37 (Vinton <br> Rd) | 2225 | Increase safety |


| Lane Type | Direction | From | To | Length <br> (ft) | Justification |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Lane Type | Direction | From | To | Length <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Justification |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Frontage <br> Road | WB | New <br> Interchange | SH 37 (Vinton <br> Rd) | 1675 | Provide auxiliary lane <br> between ramps |
| Frontage <br> Road | WB | SH 37 (Vinton <br> Rd) | FM 1905 <br> (Antonio St) | 1500 | Provide auxiliary lane <br> between ramps |
| Frontage <br> Road | WB | SH 37 (Vinton <br> Rd) | FM 1905 <br> (Antonio St) | 2950 | Provide auxiliary lane <br> between ramps |

Table 5-4. Recommended Intersection Improvements

| Cross Street | Side | Changes | $\begin{array}{c}2042 \\ \text { No } \\ \text { Improvement }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}2042 \\ \text { Build } \\ \text { PM LOS }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PM |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |  |$]$


| Cross Street | Side | Changes | Relative Cost of Improvement | 2042 <br> No Build PM LOS | $\begin{gathered} 2042 \\ \text { Build } \\ \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Thorn Ave | EB | Provide intersection bypass Add right turn lane and thru lane to FR approach <br> Add thru lane to eastbound Thorn Ave <br> Add U-turn | \$\$\$ | C | C |
|  | WB | Provide intersection bypass Add right turn lane and thru lane to FR approach <br> Add thru lane to westbound Thorn Ave <br> Add U-turn | \$\$\$ | B | B |
| SH 20 | EB | Reconstruct to SPUI with bypasses | \$\$\$\$ | B | B |
|  | WB | Reconstruct to SPUI with bypasses | \$\$\$\$ | C | C |
| Mesa Park Dr | EB | Add U-turn | \$\$ | N/A | N/A |
|  | WB | Add U-turn | \$\$ | N/A | N/A |
| Executive Center Blvd | EB | Add two left turn lanes to FR approach <br> Add thru lane to westbound Executive Center BIvd | \$\$ | E | B |
|  | WB | Add right turn lane and optional left turn lane to FR approach <br> Add thru lane to westbound Executive Center Blvd | \$\$ | F | C |

### 5.7 Segment 2 Improvements

Segment 2 includes l-10 between Executive Center Boulevard and Raynolds Street.
Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 were proposed for Segment 2. Alternative 2 was proposed due to its potential safety benefits, and because the 15 -foot inside shoulder could aid with incident management and provide opportunities for future use. Alternative 3 was proposed due to its adaptive lane and ability to provide road users a reliable trip through the segment. Alternative 4 was proposed because it eliminates frequent weaving between the mainlanes and adaptive lanes. Congestion in Segment 2 may incentivize people to cut into the adaptive lanes if these lanes are only buffer separated. Barrier separation prevents this unwanted behavior and provides a more reliable and safer trip through the segment. Modified typical sections can be used in certain areas to reduce ROW acquisitions if needed. These could include elevating the adaptive lanes, cantilevering the frontage roads, etc.

With the exception of the area beneath US 54, a minimum of four mainlanes are provided in each direction. In order to accommodate a wider mainlane footprint, recommended ramps, and CD roads, frontage roads were pushed out in most areas. Frontage roads are continuous throughout Segment 2. Improvements from the I-10 Connect project (CSJ 1067-01-113, etc.) were incorporated to the greatest extent possible. Table 5-5 lists recommended ramping changes, Table 5-6 lists recommended lane additions, and Table 5-7 lists recommended intersection improvements.

Table 5-5. Recommended Ramping Changes

| Ramp | Direction | New Gore <br> Station | Old Gore <br> Station |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Schuster Ave Exit | EB | $1938+00$ | $1945+25$ | Provide more storage for queues |
| University Ave <br> Entrance | EB | $1963+75$ | $1962+25$ | Accommodate new configuration |
| Franklin <br> Ave/Downtown Exit | EB | $1986+25$ | $1978+00$ | Consolidate ramps |
| Porfirio Diaz St <br> Entrance | EB | Removed | $1993+25$ | Porfirio Diaz St bridge removed |
| Downtown Exit | EB | Removed | $2007+00$ | Consolidate ramps |
| Franklin Ave | EB | $2009+75$ | N/A | Replace Porfirio Diaz St Entrance |
| Entrance |  |  |  |  |


| Ramp | Direction | New Gore Station | Old Gore Station | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Raynolds St Exit | WB | 2255+50 | 2234+50 | Utilize CD road to consolidate ramps |
| US 54 DC Exit | WB | 2255+50 | 2219+00 | Utilize CD road to consolidate ramps |
| Copia St Exit | WB | $2255+50$ | 2187+25 | Utilize CD road to consolidate ramps |
| US 62 (Paisano Dr) Entrance | WB | 2237+00 | $2245+75$ | Shifted to give more space from ramp to intersection |
| Raynolds St/US 54 NB Entrance | WB | 2175+00 | 2201+50 | Utilize new FR to consolidate ramps |
| US 54 NB Entrance | WB | Removed | 2198+00 | Utilize new FR to consolidate ramps |
| Piedras St Entrance | WB | 2109+00 | 2108+00 | Shifted due to wider mainlanes |
| Downtown Exit | WB | 2067+00 | 2051+00 | Shifted to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Cotton St Entrance | WB | 2046+00 | 2066+75 | Shifted to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| N Kansas St Exit | WB | Removed | 2045+25 | Consolidate ramps |
| Downtown Entrance | WB | 1999+75 | 2006+25 | Shifted to follow ramp design standards |
| Porfirio Diaz St Exit | WB | Removed | 1992+00 | Removed to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Schuster Ave Exit | WB | 1966+75 | 1969+25 | Shifted due to wider mainlanes |
| University Ave Entrance | WB | 1917+50 | 1937+50 | Shifted to provide space for frontage road weaving |
| US 54 SB DC <br> Entrance | WB | $2163+50$ | 2171+50 | Shifted due to wider mainlanes and Raynolds St Entrance ramp |
| Raynor St Exit | WB | Removed | 2159+00 | Removed to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Copia St Entrance | WB | Removed | 2141+00 | Removed to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Cotton St Exit | WB | 2126+00 | $2132+25$ | Shifted to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |

Table 5-6. Recommended Lane Additions

| Lane Type | Direction | From | To | Length <br> (ft) | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auxiliary | EB | Executive <br> Center BIvd | Franklin Avenue | 11625 | Additional capacity needed between ramps |
| Auxiliary | EB | Franklin Avenue | Campbell St | 3450 | Additional capacity needed between ramps |
| Auxiliary | EB | Cotton St | Copia St | 4600 | Additional capacity needed between ramps |
| Auxiliary | EB | Cotton St | Raynor St | 2950 | Additional capacity needed between ramps |
| Auxiliary | WB | Copia St | Piedras St | 3750 | Additional capacity needed between ramps |
| Auxiliary | WB | Franklin Avenue | Schuster <br> Avenue | 3300 | Additional capacity needed between ramps |
| Mainlane | EB | Campbell St | Copia St | 11250 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | EB | Campbell St | Copia St | 8800 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | Copia St | Campbell St | 10800 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | Copia St | Campbell St | 9650 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | Campbell St | Executive Center BIvd | 17600 | Increase capacity |
| Frontage Road | EB | Executive Center BIvd | Prospect St | 15425 | Provide new frontage road |
| Frontage Road | EB | Campbell St | Piedras St | 7525 | Provide new frontage road |
| Frontage Road | EB | US 54 | Raynolds St | 2175 | Provide auxiliary lane between ramps |
| Frontage Road | WB | Raynolds St | Copia St | 4075 | Provide new frontage road |
| Frontage Road | WB | Cotton St | Campbell St | 2100 | Provide auxiliary lane between ramps |
| Frontage Road | WB | Prospect St | Porfirio Diaz St | 2450 | Provide new frontage road |


| Lane Type | Direction | From | To | Length <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ | Justification |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Frontage <br> Road | WB | University <br> Ave | Executive <br> Center Blvd | 8325 | Provide new frontage road |

## Table 5-7. Recommended Intersection Improvements

| Cross Street | Side | Changes | Relative Cost of <br> Improvement |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Schuster Ave | EB | Reconfigure (See write up) | $\$ \$ \$ \$$ |
|  | WB | Reconfigure (See write up) | $\$ \$ \$ \$$ |
| Porfirio Diaz St | EB | Remove cross street | $\$ \$$ |
| Franklin Ave | EB | Remove cross street | Add Franklin entrance ramp |

There were numerous areas in Segment 2 that required additional considerations: where lane additions and changes to ramping alone did not sufficiently improve LOS or where constraints made unique solutions necessary. These areas are discussed in the following subsections.
(a) Frontage Roads

Frontage road addition in the segment of I-10 between Executive Center Boulevard and downtown proved to be a challenge. ROW in this segment is extremely tight, with a railroad, Border Highway West, potential historic buildings, and the Sunset Heights neighborhood all bordering l-10. There is a large area on the east side of I-10 between Executive Center Boulevard and University Avenue that is undeveloped and has steep natural terrain. A potential approach to maintain continuous frontage roads is to have the eastbound frontage road cross over to the east side of I-10, run parallel with the westbound frontage road, and cross back over to the west side near University Avenue. At that point, it would remain elevated on structure over the railroad and taper down to one lane before merging with an off-ramp lane and continuing on to downtown. On the east side, the westbound frontage road will have two segments, one from downtown to Schuster Avenue and the other from University Avenue to Executive Center Boulevard. Despite the increased structural costs and complexity, this option will help avoid much of the present ROW issues, with the exception of the Sunset Heights neighborhood. Column spacing and frontage road discontinuity are two potential issues with this design, and other alternatives will be considered. Additionally, vehicles on the eastbound frontage road don't have access to the UTEP area.

## (b) Schuster Avenue

The intersection at Schuster Avenue and Sun Bowl Drive was failing in the No Build 2042 scenario, mainly due to heavy left turn movement onto eastbound l-10 causing a bottleneck at the intersection itself. Queues from this intersection were also backing up onto the eastbound Schuster Avenue exit ramp, resulting in congestion on I-10. Roundabouts installed on the campus have been well received and effective, therefore another roundabout was proposed for this intersection. A number of ramping layouts in this area were also considered as an attempt to further relieve congestion.

According to projected traffic volumes, there will be minimal traffic on nearby University Avenue. The first concept provides access from University Avenue to eastbound I-10. This addition also increases storage so that traffic at the Schuster intersection can be redistributed. Access to westbound I-10 from Schuster Avenue was eliminated to redirect traffic to University Avenue. An additional left turn was also added for the eastbound $\mathrm{l}-10$ to Schuster Avenue movement to reduce queue lengths.

The second modification attempts to eliminate the signalized T-intersection on the west side of I-10 altogether. Access to eastbound I-10 would be provided by two direct connectors (DCs) that combine traffic from Sun Bowl Drive and Schuster Avenue, and the existing intersection would be used solely as the eastbound exit ramp from I-10. This option was seen as too disruptive and was eliminated.

Following the continuous flow concept, the third option attempted to reduce the number of signals on Schuster Avenue by making it a dedicated entrance ramp and redirecting all incoming traffic from eastbound I-10 to University Avenue. This concept seemed promising and was modified by switching access points. Access to I-10 was moved to University Avenue and access from I-10 flows to Schuster Avenue. This modified configuration provides more storage for vehicles and allows for a larger turn
radius on the entrance ramp. This option was selected as the proposed solution and evaluated. Analysis shows severe congestion due to high left turn volumes at the proposed Schuster Avenue/Sun Bowl Drive roundabout. Adjustments to intersection design and ramping configuration are being considered to address this issue.

Ramping and intersection improvements alone were unable to provide the desired benefit for this area. The proposed solution is a reconfiguration of the Schuster Avenue interchange along with the addition of continuous frontage roads in the eastbound and westbound directions. This can be viewed on page 7 of the Roll Plots in Appendix D.

## (c) Downtown

The downtown area is a hotspot for congestion. The 2042 No Build VISSIM model shows gridlock along Yandell Drive and Wyoming Avenue between N Santa Fe Street and N Campbell Street, with queues extending to the mainlanes and blocking traffic. Several layouts for the downtown area were considered to reduce congestion, connect the Uptown and downtown areas, and provide opportunities for development or improved aesthetics.

The first attempt at reducing congestion is a minimalistic approach. The westbound Yandell Drive exit is removed, forcing vehicles who previously used this exit to instead use the Missouri Avenue exit. By removing traffic from Yandell Drive, more green time is made available for cross streets. This design outperforms the No Build alternative, but significant congestion is still present. Another option involves removing the bridges across $\mathrm{l}-10$ at Oregon Street and Stanton Street. In removing these connections, the number of traffic signals on Yandell Drive and Wyoming Avenue is reduced, but performance of the network is not improved substantially.

The second attempt combines Yandell Drive and Wyoming Avenue into a single parkway that runs on top of l-10. The parkway concept removes one of the two intersections along each cross street, and in doing so, significantly reduces congestion. The parkway concept also frees up land for development by relocating existing roads from alongside I-10 to above I-10. The city and public have shown interest in using newly available land to create an attractive public space.

The third attempt at reducing congestion is the creation of a "circuit". All bridges across $\mathrm{l}-10$ are removed and a U-turn is added at either end of downtown, essentially creating a large roundabout. Cross streets tie into the frontage roads, forming the legs of the roundabout. Volumes on U-turns and frontage roads in this layout are very high, requiring up to six lanes in one direction, so the SH 20 (Mesa Street) connection across I-10 was added (along with Texas U-turns at SH 20) to allow for narrower frontage roads. In this configuration, SH 20 (Mesa Street) is overloaded and has failing LOS. To better distribute traffic across I-10 and provide less circuitous routes, the N Santa Fe Street and N Campbell Street connections across l-10 were added (as two-way streets along with Texas U-turns at both crossings). This layout effectively handles traffic on frontage roads and cross streets, offers the most benefit in the form of congestion relief, and was chosen as the preferred layout. Additionally, this layout could accommodate a deck plaza, which the city and public have shown interest in.

The fourth attempt elevates SH 20 (Mesa Street) over Yandell Drive and Wyoming Avenue. An elevated intersection above l-10 provides access to/from l-10. Additional ramps to/from I-10 create lane balance issues and failing weaving segments on I-10. Additional structure would likely be expensive, unattractive, and cause vertical alignment issues.

The fifth attempt includes a number of changes. Southbound traffic on Kansas Street diverges from its current alignment north of I-10 and joins N Campbell Street until it reaches Missouri Avenue, where it is forced to turn right. The El Paso Street, Stanton Street, and Kansas Street bridges over I10 are removed in this alternative, reducing the number of signals along Yandell Drive and Wyoming Avenue. An additional westbound ramp providing direct access to N Santa Fe Street was also added, along with a realignment of Prospect Street, which ties into Durango Street instead of N Santa Fe Street. Finally, a U-turn was added for westbound traffic prior to N Campbell Street. Components of this layout were used to improve the third layout.

The sixth attempt utilizes DCs to replace left turns from SH 20 (Mesa Street) and provides a new connection from southbound N Ochoa Street to eastbound I-10. Additional structure would likely be expensive, unattractive, and cause vertical alignment issues.


Figure 5-9. Proposed Downtown Layout
(d) Cotton Street

The existing Cotton Street interchange does not have a frontage road in the eastbound direction. Cotton Street passes over a UPRR line immediately south of l-10, and a spur of this rail line runs parallel to Cotton Street about 450 feet to the east. The existing Cotton Street Bridge is aging and in need of replacement, and only 15 ' 8 " clearance is provided for traffic underneath $\mathrm{l}-10$. A brainstorming session took place to consider options for the Cotton Street interchange.

An eastbound frontage road between downtown and Piedras Street was added in order to provide continuous frontage roads. This offers an alternative route if needed for incident management. A traditional diamond interchange with U-turns is proposed. This eliminates the severe skew angle for traffic accessing the existing eastbound entrance ramp. An additional left turn lane can be added to southbound Cotton Street to improve LOS at the intersection with the eastbound frontage road. Two three level interchange configurations for this layout are being considered: one with rail at the first level, Cotton Street at the second level and I-10 at the third level; the other with a depressed I-10 at the first level, rail at the second level and Cotton Street at the third level. Both configurations will be challenging regarding vertical alignments and clearances. The first configuration requires a very high $\mathrm{I}-10$ structure, while the second is likely more expensive and may have drainage issues. The second configuration would also result in a greater elevation difference between mainlanes and frontage roads. Alternatives at Cotton Street are still being considered.

## (e) US 54

The I-10/US 54 interchange is currently a hotspot for congestion on I-10 due to high traffic volumes and ramp density.

In the eastbound direction, a CD road is proposed east of US 54. The eastbound Copia Street entrance ramp ties into the eastbound US 54 entrance ramp to form this CD, which continues until merging with eastbound l-10 beneath US 62 (Paisano Drive). This CD has an exit to Raynolds Street for vehicles coming from US 54 and eliminates the existing weave between the US 54 entrance and the Raynolds Street exit, which is proposed to pass underneath the CD. The Chelsea Street Bridge and intersections were removed to provide more storage length for frontage road intersections and reduce the number of signals for frontage road traffic.

A CD road was also created in the westbound direction. The CD begins as a three lane exit beneath US 62 (Paisano Drive) and offers exits to Raynolds Street, US 54, and Copia Street. This CD eliminates the existing weave between the US 62 (Paisano Drive) entrance and US 54 exit. The US 62 (Paisano Drive) entrance is proposed to pass underneath the CD and no longer has access to the US 54 direct connector. A westbound frontage road between Raynolds Street and Copia Street was added in order to provide continuous frontage roads. This offers an additional route if needed for incident management and is also used as a CD to consolidate ramps. The westbound Copia Street exit and the loop ramp from US 54 tie into the new frontage road, eliminating the existing weave between these existing ramps on the mainlanes.


Figure 5-10. Proposed US 54 Area Layout

### 5.8 Segment 3 Improvements

Segment 3 includes I-10 between Raynolds Street and Eastlake Boulevard.
Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 were proposed for Segment 3. Alternative 2 was proposed due to its potential safety benefits, and because the 15 -foot inside shoulder could aid with incident management and provide opportunities for future use. Alternative 3 was proposed due to its adaptive lane and ability to provide road users a reliable trip through the segment. Alternative 4 was proposed because it eliminates frequent weaving between the mainlanes and adaptive lanes. Congestion in Segment 3 may encourage people to cut into the adaptive lanes if they are only buffer separated. Barrier separation prevents this unwanted behavior and provides a more reliable and safer trip through the segment. Modified typical sections can be used in certain areas to reduce ROW acquisitions if needed. These could include elevating the adaptive lanes, cantilevering the frontage roads, etc. Direct connectors to/from adaptive lanes could be provided to make them more accessible for trucks or transit vehicles.

With the exception of the area immediately east of US 54 and the area beneath Loop 375, a minimum of four mainlanes are provided in each direction. In order to accommodate a wider mainlane footprint, recommended ramps, and CD roads, frontage roads were pushed out in most areas. Frontage roads are continuous throughout Segment 3.

Segment 3 ramping proved to be a challenge. Interchange and ramp density are very high along the majority of this segment, resulting in weaving issues on the mainlanes, queuing and congestion at frontage road intersections, and difficulty placing ramps. Development along Segment 3 frontage roads is substantial, resulting in limited available ROW without acquisitions. Holistic approaches were used to reduce congestion along the mainlanes and frontage roads in Segment 3 because changes to one ramp often impacted multiple other ramps and interchanges.

The initial attempt sought to maximize existing ramping. The operational improvement of adding auxiliary lanes between entrance and exit ramps actually decreased LOS due to short weaving distances. To increase weaving distance, ramps were consolidated or removed altogether in failing
areas beginning with bottlenecks. Maintaining access to major intersections was a priority. Capacity was an issue in the eastbound direction near the US 54 interchange, so additional lanes were added. The mentioned changes significantly improved LOS, but still left five HCS segments failing in each direction.

A second concept utilized CD Roads to reduce ramp density and remove traffic volume from the mainlanes. It quickly became evident that the close spacing of cross streets in Segment 3 does not favor CD roads. Due to this spacing, vehicles had to enter the CD road well in advance of their cross street destination, which led to higher volumes on the CD roads, which led to more lanes on the CD roads, which led to more difficult weaving on the CD roads. Additionally, the width of the resulting facility was very large, so this concept was abandoned.

A third option was to have widened frontage roads with two lane bypasses at every intersection. The inside lanes of the new "Super Arterial" frontage roads acted as a CD road, but since no separate CD road facility was provided, facility width was much less. The frontage road bypasses were accessible to all vehicles on the frontage road instead of just those coming from I-10. In this manner, "Super Arterial" frontage roads served more uses than the CD roads. Few entrances and exits were provided, and HCS analysis showed LOS D or better on mainlanes in both directions.

The close spacing of cross streets in Segment 3 made providing intersection bypasses difficult. There was not enough distance for the bypass lanes to tie to the frontage road between many intersections, leave space for weaving and then diverge from the frontage road. For this reason, several bypasses had to span two intersections, and as a result, the "Super Arterial" frontage roads were less effective because more vehicles were forced through intersections. Additional capacity on the mainlanes was required even with the "Super Arterial" frontage roads, so the facility was wider than desired. This concept was deemed impractical because it congested frontage roads and frontage road intersections.

The fourth attempt began with an empty ramping layout. All Segment 3 ramps were removed and the following cross streets were identified as critical: US 62 (Paisano Drive), Airway Boulevard, Viscount Boulevard, Yarbrough Drive, Zaragoza Road, and Loop 375. The goal was to provide direct access between these cross streets and I-10 with X-ramp configuration. A minimum of 3,000 feet between consecutive entrance and exit gores was required to avoid weaving segments, which would fail due to high traffic volumes. Braided ramps were avoided when possible but needed in some areas to accomplish this. A minimal ramping layout was created following these criteria. Additional ramps were then added where they would not reduce mainlane LOS in order to reduce demand at overloaded intersections and provide more direct access to key areas. The Hawkins Boulevard and Loop 375 braided ramps were not incorporated because they create weaving issues and can't accommodate the proposed mainlane footprint.

This alternative increased traffic on the frontage roads and at many frontage road intersections. Modifications to many intersections were proposed to increase capacity, but several intersections
were still failing, notably in the area between Viscount Boulevard and Lee Trevino Drive. Further adjustments to ramping and intersection layouts in these areas were made to mitigate these issues.

Table 5-8 lists recommended ramping changes, Table 5-9 lists recommended lane additions, and Table 5-10 lists recommended intersection improvements.

Table 5-8. Recommended Ramping Changes

| Ramp | Direction | New Gore Station | Old Gore Station | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 62 (Paisano Dr) Entrance | EB | 2269+75 | N/A | Provide access for MCA development |
| Trowbridge Dr Exit | EB | Removed | $2258+75$ | Removed to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Geronimo Dr Exit | EB | Removed | $2274+75$ | Removed to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Trowbridge Dr Entrance | EB | Removed | 2292+00 | Removed to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Airway Blvd Exit | EB | $2303+75$ | $2343+00$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Geronimo Dr Entrance | EB | 2346+00 | 2324+50 | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Hawkins Blvd Exit | EB | $2375+50$ | $2365+75$ | Shifted to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Airway Blvd Entrance | EB | 2395+00 | $2401+50$ | Shifted due to Hawkins Blvd Exit ramp |
| Hunter Dr Exit | EB | Removed | $2414+00$ | Not needed due to Hawkins Blvd frontage road bypass |
| Hawkins Blvd Entrance | EB | $2453+25$ | $2450+75$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Hunter Dr <br> Entrance | EB | $2476+50$ | N/A | Alleviate frontage road intersections |
| Giles Rd Exit | EB | Removed | $2472+00$ | Removed to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Giles Rd <br> Entrance | EB | Removed | $2502+00$ | Removed to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| N Yarbrough Dr Exit | EB | 2507+75 | $2519+75$ | Shifted to give more space from ramp to intersection |


| Ramp | Direction | New Gore Station | Old Gore Station | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N Yarbrough Dr Entrance | EB | 2558+25 | 2545+75 | Shifted to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Lomaland Dr Exit | EB | 2540+75 | 2569+50 | Shifted to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Lee Trevino Dr Exit | EB | $2588+25$ | $2590+50$ | Shifted due to wider mainlanes |
| Zaragoza Rd Exit | EB | 2618+25 | 2666+50 | Provide x-ramp configuration and access to Pendale Rd |
| Lee Trevino Dr Entrance | EB | 2678+50 | $2625+75$ | Provide x-ramp configuration and access from Pendale Rd |
| Zaragoza Rd Entrance | EB | $2736+50$ | $2724+00$ | Shifted due to frontage road bypass |
| 375 DC Exit | EB | 2767+25 | 2758+25 | Shifted due to wider mainlanes |
| Frontage Road Exit | EB | Removed | 2771+50 | Consolidate ramps |
| Eastlake Blvd Exit | EB | 2815+50 | 2805+50 | Shifted due to wider mainlanes |
| $375 \text { DC }$ <br> Entrance | EB | 2839+00 | 2821+00 | Shifted due to Eastlake Blvd Exit ramp |
| Frontage Road Entrance | EB | 2859+75 | 2818+50 | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| 375 DC Exit | WB | 2839+00 | 2835+25 | Shifted due to wider mainlanes |
| Eastlake Blvd Entrance | WB | 2821+50 | 2817+00 | Shifted to eliminate weave (3000' between ramps) |
| Zaragoza Rd Exit | WB | 2790+25 | 2787+00 | Shifted due to wider mainlanes |
| Frontage Road Exit | WB | Removed | 2741+50 | Consolidate ramps |
| $375 \text { DC }$ <br> Entrance | WB | $2757+50$ | $2768+00$ | Reconfigured to provide exit to Zaragoza Rd |
| Frontage Road Entrance | WB | Removed | 2720+50 | Not needed due to Zaragoza Rd frontage road bypass |


| Ramp | Direction | New Gore <br> Station | Old Gore <br> Station |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zaragoza Road <br> Entrance | WB | Removed | $2689+25$ | Consolidate ramps |
| Pendale Exit | WB | $2685+75$ | $2667+75$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |


| Ramp | Direction | New Gore <br> Station | Old Gore <br> Station | Justification |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Airway Blvd <br> Entrance | WB | $2311+25$ | $2342+75$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Geronimo <br> Entrance | WB | Removed | $2284+00$ | Removed to eliminate weave <br> $(3000$ |
| US 62 (Paisano <br> Dr) Exit | WB | Removed ramps) | $2268+50$ | Removed due to spacing between <br> intersections |
| Trowbridge Dr <br> Entrance | WB | Removed | $2258+50$ | Removed to eliminate weave <br> $(3000 '$ between ramps) |
| US 62 (Paisano <br> Dr) Entrance | WB | $2237+00$ | $2245+75$ | Shifted to give more space from <br> intersection to ramp |

## Table 5-9. Recommended Lane Additions

| Lane <br> Type | Direction | From | To | Length <br> (ft) | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auxiliary | EB | Trowbridge Dr | Geronimo Dr | 3400 | Additional capacity needed between ramps |
| Auxiliary | EB | Airway Blvd | Airway Blvd | 2950 | Additional capacity needed between ramps |
| Auxiliary | EB | Hunter Dr | Sumac Dr | 3100 | Additional capacity needed between ramps |
| Auxiliary | EB | Yarbrough <br> Dr | Lomaland Dr | 3000 | Additional capacity needed between ramps |
| Auxiliary | EB | George <br> Dieter Dr | Loop 375 | 3075 | Increase safety |
| Auxiliary | WB | Loop 375 | Loop 375 | 3125 | Increase safety |
| Auxiliary | WB | Sumac Dr | McRae Dr | 3000 | Additional capacity needed between ramps |
| Auxiliary | WB | Hawkins Blvd | Airway Blvd | 2625 | Additional capacity needed between ramps |
| Mainlane | EB | US 62 <br> (Paisano Dr) | Loop 375 | 56600 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | EB | Loop 375 | Segment 4 | 100 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | EB | Loop 375 | Segment 4 | 100 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | Segment 4 | Loop 375 | 100 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | Segment 4 | Loop 375 | 100 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | Loop 375 | US 62 <br> (Paisano Dr) | 50200 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | Loop 375 | George <br> Dieter Dr | 7175 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | Lee Trevino Dr | Yarbrough Dr | 5450 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | Yarbrough Dr | Hawkins Blvd | 14325 | Increase capacity |


| Lane Type | Direction | From | To | Length <br> (ft) | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mainlane | WB | Geronimo Dr | US 62 <br> (Paisano Dr) | 5575 | Increase capacity |
| Frontage Road | EB | Geronimo Dr | Airway Blvd | 1675 | Provide auxiliary lane between ramps |
| Frontage Road | EB | Airway Blvd | Hawkins Blvd | 1000 | Provide auxiliary lane between ramps |
| Frontage Road | EB | Hawkins Blvd | Hunter Dr | 2075 | Provide auxiliary lane between ramps |
| Frontage Road | EB | George <br> Dieter Dr | Loop 375 | 1075 | Provide auxiliary lane between ramps |
| Frontage Road | EB | Loop 375 | Segment 4 | 1450 | Provide auxiliary lane between ramps |
| Frontage Road | WB | Segment 4 | Loop 375 | 850 | Provide auxiliary lane between ramps |
| Frontage Road | WB | Loop 375 | George Dieter Dr | 3325 | Provide auxiliary lane between ramps |
| Frontage Road | WB | Hunter Dr | Hawkins <br> Blvd | 2150 | Provide auxiliary lane between ramps |
| Frontage Road | WB | Hawkins Blvd | Airway Blvd | 1200 | Provide auxiliary lane between ramps |
| Frontage Road | WB | Airway Blvd | Geronimo Dr | 1450 | Provide auxiliary lane between ramps |

Table 5-10. Recommended Intersection Improvements

| Cross Street | Side | Changes | Relative Cost of <br> Improvement |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| US 62 (Paisano <br> Dr) | EB | Add U-turn <br> Add through lane to FR approach <br> Add right turn lane to NB US 62 (Paisano Dr) <br> Add right turn lane, thru lane and U-turn lane <br> to FR approach | $\$ \$$ |
|  | WB | Add right turn lane to SB US 62 (Paisano Dr) | Add right turn lane to FR approach <br> Add thru lane to NB Trowbridge Dr <br> Add thru lane to SB Trowbridge Dr |
| Trowbridge Dr | EB | $\$ \$$ |  |
| Geronimo Dr | EB | Add right turn lane, thru lane and left turn <br> lane to FR approach <br> Add thru lane to SB Trowbridge Dr | $\$ \$$ |
| Add right turn lane and thru lane to FR |  |  |  |
| approach |  |  |  |
| Add right turn lane to NB Geronimo Dr |  |  |  |


| Cross Street | Side | Changes | Relative Cost of Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Giles Rd/McRae Blvd | EB | Add thru lane and left turn lane to FR approach <br> Add right turn lane to NB Giles Rd | \$\$ |
|  | WB | Add thru lane to FR approach <br> Add right turn lane to SB McRae Blvd | \$ |
| Corral Dr/Sumac Dr | EB | Add right turn lane and thru lane to FR approach | \$ |
|  | WB | Add right turn lane and thru lane to FR approach | \$ |
| Yarbrough Dr | EB | Add right turn lane and left turn lane to FR approach <br> Add thru lane to NB Yarbrough Dr <br> Add left turn lane to SB Yarbrough Dr | \$\$ |
|  | WB | Add dedicated thru lane and left turn lane to FR approach <br> Add thru lane to SB Yarbrough Dr Add left turn lane to NB Yarbrough Dr | \$\$ |
| Lomaland Dr | EB | Add thru lane and left turn lane to FR approach | \$ |
|  | WB | Add right turn lane to SB Lomaland Dr Add thru lane to FR approach | \$ |
| Lee Trevino Dr | EB | Add thru lane and left turn lane to FR approach <br> Add right turn lane to NB Lee Trevino Dr Add thru lane to SB Lee Trevino Dr | \$\$ |
|  | WB | Add thru lane to FR approach | \$ |
| Pendale Rd | EB | Add four lane cross street with a U-turn | \$\$\$\$ |
|  | WB | Add four lane cross street with a U-turn | \$\$\$\$ |
| George Dieter Dr/Zaragoza Rd | EB | Convert to SPUI with bypasses | \$\$\$\$ |
|  | WB | Convert to SPUI with bypasses | \$\$\$\$ |

Additional consideration was given to areas of high congestion in Segment 3 and to adaptive lane access, which are discussed in the following subsections.

## (a) Airway Boulevard

Heavy left turning movement from the eastbound frontage road to Airway Boulevard and from Airway Boulevard to the eastbound frontage road is causing severe congestion. A potential solution is the continuous flow intersection (CFI). This innovative intersection design requires drivers to turn left before they reach the intersection and cross over to the right side further down the road. Increased storage bays make this configuration ideal for high volumes of left-turning traffic. Although uncommon, this configuration would significantly improve LOS at the Airway Boulevard interchange. The proposed phasing and layout of the Airway Boulevard CFI is shown in Figure 5-11.


Figure 5-11. Airway Boulevard Continuous Flow Intersection (CFI)
(b) Yarbrough Drive

Frontage road intersections in the area between Viscount Boulevard and Lee Trevino Drive are experiencing significant congestion in the 2042 Build scenario. Minimal ramping and high demand from large nearby residential communities are leading to high demand at these intersections. Eight direct connectors are proposed at the Yarbrough Drive to provide all movements between Yarbrough Drive and I-10. Yarbrough Drive falls in the center of the congested area between Viscount Boulevard and Lee Trevino Drive and nearly halfway between US 54 and Loop 375. Yarbrough Drive also connects to Loop 375 along the US-Mexico border and to Montana Avenue, before turning into Global Reach Drive, which continues to Spur 601. Upgrades along Yarbrough Drive could turn it into a major arterial or even a highway. This would hopefully pull traffic off of nearby arterials and alleviate traffic at frontage road intersections. Yarbrough Drive DCs were evaluated in a travel demand model to see
if they produce the desired reduction in traffic at nearby frontage road intersections. The DCs did not pull a significant amount of traffic off of parallel arterials, and the placement of DCs created undesirable weaving issues. Instead, a three-level interchange is proposed at Yarbrough Drive and I10, with the Yarbrough Drive through lanes bypassing frontage road intersections.
(c) Adaptive Lane Access

With heavy industrial activity along the corridor, it would be very beneficial to remove truck traffic from the general-purpose lanes and redirect them to adaptive lanes. Many studies have been done on truck-only lanes, but there are few applications across the United States. Removing trucks from the mainlanes can relieve congestion during peak hour, increase safety for general vehicles, and improve efficiency and reliability for trucks that are carrying time-sensitive goods.

It is critical to plan for truck use of adaptive lanes early, as trucking facilities have different design standards and requirements. Access points need to be provided near truck trip origins and destinations. Currently, adaptive lanes are proposed between Redd Road and Loop 375, with an intermediate access point at Buffalo Soldier Road. At Buffalo Soldier Road, ramps to/from the eastbound and westbound adaptive lanes would meet at an elevated intersection above l-10. From this elevated intersection, trucks would have access to a bidirectional facility extending north to the Airport and south to Industrial Ave. The facility will also be analyzed for passenger vehicles, transit vehicles and mixed-flow scenarios for comparison of LOS and usage. The proposed layout of the Buffalo Soldier Road elevated access points is shown in Figure 5-12.


Figure 5-12. Buffalo Soldier Road Adaptive Lane Access

### 5.9 Segment 4 Improvements

Segment 4 includes I-10 between Eastlake Boulevard and FM 3380.
Alternatives 2 and 3 were proposed for Segment 4. Alternative 2 was proposed due to its potential safety benefits, and because the 15 -foot inside shoulder could aid with incident management and provide opportunities for future use. Alternative 3 was proposed due to its adaptive lane and ability to provide road users a reliable trip through the segment. Alternative 4 would provide an even more reliable trip but was considered excessive due to relatively low traffic volumes in this segment. Alternative 3 differs from Alternative 2 in that buffer separated adaptive lanes are provided in both directions from Segment 3 to east of Horizon Boulevard.

Along this entire segment (from the Loop 375 to FM 3380) a minimum of three mainlanes are provided in each direction. In order to accommodate a wider mainlane footprint and recommended
ramps, frontage roads were pushed out in many areas. A new interchange was added near MM 40.5. Frontage roads are continuous throughout Segment 4.

Table 5-11 lists recommended ramping changes, Table 5-12 lists recommended lane additions, and Table 5-13 lists recommended intersection improvements.

## Table 5-11. Recommended Ramping Changes

| Ramp | Direction | New Gore <br> Station | Old Gore <br> Station | Justification |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Horizon Blvd Exit | EB | $2896+50$ | $2952+00$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Eastlake Blvd <br> Entrance | EB | $2992+25$ | $2896+25$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| New Interchange <br> Exit | EB | $3021+25$ | N/A | Provide access to new interchange |
| Horizon Blvd <br> Entrance | EB | $3121+50$ | $3041+50$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| FM 1110 Exit | EB | $3153+00$ | $3244+25$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |


| Ramp | Direction | New Gore <br> Station | Old Gore <br> Station | Justification |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FM 793 Entrance | WB | $3571+75$ | $3606+25$ | Shifted to give more space from <br> intersection to ramp |
| FM 1110 Exit | WB | $3293+75$ | $3281+25$ | Shifted to give more space from <br> ramp to intersection |
| New Interchange <br> Exit | WB | $3230+75$ | N/A | Provide access to new interchange |
| FM 1110 Entrance | WB | $3152+50$ | $3247+50$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Horizon Blvd Exit | WB | $3121+25$ | $3035+25$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| New Interchange <br> Entrance | WB | $3030+50$ | N/A | Provide access from new <br> interchange |
| Eastlake Blvd Exit | WB | $2990+00$ | $2896+25$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Horizon Blvd <br> Entrance | WB | $2896+50$ | $2933+50$ | Provide x-ramp configuration |
| Frontage Road Exit | WB | $2864+00$ | N/A | Provide access to Joe Battle Blvd |

Table 5-12. Recommended Lane Additions

| Lane Type | Direction | From | To | Length <br> (ft) | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auxiliary | EB | New <br> Interchange | New Interchange | 3150 | Increase safety |
| Auxiliary | WB | New <br> Interchange | New Interchange | 3125 | Increase safety |
| Mainlane | EB | Segment 3 | Horizon Blva | 18125 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | EB | Segment 3 | Eastlake Blvd | 5650 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | EB | FM 1110 | FM 793 | 27925 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | EB | FM 793 | FM 3380 | 25700 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | FM 3380 | FM 793 | 26755 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | FM 793 | FM 1110 | 27800 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | Horizon Blvd | Segment 3 | 19050 | Increase capacity |
| Mainlane | WB | Eastlake Blvd | Segment 3 | 5650 | Increase capacity |
| Frontage <br> Road | EB | Segment 3 | Eastlake Blvd | 750 | Provide auxiliary lane between ramps |
| Frontage Road | EB | Eastlake Blva | Horizon Blvd | 7200 | Provide additional lane between ramps |
| Frontage Road | EB | Horizon Blva | New <br> Interchange | 7725 | Provide new frontage road |
| Frontage Road | EB | New <br> Interchange | FM 1110 | 5500 | Provide new frontage road |
| Frontage <br> Road | EB | FM 1110 | FM 793 | 33950 | Provide new frontage road |
| Frontage Road | EB | FM 793 | FM 3380 | 30525 | Provide new frontage road |
| Frontage Road | WB | FM 3380 | FM 793 | 30750 | Provide new frontage road |
| Frontage <br> Road | WB | FM 793 | FM 1110 | 33700 | Provide new frontage road |


| Lane Type | Direction | From | To |  | Length <br> $(\mathrm{ft})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table 5-13. Recommended Intersection Improvements

| Cross Street | Side | Changes | Relative Cost of Improvement | No Build PM LOS | $\begin{gathered} \text { Build PM } \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastlake <br> Blvd | EB | Convert to CFI, SPUI or DDI (see write up) | \$\$\$\$ | F | ? |
|  | WB | Convert to CFI, SPUI or DDI (see write up) | \$\$\$\$ | F | ? |
| Horizon Blvd | EB | Convert to SPUI or DDI (see write up) | \$\$\$\$ | F | ? |
|  | WB | Convert to SPUI or DDI (see write up) | \$\$\$\$ | F | ? |
| New Interchange | EB | Add six lane cross street with a U-turn | \$\$\$\$ | N/A | N/A |
|  | WB | Add six lane cross street with a U-turn | \$\$\$\$ | N/A | N/A |
| FM 793 | EB | Add right turn lane to FR approach <br> Add right turn lane to NB FM 793 | \$ | D | F |
|  | WB | Add thru lane to FR approach | \$ | B | B |
| FM 3380 | EB | Add thru lane to FR approach | \$ | A | A |
|  | WB | Add thru lane to FR approach | \$ | A | A |

There were two intersections in Segment 4 that required additional considerations due to high turning volumes. The design of these intersections is discussed in the following subsection.
(a) Eastlake Boulevard and Horizon Boulevard

Heavy left turning traffic from the eastbound frontage road and heavy right turning traffic from southbound Eastlake Boulevard and Horizon Boulevard has produced unacceptable LOS at these interchanges. Initially, additional left turn lanes were added at each intersection to alleviate congestion, but three left-turning lanes were necessary to meet demand. This was undesirable, so additional options were explored.

Research identified intersections designed specifically to target high left turning volumes, which include the CFI, the single point urban interchange (SPUI), and the diverging diamond interchange (DDI). The main differences between these interchanges and a traditional diamond interchange include reduced number of signal phases (CFI, DDI, and SPUI) and increased storage bays (CFI). These interchanges were analyzed with volumes from the Eastlake Boulevard and Horizon Boulevard interchanges and operated effectively with the provision of two free flowing right turn lanes for the southbound to westbound movement.

A CFI, DDI, or SPUI is proposed at Eastlake Boulevard, and a DDI or SPUI is proposed at Horizon Boulevard. Two free flowing right turns are provided for the southbound to westbound movements at these interchanges to accommodate high right turn volumes. Impacts and access to adjacent properties will determine which of the mentioned interchange layouts is chosen.

## 6. Traffic

### 6.1 Traffic Projections and Analysis Methodology

Details on traffic projections and analysis methodology are shown in Appendix E. Projects that move forward into the next phase of project development will go through a separate traffic projections and analysis process specific to the new project limits identified.

### 6.2 Existing vs Proposed

The Segment 1 alternative comparison clearly shows that LOS improves in both directions of travel and in both peak hours in the Build alternative when compared with the No Build alternative, as shown in Table 6-1. The PM peak hour showed the most improvement, with the eastbound percent of segments at LOS E or worse going from 33 percent to 11 percent and the westbound percent of segments at LOS E or worse going from 32 percent to 18 percent.

Table 6-1. Segment 1 Percent Passing Comparison - From the HCS Analysis

| Direction | Time <br> Period | Existing |  | 2042 No-Build |  | 2042 Build |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% LOS D or } \\ \text { better } \end{gathered}$ | \% LOS E or worse | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% LOS D or } \\ \text { better } \end{gathered}$ | \% LOS E or worse | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { LOS D or } \\ \text { better } \end{gathered}$ | \% LOS E or <br> worse |
| EB | AM | 87\% | 13\% | 80\% | 20\% | 93\% | 7\% |
|  | PM | 95\% | 5\% | 67\% | 33\% | 89\% | 11\% |
| WB | AM | 91\% | 9\% | 82\% | 18\% | 94\% | 6\% |
|  | PM | 82\% | 18\% | 68\% | 32\% | 82\% | 18\% |

The Segment 2 alternative comparison clearly shows that LOS improves in both the directions of travel and in both peak hours in the Build alternative when compared with the No Build alternative, as shown in Table 6-2. The PM peak hour showed the most improvement, with the eastbound percent of segments at LOS E or worse going from 76 percent to six percent and the westbound percent of segments at LOS E or worse going from 53 percent to 10 percent LOS E or worse. The eastbound AM peak hour also improved significantly, with the number segments at LOS E or worse reducing from 52 percent to nine percent.

Table 6-2. Segment 2 Percent Passing Comparison - From the HCS Analysis

| Direction | Time <br> Period | Existing |  | 2042 No-Build |  | 2042 Build |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% LOS D or } \\ \text { better } \end{gathered}$ | \% LOS E or <br> worse | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { LOS D or } \\ \text { better } \end{gathered}$ | \% LOS E or worse | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% LOS D or } \\ \text { better } \end{gathered}$ | \% LOS E or worse |
| EB | AM | 88\% | 12\% | 48\% | 52\% | 91\% | 9\% |
|  | PM | 85\% | 15\% | 24\% | 76\% | 94\% | 6\% |
| WB | AM | 89\% | 11\% | 56\% | 44\% | 58\% | 42\% |
|  | PM | 95\% | 5\% | 47\% | 53\% | 90\% | 10\% |

The Segment 2 No Build and Build 2042 alternative comparison was further analyzed using VISSIM 7, a traffic simulation software. The analysis shows improved driving conditions along the entire segment in the Build alternative when compared with the No Build alternative. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) increases in the Build alternative when compared with the No Build alternative, while annual delays in both hour and cost decrease, as shown in Table 6-3 and Table 6-4.

Table 6-3. Segment 2 AM Peak Hour Measures of Effectiveness Comparison

| MOE | AM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing AM | No-Build 2042 AM | Build 2042 AM |
| Total travel time (veh-hr) | 2,652.27 | 5,499.36 | 5,499.34 |
| Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 699 | 3,161 | 2,663 |
| Calculated Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 639 | 2,647 | 2,247 |
| Average Delay time per vehicle (sec/veh) | 81 | 275 | 210 |
| Average speed (mph) | 41 | 23 | 27 |
| Number of vehicles served | 28,330 | 34,703 | 38,549 |
| Travel Time (min/veh) | 5.62 | 9.51 | 8.56 |
| Annual Delay Hours | 524,000 | 2,371,000 | 1,998,000 |
| Annual Delay (\$) | \$ 9,520,000 | \$43,060,000 | \$36,280,000 |
| VMT | 107,154 | 127,001 | 147,836 |

Notes: Annual delay dollars based on 250 Working days/ 3 hours of peak traffic in each AM \& PM peak / \$18.19 per hour based on TTI's 2015
Urban Mobility Scorecard

Table 6-4. Segment 2 PM Peak Hour Measures of Effectiveness Comparison

| MOE | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing PM | No-Build 2042 PM | Build 2042 PM |
| Total travel time (veh-hr) | 2,982 | 7,875 | 4,901 |
| Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 974 | 6,103 | 1,785 |
| Calculated Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 872 | 4,319 | 1,574 |
| Average Delay time per vehicle (sec/veh) | 107 | 570 | 135 |
| Average speed (mph) |  | 37 | 12 |
| Number of vehicles served | 29,307 | 27,282 | 33 |
| Travel Time (min/veh) | 6.11 | 17.32 | 42,008 |
| Annual Delay Hours | 731,000 | $4,578,000$ | 7.00 |
| Annual Delay $(\$)$ | $\$ 13,270,000$ | $\$ 83,140,000$ | $1,339,000$ |
| VMT | 109,308 | 95,023 | $\$ 24,320,000$ |

Notes: Annual delay dollars based on 250 Working days/ 3 hours of peak traffic in each AM \& PM peak / \$18.19 per hour based on TTI's 2015
Urban Mobility Scorecard

The Segment 3 alternative comparison clearly shows that LOS improves in both the directions of travel and in both peak hours in the Build alternative when compared with the No Build alternative, as shown in Table 6-5. Both the AM and PM peak hours showed significant improvements over the No Build. The largest improvement was in the AM peak hour in the westbound direction, with the number of segments at LOS E or worse reducing from 53 percent to zero percent.

Table 6-5. Segment 3 Percent Passing Comparison

| Directio <br> n | Time <br> Period | Existing |  | 2042 No-Build |  | 2042 Build |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% LOS E or worse | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% LOS D or } \\ \text { better } \end{gathered}$ | \% LOS E or worse | \% LOS E or worse | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% LOS D or } \\ \text { better } \end{gathered}$ | \% LOS E or worse |
| EB | AM | 100\% | 0\% | 64\% | 36\% | 91\% | 9\% |
|  | PM | 87\% | 13\% | 36\% | 64\% | 79\% | 21\% |
| WB | AM | 93\% | 7\% | 47\% | 53\% | 100\% | 0\% |
|  | PM | 98\% | 2\% | 55\% | 45\% | 96\% | 4\% |

The Segment 3 No Build and Build 2042 alternative comparison was further analyzed using VISSIM 7. The analysis shows improved driving conditions along the entire segment in the Build alternative when compared with the No Build alternative. VMT increases in the Build alternative when compared with the No Build alternative, while annual delays in both hour and cost decrease, as shown in Table 6-6 and Table 6-7.

Table 6-6. Segment 3 AM Peak Hour Measures of Effectiveness Comparison

| MOE | AM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing AM | No-Build 2042 AM | Build 2042 AM |
| Total travel time (veh-hr) | 4,098 | 8,447 | 5,167 |
| Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 825 | 4,522 | 1,453 |
| Calculated Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 744 | 3,674 | 1,296 |
| Average Delay time per vehicle (sec/veh) | 69 | 285 | 97 |
| Average speed (mph) | 42 | 24 | 35 |
| Number of vehicles served | 38,687 | 46,403 | 48,326 |
| Travel Time (min/veh) | 6.36 | 10.92 | 6.42 |
| Annual Delay Hours | 619,000 | 3,391,000 | 1,090,000 |
| Annual Delay (\$) | \$11,240,000 | \$61,580,000 | \$19,790,000 |
| VMT | 170,592 | 204,005 | 181,142 |

Notes: Annual delay dollars based on 250 Working days/ 3 hours of peak traffic in each AM \& PM peak / \$18.19 per hour based on TTI's 2015 Urban Mobility Scorecard

Table 6-7. Segment 3 PM Peak Hour Measures of Effectiveness Comparison

\left.| MOE | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Existing PM | No-Build 2042 PM |$\right]$ Build 2042 PM

Notes: Annual delay dollars based on 250 Working days/ 3 hours of peak traffic in each AM \& PM peak / \$18.19 per hour based on TTI's 2015 Urban Mobility Scorecard

The Segment 4 alternative comparison clearly shows that LOS improves in both directions of travel and in both peak hours in the Build alternative when compared with the No Build alternative, as shown in Table 6-8. There are no segments in Segment 4 that operate at LOS E or worse in the Build alternative.

Table 6-8. Segment 4 Percent Passing Comparison

| Direction | Time <br> Period | Existing |  | 2042 No-Build |  | 2042 Build |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% LOS D or } \\ \text { better } \end{gathered}$ | \% LOS E or worse | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% LOS D or } \\ \text { better } \end{gathered}$ | \% LOS E or worse | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% LOS D or } \\ \text { better } \end{gathered}$ | \% LOS E or worse |
| EB | AM | 100\% | 0\% | 89\% | 11\% | 100\% | 0\% |
|  | PM | 89\% | 11\% | 79\% | 21\% | 100\% | 0\% |
| WB | AM | 100\% | 0\% | 79\% | 21\% | 100\% | 0\% |
|  | PM | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% |

### 6.3 Conclusion

Based on available data from TxDOT, cities in the El Paso Metropolitan area, and El Paso MPO, and on supplemental data provided by GRV, the traffic analysis concluded that if improvements are not implemented on l-10, delays and user costs will significantly increase over the next 20 years. Potential negative impacts to the economy (from large delays and increased incidences due to substandard design) can be mitigated if the improvements recommended in this report are implemented.

More details related to traffic analyses can be found in Appendix E.

## 7. Safety

I-10 in El Paso has had a recent increase in crashes, and TxDOT is placing high importance on reversing this trend. The public also put an emphasis on safety, rating it in the top three areas of concern for all four segments along the corridor, as shown in Figure 7-1.

## P <br> PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

## WE ASKED WHAT WAS IMPORTANT TO YOU AND THIS IS HOW YOU RESPONDED:



SEGMENT 4




Figure 7-1. Public Involvement

### 7.1 Existing Crash Analysis

To analyze the current safety impacts along l-10, crash data from years 2011 through 2015 was obtained from TxDOT and reviewed for crash patterns, trends, and types. Figure 7-2 shows crash density along l-10, Table 7-1 shows a crash rate analysis summary, and Table 7-2 shows the top crash contributing factors by segment.


Figure 7-2. I-10 Crash Density (2011-2015)

## Table 7-1. I-10 Crash Rate Analysis Summary (2011-2015)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Yearly Total | 410 | 658 | 411 | 607 | 1705 |
| Average Daily Traffic Volume* | 115,467 | 115,901 | 121,025 | 102,827 | 106,710 |
| I-10 Corridor Crash Rate | 17.50 | 27.98 | 16.73 | 29.09 | 78.73 |
| Statewide Average Crash Rate** | 70.21 | 94.14 | 99.44 | 108.82 | 142.21 |
| Corridor Safety Ratio | 0.25 | 0.30 | 0.17 | 0.27 | 0.55 |
| Five-Year Annual Average Safety Ratio | 0.31 or $69 \%$ less crashes than other urban interstate facilities |  |  |  |  |

Table 7-2. Top Crash Contributing Factors by Segment (2011-2015)

|  | Segment 1 | Segment 2 | Segment 3 | Segment 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Speeding | 267 | 338 | 600 | 101 |
| Driver Inattention/Distraction | 96 | 102 | 134 | 32 |
| Unsafe Lane Change | 85 | 93 | 134 | 15 |
| Followed Too Closely | 13 | 27 | 60 | 5 |
| Fatigued or Asleep | 16 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Faulty Evasive Action | 23 | 15 | 25 | 8 |
| Failed to Drive in Single Lane | 19 | 9 | 8 | 11 |
| Alcohol Related | 29 | 27 | 25 | 23 |
| Other | 167 | 101 | 127 | 88 |
| Information Not Reported | 199 | 215 | 389 | 62 |
| Total Crashes | 914 | 932 | 1506 | 349 |

### 7.2 Predictive Crash Analysis

A predictive crash analysis for each corridor-wide alternative was performed using ISATe to determine the relative safety of corridor-wide alternatives. Table 7-3 summarizes the results of this analysis. Each alternative is ranked from 1-5, with 5 being the worst. More detailed results and descriptions of how the predictive crash analysis was performed can be found in Appendix C.

Table 7-3. Predictive Crash Analysis Comparison

| Alternative | Total | Fatal | Injury | Property Damage Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Build | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 |

Results of the predictive crash analysis show Alternative 4 producing the most fatal and injury crashes. These results do not take into account the potential removal of truck traffic from the mainlanes. The barrier separated adaptive lanes were modeled as a four-lane facility with twice the expected traffic volume (instead of a two lane facility) due to software limitations, and the results were divided in half before being added to the mainlane crashes for Alternative 4. It is likely that crashes on the barrier separated adaptive lanes are overestimated since the potential for lane changes in the model (on a four-lane facility) created more opportunity for crashes.

Alternative 2, with its enhanced shoulder, had the best results in regards to safety, which was its intended purpose.

A predictive crash analysis was also conducted for the No Build and Build scenarios using the Interactive Highway Safety Design Model (IHSDM) to assess the potential safety benefits of recommended freeway capacity and ramp improvements compared to the current No Build condition. The analysis is "comparative" because it is based on the national safety performance functions (SPFs) published in the Highway Safety Manual (HSM). There are no approved and published calibration factors for predicting interstate and ramp crashes in Texas, therefore the analysis results do not represent the actual expected number of crashes but rather provide an indication of whether crashes and crash rates will increase or decrease.

The current and proposed geometry and projected traffic volume data was entered into IHSDM for the freeway segments and ramps. The software predicted the number of crashes on the 57.5 miles of freeway for the 21-year period from 2022 to 2042 (inclusive). The IHSDM model outputs for the No Build and Build mainlane conditions are presented in Appendix F.

The results of the freeway analysis are presented in Table 7-4 and Table 7-5. The predicted No Build crashes total 21,806 for the 21 years or 1,038 crashes per year, with 21.5 fatal and incapacitating injury crashes per year. The Build crashes total 15,916 for the 21 years or 758 crashes per year with 17.5 fatal and incapacitating injury crashes per year. The total crashes in the Build scenario is predicted to decrease by 27.0 percent. The fatal and serious injury crashes on the freeway are predicted to decrease by $18.5 \%$.

Table 7-4. Predicted Freeway Crashes by Severity (2022-2042)

|  | Severity |  |  |  |  | Total Crashes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fatal | Incapacitating <br> Injury | Non- <br> Incapacitating <br> Injury | Possible <br> Injury | PDO | Total | $\%$ <br> Change |
| No Build | 126 | 325 | 2221 | 3968 | 15167 | 21806 |  |
| Build | 103 | 265 | 1808 | 3225 | 10515 | 15916 | $-27.0 \%$ |

Table 7-5. Average Annual Predicted Freeway Crashes by Severity (2022-2042)

|  | Severity |  |  |  |  | Total Crashes |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fatal | Incapacitating <br> Injury | Non- <br> Incapacitating <br> Injury | Possible <br> Injury | PDO | Total | $\%$ <br> Change |
| No Build | 6.0 | 15.5 | 105.7 | 188.9 | 122.2 | 1038.4 |  |
| Build | 4.9 | 12.6 | 86.1 | 153.6 | 500.7 | 757.9 | $-27.0 \%$ |

Figures 7-3 through 7-6 show a breakdown of predicted crashes by segment.


Figure 7-3. Segment 1 Predicted Freeway Crashes by Severity (2022-2042)


Figure 7-4. Segment 2 Predicted Freeway Crashes by Severity (2022-2042)
$\square$ No Build Build


Figure 7-5. Segment 3 Predicted Freeway Crashes by Severity (2022-2042)


Figure 7-6. Segment 4 Predicted Freeway Crashes by Severity (2022-2042)

### 7.3 Crash Cost Comparison

As part of the predictive crash analysis, a crash cost comparison between the No Build and Build scenarios was produced. Crash cost is the monetary value of the impact of a crash based on crash severity. The purpose of the crash cost comparison was to determine whether or not the Build scenario would be cost efficient in terms of safety. The comparison was done using 2042 dollars. Crash cost was calculated by using the recommended national KABCO comprehensive crash unit costs in 2016 dollars as the base values for all crash severity types. A two percent yearly growth rate was used to obtain unit costs in 2042 dollars, as shown in Table 7-6.

Table 7-6. Unit Costs by Crash Type

| Crash Severity | 2018 Comprehensive Crash <br> Unit Costs | 2042 Comprehensive Crash <br> Unit Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K | $\$ 11,295,400$ | $\$ 18,901,927$ |
| A | $\$ 655,000$ | $\$ 1,096,089$ |
| B | $\$ 198,500$ | $\$ 332,173$ |
| C | $\$ 125,600$ | $\$ 210,181$ |

Crash data from the IHSDM model outputs for the No Build and Build scenarios was divided into quarter-mile segments along the I-10 corridor. The calculated unit costs in 2042 dollars were then applied to the crash data, and the difference in crash cost between the No Build and Build scenarios was calculated per quarter-mile segment. Figures 7-7 through 7-10 show crash cost difference for each of the four context areas.


Figure 7-7. Segment 1 Crash Cost Differential (2042 Dollars)


Figure 7-8. Segment 2 Crash Cost Differential (2042 Dollars)


Figure 7-9. Segment 3 Crash Cost Differential (2042 Dollars)


Figure 7-10. Segment 4 Crash Cost Differential (2042 Dollars)

The overall crash cost for the Build scenario is approximately $\$ 891$ million (2042 dollars) less than the overall crash cost for the No Build scenario. Quarter mile segments with a decrease in crash cost are a result of an increased number of lanes, improved mainlane and ramp geometry, or a reduced number of ramp connections within or near those segments. Quarter mile segments with an increase in crash cost are a result of added ramp connections that did not exist in the No Build scenario or increased traffic volume. It is expected that some of the quarter mile segments would have greater crash cost in the Build scenario due to relocation of existing ramp connections.

### 7.4 Safety Analysis Conclusion

Over the five-year period (2011-2015), 3,701 crashes were reported within the project limits. The TxDOT five-year average crash rate for urban interstate facilities reported 102.96 crashes per 100 million VMT. The entire length of I-10 within the project limits had a five-year average crash rate of 34.00 crashes per 100 million VMT, which is 69 percent lower than the five-year statewide average crash rate.

The results of the predictive crash analysis show that freeway crashes are predicted to decrease by 27.0 percent ( 5,890 crashes) between the No Build and Build scenario. This equates to an estimated $\$ 891$ million (2042 dollars) in overall crash cost savings.

The proposed improvements provide safety benefits, meet current design standards and meet desirable operational goals.

## 8. Bike and Pedestrian Recommendations

### 8.1 Corridor-Wide

The City of El Paso Bike Plan is accommodated between the frontage roads at each cross street.

### 8.2 Downtown

Bicycle level of traffic stress is a metric used to assess the comfort and connectivity of bicycle networks. Protected bike lanes provide a low level of traffic stress while sharrows (or no lane markings at all) provide a high level of traffic stress. Potential bicycle ridership increases exponentially as level of traffic stress decreases. Only experienced and confident riders are comfortable using facilities with a high level of traffic stress. These riders make up a small portion of the population. Unexperienced but interested riders, which make up a much larger portion of the population, are willing to use facilities that provide greater comfort. For this reason, the downtown bike layout is designed to provide low stress facilities (in the form of protected bike lanes) that connect existing low stress facilities. Sidewalks are provided along these protected bike lanes to accommodate pedestrians and improve their experience. An example of the potential bike and pedestrian facilities is illustrated in Figure 8-1.


Figure 8-1. Potential Bike and Pedestrian Facilities

Figure 8-2 shows how the proposed bicycle improvements connect existing low stress areas around downtown El Paso. Existing low stress facilities are indicated by solid green lines and proposed low stress facilities are indicated by dashed green lines.


Figure 8-2. Existing and Proposed Low Stress Facilities
The additional recommended low stress facility indicated by the dotted green lines would facilitate a connection between UTEP, downtown, and Medical Center of the Americas along SH 20. Linking these three high density activity centers could result in a highly utilized multimodal network but would require some improvements away from the Interstate facility.

### 8.3 Other Recommendations

Numerous comments were received during the public involvement process regarding potential bike and pedestrian facilities along the l-10 corridor. The following bike and pedestrian facilities are recommended in response to many of these comments:

- 12-foot two-way shared use paths along the eastbound and westbound frontage roads between Antonio Street and Vinton Road/Westway Boulevard
- 12-foot two-way shared use paths along the eastbound and westbound frontage roads between Vinton Road/Westway Boulevard and Loop 375
- Pedestrian bridge over I-10 at Trade Center Avenue near Canutillo High School
- 10-foot shared use path along the westbound frontage road between Executive Center Boulevard and UTEP
- 12-foot two-way cycle track along the westbound frontage road between UTEP and downtown
- 10-foot shared use paths along the eastbound and westbound frontage roads between downtown and Piedras Street


## 9. Technology Inventory and Recommendations

### 9.1 Current Corridor Technologies

TxDOT El Paso District has been implementing numerous intelligent transportation system (ITS) technologies and solutions on the l-10 corridor. The current deployment includes fiber optic communication, video surveillance, speed monitoring and data sharing with other agencies. The current breakdown of ITS technology deployed throughout the l-10 corridor is as follows:

- Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) Cameras: 38 cameras currently monitor 37 miles of the corridor starting at the New Mexico state line and end at Horizon Boulevard.
- Dynamic Message Signs (DMS): 25 signs provide information to the traveling public beginning at Westway Boulevard and ending at Horizon Boulevard.
- Vehicle Detectors: 141 detectors are stationed on 37 miles of the corridor starting at the New Mexico state line and end at Horizon Boulevard.
- Lane Control Signals: 34 LCS stations from Country Club Road. to Horizon Boulevard.
- Highway Advisory Radio: 9 controllers and 8 beacons provide information to tune into a preset station on the travelers radio.

The data received from these devices is transmitted to the TxDOT TransVista traffic management center (TMC) and shared with the City of El Paso's TMC and 911 emergency center which includes police, fire and emergency medical services (EMS).

The utilization of traditional ITS technologies can facilitate a smoother transition to autonomous and connected vehicles. The existing ITS infrastructure can support autonomous and connected hardware by mounting to the camera/detector poles and utilizing the same sources for power and communications backhaul as the existing ITS systems. This coordination is key to providing seamless implementation of future advancements in connected vehicles.

With expanding technology and ITS infrastructures, being able to provide a system that can adjust with additional networked devices is critical. To facilitate new technologies, TxDOT should ensure that legacy ITS technology is upgraded to include Ethernet based IP networking, has dedicated power, and has expansion capabilities. This will allow new technologies that require Power-over-Ethernet (POE) and a communications backhaul such as Dedicated Short Range Communications (DSRC) or 5G microcells to be readily added.

A full summary of current corridor technologies can be found in Appendix G.

### 9.2 Enhancements to Existing ITS Technologies

The I-10 Corridor already has a significant deployment of ITS equipment including CCTV, DMS, radar and Bluetooth vehicle detection equipment throughout the corridor. Travelers on the corridor have
access to cellular communications as well as trip planning applications and information dissemination mechanisms that allow for travelers to select alternative routes, modes, and time-ofday for their travel. At the same time, there are potential enhancements that could be made to the traditional ITS components that would strengthen their impact on reducing congestion and improving mobility. This section provides recommendations for potential near-term enhancements that could be made by TxDOT to increase the impact of existing ITS infrastructure on reducing congestion and improving mobility.

## (a) Power and Communications Upgrades

Dedicated power and a communications backhaul are the cornerstones of ITS deployments and are even more critical for emerging technologies. In preparation for emerging technologies, TxDOT should consider enhancing the existing power and communications links to include the following:

- Dedicated power with secondary power backup for ITS components.
- Inclusion of Power-over-Ethernet (PoE) as a power source at ITS deployment locations.
- Upgrades or installation of fiber-optic strands for ITS components linked to a Traffic Management Center. These fiber-optic strands should be at least 144 strands with 10 gigabits per second (Gbps) capabilities.
(b) Improvements to Closed Circuit Television Cameras

TxDOT has coverage of the l-10 freeway in this corridor. However, this coverage is not universal throughout the corridor even on I-10. Additional camera coverage could be added to include more segments of l-10 as well as additional coverage of arterials and alternative routes such as SR 62 and SR 375. The coverage of additional road segments will enable TxDOT to more quickly identify and clear incidents as well as monitoring traffic on $\mathrm{I}-10$ and alternative arterials.

The existing CCTV cameras as well as any additional cameras should be digital, IP based cameras that avoid the need for direct linkages to a TMS. Moving to a digital camera platform will enable TXDOT to deploy software-based technologies that can automatically process the digital images using advanced computer analytics to identify traffic incidents, perform vehicle classification and counts, and to provide information on traffic speeds.
(c) Improvements to Dynamic Message Signs

There is coverage of I-10 and SR 62 with respect to DMS but other potential alternative routes such as SR 375 are lacking DMS components. Understanding that DMS as a technology will be rendered obsolete by vehicle-to-vehicle ( V 2 V ) and vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) communications within the next two decades, there is still a role for DMS in the next 10-15 years to provide information to drivers of manually operated vehicles. TxDOT could consider replacing DMS components as they reach the end of their service life with high resolution full color LED instead of the existing monochrome displays.

Travelers along the I-10 Corridor have a number of trip planning applications and information sources as previously described. However, these are not integrated into a single, comprehensive mobile application that combines traffic information on I-10 and arterials with real-time transit information. TxDOT should consider developing or supporting the development of such an integrated trip planning and real-time traffic reporting application. As an alternative, TxDOT could consider entering into agreements with large aggregators of traffic and trip information such as Waze ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ and others.

## (e) Streetlight Improvements

Streetlights are not typically considered to be ITS components. However, advances in streetlights include conversion to LED as well as dynamically controlled lighting based upon motion and the amount of ambient light. New streetlights also include the ability for additional sensors, such as weather sensors, to be added. When performing routine replacement of existing streetlights in the I10 corridor, TxDOT should ensure that the replacements have the ability to add sensors (e.g., inclusion of 5-pin or 7-pin ports on the top of the light for plug in modules).

### 9.3 Investments for Emerging Technologies

Not all emerging technologies will have an immediate impact on congestion, mobility, and travel time reliability. However, these technologies will emerge rapidly and it is important for TxDOT to be in a position to capitalize upon these technologies when the market saturation is such that they will have a significant impact.
(a) Truck Parking and Port of Entry (POE) Reservation System

TxDOT could implement a truck parking and port of entry (POE) reservation pilot system along the I10 corridor. This system would utilize smart truck parking signs which would display available parking spaces at designated truck parking lots near the l-10 corridor between the Anthony Travel Center and Fabens rest areas. This system would need to be developed in coordination with local area businesses such as private operated travel centers and plazas, large big-box retailers and other area businesses to ensure that there is capacity to handle the truck parking spots and to install technology to automatically determine parking availability. Currently, there are a number of technology solutions on the market that can be installed to track the number of available parking spots. The trucks could use these parking spaces as a way to make local deliveries more efficient and reduce the driving time and emissions emitted by trucks trying to find available overnight parking.

Truck parking spaces could be used as a staging area for border crossing. Trucks that are parked at these locations could wait until they receive their reserved border inspection time and then travel to the POE at that time. Allowing for trucks to be parked before moving through their POE could reduce driver time in the truck, reduce fuel consumption, reduce idling time at the border and reduce truck emissions.

If this system were to be contemplated, a baseline of data would need to be gathered (if not already known) to determine the additional driving time, costs and emissions looking for a parking spot as
well as the time, costs and emissions generated waiting to pass through the POE. This data would then need to be compared to the pilot generated data to determine if there has been any measurable decrease in time, cost, and emissions. If there is a positive effect on time, cost and emissions, the pilot could potentially be expanded.

A 2020 study on truck parking for TxDOT found that around urban centers and major freight corridors throughout the state, authorized truck parking locations are at or overcapacity most weekday nights, and many for most of the day. There are approximately 27,000 authorized truck parking spaces statewide, publicly and privately owned, and on an average weekday night at the peak hour there are:

- 32,000 trucks needing a safe and authorized place to park.
- 21,000 trucks parked at authorized locations.
- 5,000 trucks that have no access to authorized locations.
- 6,000 trucks parking in unauthorized locations because the authorized parking is not located where drivers need it, or missing the necessary amenities, or is lacking in some other way.

The Reimagine I-10 Study identified a total of 959 existing truck parking spaces along the I-10 corridor within the study area using findfuelstops.com supplemented with aerial imagery. This included 373 spaces in Segment 1, zero spaces in Segment 2, 17 spaces in Segment 3, and 569 spaces in Segment 4.

Based on capacity needs, safety needs, and freight network significance, the TxDOT truck parking study identified one truck parking location with "High Capacity Need", one truck parking location with "Medium Capacity Need", and one truck parking location with "Low Capacity Need" in Segment 1. Two truck parking locations with "High Capacity Need" and one truck parking location with "Medium Capacity Need" were identified in Segment 4. Additionally, I-10 from Artcraft Road to FM 793 was identified as a corridor with high truck parking needs, which includes all of Segment 2 and Segment 3.

The TxDOT truck parking study recommends expanded and upgraded facilities with more spaces and amenities in Anthony and Fabens. The study also identifies the need for a new truck staging/parking facility near the Zaragoza Road interchange. These locations would be good candidates for the technology pilots mentioned in this report to test the effectiveness of smart truck parking signs and staging with POE reservations.

## (b) 5 G

Globally, there have been over 20 trials testing cellular vehical-to-everything (C-V2X) technology with three in the United States. These trials have been utilizing the C-V2X process control module 5 (PCM5) protocol while using a 4GLTE network. C-V2X 5G new radio (NR) has been evaluated in China and one is in the process of being trialed in Ann Arbor, Michigan in the fall of 2019. The goal of the 5G project would be to determine whether the use of C-V2X through a 5G network can reduce congestion, increase speed and traffic throughput and reduce traffic incidents, accidents and fatalities on the
pilot project corridor. A portion of the I-10 corridor in El Paso has been identified as having the potential for a deployment of 5G C-V2X technology to test the various V2X technologies. The corridor, which stretches from Schuster Avenue to Copia Street is approximately 4 miles. A 5G cell network covering the span of I-10 from Schuster Avenue to Copia Street utilizing different types of cells, Picocells or Microcells, is being proposed for the pilot project.

Based on past deployments of cellular technology, the City of El Paso and the l-10 corridor is not expected to have 5G cellular service deployed until 2021. The almost 2 year timeframe should allow for a project plan to be put together and stakeholders engaged and committed. In addition, grant funding that could pay for some of the cost of the pilot project could be applied for. Launching a pilot project in the spring or summer of 2021 should not be out of the realm of possibilities. TxDOT will want to determine, in conjunction with the project partners, the length of the pilot, which could run for months in order to properly assess the technology in all type of driving conditions. Performance measurements to accurately assess the impacts of the pilot would include:

- Number of vehicles connected and participating in the pilot.
- Measuring the signal speed, both sending and receiving data, from the 5G cells.
- Speed of traffic along the l-10 corridor to determine whether there has been an increase/decrease in overall throughput and travel times.
- Capturing other traffic data including measuring traffic incidents (near misses that may be determined by analyzing driving data), traffic accidents and fatalities.
(c) Electrification Corridor

TxDOT will want to consider deploying an electric vehicle electrification pilot project along the l-10 corridor. The goal of the pilot would be to gather data to determine:

- Whether the addition of charging stations will lead to an increase in the number of electric vehicles that are owned and operated in El Paso.
- Whether public installation of charging stations will spur additional investment from private electric vehicle charging station operators.
- Whether the increase in electric vehicles has a measurable impact on lowering emissions in the l-10 corridor area.

Three different use cases for deploying electric vehicle charging stations have been developed including installing charging stations at rest stops on I-10, converting an I-10 lane to an HOV EV lane and installing charging stations at major area employers along the $\mathrm{l}-10$ corridor.
(i) I-10 Rest Area Electric Vehicle Charging Station Pilot

Rest stops on l-10 at the Anthony Travel Center and Fabens rest areas were recommended for installing electric vehicle charging stations over others because they are owned and operated by TxDOT, have a high enough volume of vehicles due to easy access to l-10, and are at a location that encourages vehicles to remain idle for a period of time. Constructing charging infrastructure in
facilities where travelers are already stopping and potentially dwelling for a substantial amount of time provides an opportunity to offer both consumer facing and commercial facing charging facilities.

## (ii) $\mathrm{I}-10 \mathrm{HOV}$ EV Lanes Pilot

The concept of managed lanes is growing in El Paso, and there is an opportunity to combine the use of HOV lanes with electric vehicles (EV) as a way to incentivize the increased purchase and use of electric vehicles along the I-10 corridor. Along a 4-mile corridor on I-10, from Schuster Avenue to Copia Street, TxDOT should dedicate one lane in either direction as a dedicated HOV EV lane. The use of HOV EV lanes would reduce current and future traffic congestions for drivers of electric vehicles that drive in the HOV EV lane. If successful, the length of the HOV EV lanes could be expanded beyond Schuster Avenue and Copia Street to further encourage adoption of electric vehicles.
(iii) Install Charging Stations at Major Area Employers along the I-10 Corridor Pilot

In addition to installing charging stations at rest areas along the I-10 corridor, TxDOT should consider partnering with major local area employers near the l-10 corridor to deploy electric vehicle charging stations. TxDOT, in conjunction with major employers, both public and private, should deploy electric vehicle charging stations at work locations throughout El Paso near the l-10 corridor. Considerations for TxDOT to determine the right employer partners would include:

- Number of employees.
- Proximity to l-10.
- Number of visitors/customers.
- Other attributes.

Major industries to consider are healthcare organizations, education and Fort Bliss. Other companies in the electric industry may also be good employer partners for this pilot.
(d) UAS Incident Management

TxDOT may want to consider developing a pilot for the use of Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) to aid in the event of a traffic incident or accident along the l-10 corridor. Significant regulatory requirements, both from a federal and state level, limit the type of pilot project that can be recommended. Regulations from a federal standpoint are governed under the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) which controls how a vehicle operates within the airspace. At the state level, Texas regulations and laws control who can use Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) and for what specific activities or purposes they can be used with privacy being a significant concern. While these rules and regulations are being updated based on technology development and feedback from industry and learnings from approved pilots, the suggested pilots should be able to comply with both federal and state regulatory requirements as they exist today.

While regulatory considerations are important when considering an UAS pilot project, current technology constraints also act as a limiting factor. Current mobile UASs allow for aerial drones to
operate up to 1 hour in a range of up to 6 miles with sustained winds of less than 40 miles per hour. These mobile systems are intended to be used by people at an incident scene. In addition to mobile systems, stationary systems allow for drones to be deployed from a fixed point, which can reduce the time it take so deploy a drone from a mobile location. These stationary systems can come with a tethered which allows for the drone to remain in a fixed position but allows for a longer use based on a battery management system remaining on the ground. In addition, stationary systems also have the flexibility to release a drone to fly, similar to a mobile drone system, but allows for the drone to be housed in a weather-protected port while it is being stored and charged.

There are a number of UASs being tested in a variety of different use cases around North America. In Canada, the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) Traffic Safety and Operational Support Command has been using UAS since 2012 to enhance search and rescue operations and map collision scenes for the Highway Safety Division (HSD). North Carolina is utilizing UAS to support construction inspections and reconstruct accident scenes in order to open travel lanes more quickly. The Texas Department of Public Safety has developed a UAS program with systems in operation across Texas. The Texas program has provided support to local law-enforcement to develop UAS programs and has developed a policy for how those operations should take place.

The first pilot project would involve the use of a mobile UAS along the I-10 corridor when there is a traffic incident or accident. The UAS is operated by a pilot on-scene and is used to gain a higher vantage point of the incident, allowing a better view of the on-ground details. These systems have been successful in this use, as they can give the first responders a better situational awareness of the area, better understand the extent of the accident, better detect the extent of spilled fluids and accident debris, and give a clearer picture of the position and location of evidence available for reconstruction.

The second pilot project would involve the deployment of stationary UASs along the $\mathrm{I}-10$ corridor where they can be deployed in the event of a traffic incident or accident. The second pilot is a system of stationary UASs located along the corridor that could deploy quickly in response to an accident to give a better understanding of an incident scene. In this scenario, the vehicle would only operate vertically from the base station and would rely on the high resolution of the camera to capture the imagery from an incident. This system could cut the time required to get a camera on an incident, but it would also come at the expense of the greater detail that would come from a first responder operating the UAV.

A Concept of Operations or Operational Deployment Protocol will need to be developed specifically for use along the El Paso I-10 corridor. This will inform the basic operation of the program, who is responsible for what, how communications and coordination between agencies will be managed, and different operational protocols for different scenarios. Additionally, it should define how the UAS program is integrated with the existing Traffic Management Center and operations. Finally, performance measures such as vehicle control and operation, communication, image quality, response time and maintenance should all be analyzed during the pilot.
(e) Platooning

TxDOT has an opportunity to develop a truck platooning pilot to improve safety, reduce environmental impacts, and alleviate congestion along the I-10 corridor. The El Paso area is home to the third busiest truck border port in the United States and serves as a commercial freight, truck and air hub for the region. Truck freight uses the I-10 corridor and surrounding street network and is distributed throughout El Paso in one of four ways: 1) through trips; 2) POE destinations; 3) local destinations; and 4) intermodal destinations such as rail yards and the airport.

Many states prohibit truck platooning through following-too-closely (FTC) statutes but over 20 states, including Texas, have enacted FTC exemptions to allow for truck platooning. While the regulatory environment is open for piloting, testing and innovation, the technology component which will allow for the safe usage of truck platooning technology is just being developed. Platooning technology allows multiple vehicles to virtually couple such that vehicles can accelerate and brake simultaneously based on the steering, acceleration, and braking inputs of the lead vehicle. The connection between vehicles can be done via dedicated short-range communications or 5G connected vehicle technology, with the vehicle controls for platooning vehicles being automated. In addition, Vehicle-to-Vehicle (V2V) safety applications utilize communication between vehicles to prevent crashes while Vehicle-to-Infrastructure (V2I) safety applications integrate roadside communication infrastructure and vehicle data to enhance safety to drivers. Truck platooning is expected to improve capacity through reduced headways, decrease collisions, and increase fuel economy due to increased connectivity and automating among vehicles. Platooning technology requires trucks that are of similar size, that are new models and include required technology, and by similar manufacturers that allow shared use of proprietary technology.

There are a number of truck platooning pilot project that have either been completed or are currently underway. Several companies have completed demonstrations in Texas, Michigan, North Carolina, Florida, and other locations. Volvo Trucks North America and FedEx are running truck platoons in North Carolina and report fuel savings when operating along long distances on interstate environments. In addition, Peloton Technology recently unveiled technology for truck platooning that allows a single driver to drive a pair of vehicles. Peloton's proprietary technologies link pairs of heavy trucks for connected driving that improves aerodynamics, fuel economy and safety, using V2V communications and radar-based active braking systems, combined with vehicle control algorithms. While still in development, truck platooning technology may be ready for a pilot project in the I-10 corridor in the near term.

I-10 is uniquely located across a major metropolitan area, along a regional and national east-west corridor, and adjacent to the U.S.-Mexico border. These characteristics provide opportunities for truck platooning use cases that will improve efficiency for truckers, commercial companies, and the local economy.

There are over two dozen drayage operations, freight that is shipped over relatively short distances, along l-10 in El Paso. Truck platooning will provide coordinated travel reliability that enhances efficiency. Through the use of a dynamic freight staging application, vehicles within a specified area will communicate their origins and destinations. The system will analyze the information provided and coordinate Dynamic Freight Staging. Dynamic freight staging will introduce the capability to group trucks at their origin or destination for a short period of time before, during or after a delivery. Drivers and shippers will be incentivized to use this service by the time and fuel savings afforded through signal priority. The application could be designed with the capability to build in reservation of delivery windows at El Paso International Airport and other area freight facilities.

## (ii) Border Operations

Cross-border truck volumes continue to increase with hundreds of thousands of trucks passing through the El Paso border each year. Through enhanced coordination of multiple trucks traveling similar paths and distances, truck platoons can improve cross-border travel reliability and efficiency. With an eye towards future port of entry (POE) reservation, truck platoons could reduce queuing at border crossings. This deployment will build off of the improvements in drayage operations with signals along Airway Boulevard and Montana Avenue to be upgraded to include new controllers and DSRC. Trucks will be organized into non-autonomous "guided platoons" or road trains of three to five vehicles with similar routes through dynamic matching based on origin and destination. This use case will showcase many of the benefits of semi-autonomous platooning without the need for cooperative adaptive cruise control, a technology that has yet to become adopted widespread. The establishment of platoons will also serve as a basis for enacting signal priority, which will be requested through cellular technology.

## (iii) Long Haul Trucking

Approximately 55 miles of the 880-mile Texas I-10 corridor are located in the study area. Trucks equipped with proper technology and of suitable size and condition will be able to form platoons at the eastern and western ends of the study area through the use of cooperative adaptive cruise control. At the western end of the study area, Exit 0 in Anthony, Texas provides Flying J Travel Plaza, Pilot Travel Center, and Love's Travel Stop suitable for truck staging. At this location, trucks coming from the west can stop, rest, and connect in a platoon for the travel east through the study area. At the eastern end of the study area, Exit 49 in Fabens, Texas provides Fast Trak travel center with amenities for truckers. At this location, trucks from the east can stop, rest, and connect in a platoon for the travel west through El Paso. Long haul trucking will benefit from fuel savings during platooning across this approximately 55 mile stretch of interstate. The associated benefit to El Paso will be improved air quality from fewer emissions from trucks passing through the region.

Truck platooning deployments will rely on a combination of public and private partnerships. Traffic signal improvements along Airway Boulevard and Montana Avenue to include new controllers and

DSRC will be a public sector responsibility while implementation of 5 G technology will require investments from the private sector. Performance measures identified for the proposed truck platooning pilot would analyze the following data before and after the pilot to determine whether there has been a measurable change:

- Number of crashes.
- Fuel usage.
- Delivery time.
- Emissions.


## 10. Implementation Plan

Break out projects and interim improvements were identified for the Reimagine I-10 corridor. More details on break out projects can be found in Appendix H, and more details on interim improvements can be found in Appendix I.

### 10.1 Break Out Projects

Break out projects are projects that can be constructed independently and make up part of the recommended improvements for the whole corridor. Since they typically involve only a small fraction of the project limits, break out projects are useful as they can be done with much less funding and can target areas with the most significant issues. Break out projects differ from interim improvements in that they do not have to be completely reconstructed to match the ultimate design for the corridor.
(a) Segment 1

Ongoing and upcoming projects in Segment 1 include the new Los Mochis Drive underpass, direct connectors and ramping changes near the Artcraft Road interchange, roundabouts and frontage road bypasses at the Thorn Avenue interchange, the Go10 project, and the new Mesa Park Drive interchange. A study for improvements to the SH 20 (Mesa Street) interchange is also underway. In addition to these ongoing and upcoming projects, the Reimagine I-10 Study proposes corridor reconstruction between the New Mexico state line and Loop 375, shared use paths between Antonio Street and Vinton Road, a pedestrian bridge across I-10 at Canutillo High School, adaptive lanes between Thorn Avenue and Executive Center Boulevard, new frontage roads and ramping improvements between US 85 and Executive Center Boulevard, and truck parking as break out projects. Segment 1 break out projects along with estimated cost and timeframe are shown in Figure 10-1.
(b) Segment 2

This area of I-10 contains two of El Paso's major trip attractors: downtown and UTEP. The worst mainlane congestion and pavement quality also exist in this segment. Recommended break out projects include corridor reconstruction between Executive Center Boulevard and Schuster Avenue, and corridor reconstruction between Schuster Avenue and Copia Street. Segment 2 break out projects along with estimated cost and timeframe are shown in Figure 10-2.

## (c) Segment 3

Recommended break out projects in Segment 3 include corridor reconstruction between Copia Street and US 62 (Paisano Drive), corridor reconstruction between US 62 (Paisano Drive) and Airway Boulevard, corridor reconstruction between Airway Boulevard and Yarbrough Drive, and corridor reconstruction between Yarbrough Drive and Eastlake Boulevard. Segment 3 break out projects along with estimated cost and timeframe are shown in Figure 10-3.
(d) Segment 4

Recommended break out projects in Segment 4 include the Eastlake Boulevard interchange, corridor reconstruction between Eastlake Boulevard and Horizon Boulevard, the Horizon Boulevard interchange, corridor reconstruction between Horizon Boulevard and FM 1110, a new interchange near MM 40-41, the FM 1110 interchange, frontage roads between FM 1110 and FM 3380, mainlane reconstruction between FM 1110 and FM 3380, the FM 793 interchange, the FM 3380 interchange, and truck parking. Segment 4 break out projects along with estimated cost and timeframe are shown in Figure 10-4.


Figure 10-1. Segment 1 Break Out Projects


Figure 10-2. Segment 2 Break Out Projects


Figure 10-3. Segment 3 Break Out Projects


Figure 10-4. Segment 5 Break Out Projects

### 10.2 Interim Improvements

Interim improvements are short- to mid-term improvements to address more immediate needs for the corridor until funding can be obtained for larger-scale projects. Unlike break out projects, interim improvements do not match the ultimate design for the corridor.
(a) Segment 1

Pavement rehabilitation is recommended as an interim improvement to increase the remaining life of mainlane pavement between Transmountain Drive and Northern Pass Drive, and between Thorn Avenue and US 85. Segment 1 interim improvements along with estimated cost and timeframe are shown in Figure 10-5.
(b) Segment 3

Pavement reconstruction is recommended as an interim improvement to replace mainlane pavement between Copia Street and Raynolds Street.

Construction on the US 54 interchange to facilitate new movements and streamline access to Bridge of the Americas will begin shortly. A bottleneck currently exists east of US 54, caused by the weaving between the US 62 (Paisano Drive) entrance and the US 54 exit. Congestion in this area will likely increase with the planned expansion of Medical Center of the Americas. Interim operational improvements may be able to improve the flow of mainlane traffic. Two potential ramp removals in this area are the eastbound Chelsea Street exit and the westbound US 62 (Paisano Drive) entrance. The eastbound Chelsea Street exit could be barrier separated from the mainlanes to maintain access from US 54. Removal of the Chelsea Street underpass might further improve operations in this area. The westbound Raynolds Street entrance would carry higher volume as a result of the westbound US 62 (Paisano Drive) entrance ramp removal. The l-10 mainlanes should be more capable of handling this high-volume entrance west of the US 54 exit, where volume on the mainlanes are lower (only vehicles exiting at Copia Street would need to be in the far right lane).

Pavement reconstruction is recommended as an interim improvement to replace mainlane pavement between Raynolds Street and Buffalo Soldier Road, and between McRae Boulevard and Lomaland Drive.

The worst areas of congestion in the Segment 32042 No Build VISSIM model are along frontage roads and at intersections. Synchro results were analyzed to determine the intersections with the greatest delay in the 2042 No Build scenario. These intersections, and interim improvements, are as follows:

## Buffalo Soldier Road

Signalize the Buffalo Soldier Road intersection with the westbound Frontage Road.

## Airway Boulevard

Convert the U-turn lane to a left-U turn lane and the left-thru lane to a thru lane on the eastbound Frontage Road approach. Convert the rightmost thru lane to a right turn lane on the westbound Frontage Road approach. Make the right turn lane from the southbound Airway Boulevard approach channelized and free flowing. Optimize Airway Boulevard interchange signals.

## McRae Boulevard

Convert the U-turn lane to a left-U turn lane and the left-thru lane to a thru lane on the eastbound Frontage Road approach. Convert the left-thru lane to a thru lane on the northbound McRae Boulevard approach. Convert the left-thru lane to a thru lane on the westbound Frontage Road approach. Add a right turn lane with significant storage length to the southbound McRae Boulevard approach. Optimize McRae Boulevard interchange signals.

## Yarbrough Drive

Convert the U-turn lane to a left-U turn lane and the left-thru lane to a thru lane on the eastbound Frontage Road approach. Convert the left-thru lane to a thru lane on the northbound Yarbrough Drive approach. Convert the U-turn lane to a left-U turn lane and the left-thru lane to a thru lane on the westbound Frontage Road approach. Add a right turn lane with significant storage length to the southbound Yarbrough Drive approach. Optimize Yarbrough Drive interchange signals.

## Lee Trevino Drive

Convert the left-thru lane to a left turn lane on the northbound Lee Trevino Drive approach. Restripe the bridge portion to eight 11-foot lanes. On the southbound Lee Trevino Drive approach, add a left turn lane and convert the left-thru lane to a thru lane. Also convert the rightmost thru lane to a thruright turn lane. Optimize the Lee Trevino Drive interchange signals.

## Zaragoza Road

Convert the left-thru lane to a left turn lane on the eastbound Frontage Road approach. Convert the left-thru lane to a thru lane on the northbound Zaragoza Road approach. Add a right turn lane to the southbound Zaragoza Road approach. Optimize Zaragoza Road interchange signals.

Segment 3 interim improvements along with estimated cost and timeframe are shown in Figure 106.
(c) Segment 4

The Eastlake Boulevard and Horizon Boulevard interchanges are projected to have significant delay in the 2042 No Build scenario. Changes to lane assignment at these interchanges may alleviate congestion. Recommended interim improvements are as follows:

## Eastlake Boulevard Interchange

Convert the left-thru lane to a left turn lane on the eastbound Frontage Road approach. Convert one thru lane to an additional right turn lane on the southbound Eastlake Boulevard approach. Optimize Eastlake Boulevard interchange signals.

## Horizon Boulevard Interchange

Convert the left-thru lane to a left turn lane on the eastbound Frontage Road approach. Convert one thru lane to an additional right turn lane on the southbound Horizon Boulevard approach. Optimize Horizon Boulevard interchange signals.

Additionally, three ramps (the eastbound Horizon Boulevard exit, westbound Horizon Boulevard entrance, and westbound Eastlake Boulevard entrance) in Segment 4 are projected to be over capacity in the No Build 2042 scenario. If improvements were made to these ramps, they would likely not be salvageable, so a break out project is not prioritized. Interim improvements could address capacity issues by adding a lane to each of these ramps. Segment 4 interim improvements along with estimated cost and timeframe are shown in Figure 10-7.


Figure 10-5. Segment 1 Interim Improvements


Figure 10-6. Segment 3 Interim Improvements


Figure 10-7. Segment 4 Interim Improvements

## 11. Benefit Cost Analysis

### 11.1 Preliminary Cost Estimate

Preliminary cost estimates were developed for each of the four segments using TxDOT statewide average low bid unit prices from 2018. Costs include earthwork and landscape, subgrade treatments and base, surface courses and pavement, structures, miscellaneous construction, lighting, signing, markings and signals. Costs were then inflated to future years, which vary by segment. Preliminary cost estimates are shown in Table 11-1. It should be noted that these cost estimates are very highlevel and intended to show the magnitude of the costs. More specific cost estimates will be performed in later phases of project development.

Table 11-1. Preliminary Cost Estimates

|  | Segment 1 | Segment 2 | Segment 3 | Segment 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | New Mexico State <br> Line (MM 0) to Executive Center Blvd (MM 16) | Executive Center Blvd (MM 16) to Chelsea St (MM 23) | Chelsea St (MM 23) to Loop 375 (MM 35) | Loop 375 (MM 35) to FM 3380 (MM 58) |
| Earthwork and Landscape Subtotal | \$104,610,000 | \$109,820,000 | \$252,140,000 | \$30,650,000 |
| Subgrade Treatments and Base Subtotal | \$94,140,000 | \$46,290,000 | \$74,130,000 | \$186,160,000 |
| Surface Courses and Pavement Subtotal | \$169,480,000 | \$83,120,000 | \$133,770,000 | \$338,720,000 |
| Structures Subtotal | \$405,440,000 | \$449,510,000 | \$332,990,000 | \$143,850,000 |
| Miscellaneous Construction Subtotal | \$97,720,000 | \$41,560,000 | \$67,400,000 | \$134,340,000 |
| Lighting, Signing, Markings and Signals Subtotal | \$37,990,000 | \$24,070,000 | \$32,560,000 | \$47,430,000 |
| Current Estimate Total (2018) | \$909,380,000 | \$754,370,000 | \$892,990,000 | \$881,150,000 |
| Inflated Current Estimate | \$1,196,680,000 | \$1,161,320,000 | \$1,739,460,000 | \$1,716,390,000 |
| Year of Inflated Current Estimate | 2025 | 2029 | 2035 | 2035 |

### 11.2 Benefit-Cost Analysis

A benefit-cost analysis (BCA) was performed to determine the cost effectiveness of Reimagine I-10 recommendations. The BCA considers travel time savings, vehicle operating costs, trucking costs, crash costs, emissions costs, operations and maintenance costs, and capital costs to calculate net present value (NPV) and benefit-cost ratio (BCR). Results are shown both undiscounted and discounted to future years in Table 11-2 below.

## Table 11-2. Benefit-Cost Analysis Results

Summary of Results Over the Study Period. All Values in Millions of 2018\$

| Impact Categories | NPV Over 20 Years of Operations |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Undiscounted | 7\% |
| Benefits |  |  |
| Travel Time Savings | \$1,071.4 M | \$209.9 M |
| Vehicle Operating Cost Savings | (\$146.9 M) | (\$28.8 M) |
| Avoided Trucking Costs | \$274.4 M | \$53.8 M |
| Safety Improvement Benefits | \$295.2 M | \$61.4 M |
| Emission Reduction Benefits | (\$2.1 M) | (\$0.5 M) |
| O\&M Cost Savings | (\$45.4 M) | (\$9.4 M) |
| PV Benefits | \$1,446.6 M | \$286.4 M |
| Costs |  |  |
| Capital Costs | \$3,437.9 M | \$1,335.3 M |
| PV Costs | \$3,437.9 M | \$1,335.3 M |
| Net Present Value (NPV) | (\$1,991.3 M) | (\$1,048.9 M) |

Summary of Key Financial Metrics. All Values in Millions of 2018\$

| Key Financial Metrics | Undiscounted | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total Benefits | $\$ 1,446.62 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 286.42 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Total Costs | $\$ 3,437.89 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 1,335.31 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Net Present Value (NPV) | $(\$ 1,991.27 \mathrm{M})$ | $(\$ 1,048.89 \mathrm{M})$ |
| Return on Investment (ROI) | $-58 \%$ | $-79 \%$ |
| Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) | 0.42 | 0.21 |
| Payback Period (years) | $>20 \mathrm{yrs}$ | $>20 \mathrm{yrs}$ |
| Internal Rate of Return (IRR) | $-7.2 \%$ |  |

The undiscounted BCR is 0.42 and the discounted BCR (using a $7 \%$ discount rate) is 0.21 . This difference is due to the fact that benefits come at a later year than costs. Both BCRs are low due to high project costs. All corridor study recommendations were included in the BCA. Many recommendations identified as break out projects and interim improvements likely have higher BCRs.

The full benefit-cost analysis can be found in Appendix K.

## 12. Projects, Reports, and Studies

Below is a list of projects, reports, and studies that were considered in the Reimagine l-10 Study:

- Page 2-5. TxDOT Border Transportation Masterplan 2018 Border Crossing Data (October 2019)
- Page 2-6. TxDOT Analysis of Mitigation Strategies for I-10 Corridor Hot Spots (August 2007)
- Page 2-6. TxDOT I-10 and Loop 375 Corridor Simulation Study (August 2009)
- Page 2-6. TxDOT Zaragoza Preliminary Improvement Concepts (September 2009)
- Page 5-9. TxDOT EI Paso County Regional Transit Institutional Options Feasibility Study (April 2019)
- Page 8-1. City of El Paso Bike Plan (August 2016)
- Page 9-4. TxDOT Truck Parking Study (February 2020)

Additional projects, reports, and studies incorporated:

- I-10 third lane New Mexico state line to SH 20 (Mesa St) (CSJ 2121-01-094)
- VE Study Recommendations
- Los Mochis Drive
- Thorn Avenue
- SH 178
- Mesa Street - SH 20 Corridor Study (CSJ 0001-02-059)
- Go10 (CSJ 2121-02-137)
- Mesa Park Drive Interchange (CSJ 2121-02-150)
- Border West Expressway (CSJ 2552-04-027)
- Paseo Del Norte Deck Plaza
- UPRR improvements
- I-10 Connect (CSJ 0167-01-113)
- MCA masterplan
- Borderland Expressway (CSJ 0924-06-136)
- Private developments at Eastlake Boulevard interchange
- Horizon Boulevard (FM 1281) Corridor Study (CSJ 3451-01-032)
- Border Highway East Study (CSJ 0924-06-090)
- Fabens airport enhancements

Additional reports are referenced in documents in the appendices.
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## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose

Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) in coordination with, El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and City of El Paso is conducting a study of the Interstate Highway 10 (I-10) Corridor from the New Mexico Stateline to FM 3380 (Aguilera International Highway) (Figure 1-1). The study's purpose is to analyze current and future transportation needs for the EI Paso I-10 Corridor.


Figure 1-1. I-10 Study Limits

### 1.2 Study Context

To better evaluate the elements of the corridor, the corridor was broken into four segments, or context areas, to identify unique characteristics and needs specific to that segment which may not be applicable to the entire project area. The four segments are as follows:

- Segment 1: Northern Gateway (New Mexico State Line to Executive Center Boulevard)
- Segment 2: Downtown (Executive Center Boulevard to Raynolds Street)
- Segment 3: Airport (Raynolds Street to Eastlake Boulevard)
- Segment 4: Southern Gateway (Eastlake Boulevard to FM 3380)

Figure 1-2 shows the breakdown of each segment along I-10.


Figure 1-2. l-10 Segments
(a) Segment 1: Northern Gateway

I-10 is a four-lane divided highway from the New Mexico state line to SH 20 (Mesa Street) and a sixlane separated highway from SH 20 (Mesa Street) to Executive Center Boulevard. This section has a posted speed limit of 75 miles per hour (mph) from Antonio Street to Redd Rd where the speed limit decreases to 60 mph . This section has continuous frontage roads from Antonio Street to SH 20 (Mesa Street) with a posted speed limit of 55 mph .

Land use in this segment is primarily residential with several industrial sites and a few major entertainment and retail attractions. These attractions include Wet ' $N$ ' Wild Waterworld near the New Mexico State Line, the Outlet Shoppes at El Paso just north of the Loop 375 interchange, and Sunland Park Mall between Sunland Park Drive and the SH 85 interchange. Long stretches of undeveloped land border I-10 north of Loop 375, but some major development is taking place around the Loop 375 interchange. South of Artcraft Road/Paseo del Norte density increases and land use is primarily residential. The two-mile stretch along I-10 between the SH 85 interchange and Executive Center Boulevard is undeveloped with uneven terrain.

The north end of Segment 1 has a wide unpaved median, frontage roads, and two mainlanes in each direction. In the immediate vicinity of the Redd Road interchange, the median is paved. South of SH 20 (Mesa Street) there are no frontage roads and three mainlanes in each direction. The GO 10 project is added mainlanes and collector distributor roads to the corridor between SH 20 (Mesa Street) and Executive Center Boulevard.
(b) Segment 2: Downtown
$\mathrm{I}-10$ is primarily an eight-lane highway from Executive Center Drive to Prospect Street. Once entering the business district at Yandell Drive the lanes decrease to a six-lane highway. From Dallas Street to Copia Street the lanes increase to a ten-lane highway and from Copia Street to Raynolds Street is then reduced to an eight-lane highway. The posted speed limit for this section is 60 mph . The westbound frontage road exists east of downtown, and the eastbound frontage road exists east of Piedras Street. The mainlanes are depressed through downtown with steep walls connecting the outside shoulder edges to ground level.

Land use in this segment is extremely varied but dominated by commercial, industrial, and residential uses. Major trip attractors include Downtown, the Bridge of the Americas Port of Entry, and The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP). Segment 2 is extremely dense with the exception of the 1.5 mile stretch between Executive Center Boulevard and UTEP. Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) rail lines exist along the eastbound side of I-10 for the majority of Segment 2 and a UPRR rail yard exists between downtown and Piedras Street.
(c) Segment 3: Airport

I-10 is an eight-lane highway from Raynolds Street to McRae Boulevard and a six-lane highway from McRae Boulevard to Eastlake Boulevard with continuous frontage roads throughout the entire section. The posted speed limit for the mainlanes is 60 mph and the posted speed limit for the frontage roads is 45 mph . The median is paved and inside shoulders are narrow at spots. Several recent studies have been conducted in this segment regarding additional north-south connectivity and capacity.

Land use in this segment is dominated by commercial and residential with the exception of a very large industrial area on the eastbound side of l-10 between Marlow Road and Tony Lama Street. A few additional industrial sites are scattered throughout the remainder of Segment 3. Major attractions in this segment include the El Paso International Airport, Fort Bliss, the Fountains at Farah, Cielo Vista Mall, University Medical Center, the Zaragoza Port of Entry, and Bassett Place.
(d) Segment 4: Southern Gateway

I-10 is a four-lane highway from Eastlake Boulevard to FM 3380 with a posted speed limit of 75 mph . There are continuous frontage roads from Eastlake Boulevard to FM 1110 (Darrington Road) that have a posted speed limit of 55 mph .

The Loop 375 interchange is surrounded by commercial, industrial and agricultural zones. The remainder of this segment is primarily residential with small businesses interspersed. Major trip attractors are Horizon area truck stops. There is very little development along l-10 in Segment 4 except at the Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard interchanges. Density is lower compared to the rest of the corridor.

The remainder of this memo will be focused on the existing conditions of $\mathrm{I}-10$ on and adjacent to these segments.

## 2. Existing Roadway Conditions

### 2.1 Functional Classification

Functional Classification is an essential component in all planning projects. While all roadways function by connecting places and people, identifying the functional classification of a roadway provides planners and engineers a means of access from specific locations as well as design criteria, social and economic objectives, and funding sources.

The Reimagine I-10 corridor study focuses primarily on I-10, which serves as a principal arterial within a large, urbanized area with populations greater than 200,000. Principal arterials are defined as the main movement of people and goods with high mobility and limited access. I-10's mainlanes or general-purpose lanes are further classified as an interstate, which is the highest classification of arterials. Interstates were designed with mobility and long-distance as the prime focus. Whereas the frontage roads along l-10 are classified as a major collector, where the primary function of this roadway is to gathering traffic from local roads and funneling into the arterial network.

All though I-10 is primarily designated as interstate, segments of the corridor have additional designations. Starting with Segment 1, I-10 shares joint designation with US 180, US 85 and CanAm Highway. CanAm Highway is an international highway which facilitates movement to/from Mexico to Canada through the United States. l-10 loses the two of three joint designations after the Sunland Park Drive Interchange where US 85 and CanAm highway diverge off to their own alignment, also known as US 62 (Paisano Dr). The I-10/US 180 designations continue through Segment 2 to Segment 3 , where US 180 diverges off onto the alignment of US 62 (Paisano Dr) ultimately follows Montana Avenue to the east.

### 2.2 Network Connectivity

The l-10 corridor is within an urbanized area and provides access to 53 cross streets. They are classified as "Other Freeway/Expressway" (3); "Other Principal Arterials" (20), "Minor Arterials" (17); "Local" (1); and "Major Collectors" (12). There are three system interchanges along the study limits. Table 2-1 lists these various roadways and classifications.

Table 2-1. l-10 Cross Streets and Functional Classification

| Segment | Minor <br> Arterial | Major <br> Collector | Other <br> Principal <br> Arterial | Local | Other <br> Freeway/ <br> Expressway |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Segment 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 |
| Segment 2 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Segment 3 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 1 |
| Segment 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 17 | 12 | 20 | 1 | 3 |



Figure 2-1. Cross Street Functional Classification

### 2.3 Roadway Characteristics

The existing roadway characteristics vary throughout the l-10 Corridor. Segment 1 is primarily composed of a flexible mixed bituminous surface. Some portions of the segment have a rigid continuously reinforced concrete pavement (CRCP). Segments 2,3 , and 4 are primarily composed of a CRCP surface with some portions of flexible mixed bituminous pavement. The base type throughout the corridor primarily consists of a flexible granular base and a hot mix, asphaltic, concrete base. A few areas have a granular stabilized earth base.

The speed limits and number of lanes are briefly summarized in Section 1.2 above. The existing lane width throughout the corridor is generally 12 feet. There are few exceptions for areas with lateral constraints. The inside shoulder width for Segment 1 varies between four and ten feet. Segments 2 and 3 have inside shoulder widths greater than ten feet. Segment 4 has an inside shoulder width between four and six feet. The outside shoulder width is generally ten feet throughout the corridor with few exceptions for areas with lateral constraints.

In addition to speed limits, number of lanes, roadway widths, surface types, and base types, the summary includes flexible and rigid Equivalent Single Axle Load (ESAL) values for the corridor. ESAL values help generalize the effect that any given vehicle will have on a pavement structure. This will account for all vehicles ranging from passenger cars to freight vehicles.

### 2.4 Access

The l-10 Corridor within the El Paso County serves as the lifeline for the region. However, because of the natural and cultural constraints as well as the international border with Mexico, the El Paso region is limited to alternative routes. There are three major system interchanges which exist along the corridor. State Loop (SL) 375 intersects I-10 in two locations, once in Segment 1 and second in Segment 3. The third system interchange is US 54 in Segment 2. This puts an additional strain along I-10 as the Principal Arterial and results in higher than anticipated ramp densities for similar interstate class arterials. Segments 2 and 3, which are located in the heavily urbanized and developed area and therefore have a relatively high ramp density when compared to the rural Segments 1 and 4 which are not as dense. Table 2-2 lists the existing ramp densities per Segment.

## Table 2-2. Segment Average Ramp Density

| Segment | Ramps/Mile |
| :---: | :---: |
| Segment 1 | 1.16 |
| Segment 2 | 2.21 |
| Segment 3 | 2.25 |
| Segment 4 | 0.47 |

Ramp density correlates to Total Ramp Density (TRD) in the Highway Capacity Manual. The Highway Capacity Manual utilizes TRD as one of the factors to determine the reduction in free flow speed (FFS). In turn free flow speed is one of the many components which determine the level of service. Level of service is a measure of density of passenger cars per mile per lane. A higher TRD in essence will reduce the FFS, which ultimately reduces the level of service for the facility. Figure 2-2 illustrates the effects of the TRD onto the corridor by segment.


Figure 2-2. Total Ramp Density Impacts by Segment
As mentioned earlier, the urban segments (Segments 2 and 3) have higher ramp density and therefore have a higher FFS reduction. It becomes difficult to reduce the number of ramp per mile due to public resentment and impacts to local businesses.

### 2.5 Right-of-Way

Along the I-10 El Paso Corridor, right-of way width varies between 220 feet and 760 feet. Right-ofway width increases near undeveloped plots of land and where frontage roads shift out away from the highway (often at interchanges). Right-of-way is limited in other areas by developments along I10, particularly in dense urban segments.

The right-of-way width in Segment 1 ranges from 300 feet to 580 feet and is typically about 400 feet. There is sufficient width to allow for expansion. LBJ Park, Keystone Dam, Resler Canyon Nature Preserve, and Buena Vista Park border the existing right-of-way in this segment.

Right-of-way width in Segment 2 is the most constraining, varying between 220 feet and 470 feet. Between UTEP and the UPRR railroad crossing immediately east of Cotton Street, there is approximately 250 feet of right-of-way width. Due to substantial development bordering l-10, there is little room for expansion within existing right-of-way. Smelter Cemetery, Sunset Heights Historic District, Grace Chope City Park, Old San Francisco Historic District, Cavalry Park, Independent Historic District, Concordia Cemetery, Mt. Sinai Cemetery, B’nai Zion Cemetery, and Lincoln Park border the existing right-of-way in this segment.

Along Segment 3, right-of-way width varies between 260 feet and 480 feet. Right-of-way width is approximately 300 feet in the heavily developed area between US 62 (Paisano Drive) and Zaragoza Road and is constraining. Lincoln Park, Saipan-Ledo Park, and San Juan Park border the existing right-of-way in this segment.

Right-of-way width exceeds 350 feet along the majority of Segment 4 and varies between 270 feet and 760 feet. There is ample room for future additions or widening.

### 2.6 Bridges

There are approximately 202 bridge class structures along $\mathrm{I}-10$ within the project limits. For analysis purposes, PonTex reports were utilized to determine any potential structural deficiencies. PonTex is a bridge inspection data management intended to replace but not retire BRINSAP. Within the report 31 bridges are classified as Functionally Obsolete. FHWA classifies bridges Functionally Obsolete if it fails to meet its design criteria either by its deck geometry, its load-carrying capacity, its vertical and horizontal clearances, or the approach roadway alignment to the bridge. Over half of the structures within the corridor were built before 1970, during the construction of the interstate system. Figure 2-3 illustrates how many structures were built within a given year range.


Figure 2-3. Year of Construction by Segment

Over 50\% of the structures within Segments 1, 2, and 4 and $47 \%$ of the structures in Segment 3 were built before the year 1970 .

For planning purposes another key factor regarding bridge structures is the sufficiency rating. TxDOT's Bridge Development Manual defines sufficiency rating as "A single numerical rating ranging from 0 to 100 that is based on federal criteria and takings into consideration a bridge's structural adequacy and safety, serviceability and functional obsolescence, and essentiality of traffic service". A more detailed definition can be found in the TxDOT Bridge Inspection Manual Section 3 Sufficiency Ratings.

Six of the 31 Functionally Obsolete had sufficiency rating below 70 with the lowest being 58.6. One structurally deficient structure in Segment 3 is on I-10 Eastbound Frontage Road has a sufficiently rating of 31.4 and is closed to traffic. Segment 2 contains three utility bridge structures which span over the I-10 mainlanes and do not contain a sufficiency rating. Figure 2-4 illustrates the sufficiency ratings of all of the bridge class structures per segment.


Figure 2-4. Sufficiency Ratings by Segment
Even though over half of the structures were built before 1970, 85\% of all of the structures have a sufficiency rating over 80.

The TxDOT Roadway Design Manual specifies that all controlled access highway grade separation structures, including railroad underpasses, should provide 16'-6" minimum vertical clearance over the usable roadway. Roadways under the mainlanes of interstate or controlled access highways must meet the appropriate clearance required by the undercrossing roadway classification. PonTex reports indicate that all overpasses over I-10 mainlanes meet or exceeded the 16 '- 6 " clearance minimum.


Figure 2-5. Vertical Clearances
Vertical clearances on structures crossing drainage or pedestrian walkways are shown as not applicable (N/A) as they do not cross any functional classified roadway. It should be noted that the Texas Freight Plan recommends vertical clearances of 18 '-6" and when compared to the $\mathrm{l}-10$ corridor only a handful achieve this recommendation.

### 2.7 Previous Transportation Studies

Several studies have been prepared for I-10 and its adjacent roadways. This section provides comprehensive summaries and recommendations of the most recent and relevant transportation studies that have been developed for this corridor.
(a) Airway Boulevard Feasibility Study (December 2005)

The purpose of this study was to identify feasible alternatives for a north-south connector between the south side of the city of El Paso and the area north of I-10 in order to connect citizens to a retail district and the El Paso International Airport. The focus of the study was between Trowbridge Drive/North Loop Drive and I-10. Hawkins Boulevard is the major north-south roadway that serves this area, and an additional connection is needed. The study recommended a connection from Airway Boulevard to the Border Highway, which was divided into three phases. Phase 1 is a two-lane connector between Airway Boulevard and Market Street. Phase 2 is a four-lane connector between Airway Boulevard and Delta Drive. Phase 3 is a study to determine a potential connection to the Border Highway. HDR does not recommend constructing this connector because there are many utility and ROW conflicts and a railroad in close proximity. The l-10 Connect project should provide the desired additional north-south connectivity in the east El Paso area.
(b) Analysis of Mitigation Strategies for I-10 Corridor Hot Spots (August 2007)

This study identified "hot spots" along l-10 reflecting traffic conditions in the year 2030. Freeway mainlanes that drop below 40 mph and/or speed reductions for extended periods of time qualify as "hot spots." During the AM peak in the eastbound direction, there is a constant speed reduction to 40 mph from Vinton Road to Transmountain Drive; a speed drop to 30 mph between Sunland Park Drive and Executive Center Boulevard; heavy congestion at the Buena Vista interchange; heavy traffic exiting at UTEP (with speed drops to 20-30 mph); fairly heavy congestion between Geronimo Drive and Airway Boulevard; (average speed 45 mph ) and very heavy volume exiting at Eastlake Boulevard (Eastlake Boulevard shows heavy congestion in both directions during morning peak hours). During the AM peak in the westbound direction, there is heavy traffic going to/from SH 20 (Mesa Street); a large amount of westbound traffic exiting at Executive Center Boulevard and turning left towards US 62 (Paisano Drive); stop and go traffic between Geronimo Drive and US 62 (Paisano Drive); a constant two hour speed reduction below 40 mph from Lee Trevino Drive to Geronimo Drive; and a constant speed reduction below 40 mph from Horizon Boulevard to Loop 375 with a concentration of traffic at Americas interchange. During the PM peak in the eastbound direction, there is a constant speed reduction to 40 mph between Transmountain Drive and Redd Road; stop and go traffic between Cotton Street and Raynolds Street; and constant slow speed below 40 mph between US 62 (Paisano Drive) and Zaragoza Road (with heavy congestion at Airway Boulevard). There are also random large speed reductions below 10 mph between SH 20 (Mesa Street) and Schuster Avenue concentrated at the Executive Center Boulevard and Buena Vista interchanges. During the PM peak in the westbound direction, there is heavy traffic from SH 20 (Mesa Street) to Vinton Road (SH 20 significantly contributes to l-10 westbound traffic), extreme congestion between UTEP and Sunland Park Drive (particularly between the Executive Center Boulevard and Buena Vista interchanges), parking lot traffic conditions between Geronimo Drive and US 62 (Paisano Drive), and consistent heavy congestion from Horizon Boulevard to Loop 375 (the Horizon interchange shows extremely heavy congestion).

Direct connectors from eastbound $\mathrm{I}-10$ to northbound Buffalo Soldier Road and from southbound Buffalo Soldier Road to westbound l-10 are proposed to encourage the use of Montana Avenue as an alternate route to $\mathrm{l}-10$ (it is assumed that Montana Avenue is a four-lane tollway with two-lane frontage roads in each direction by the year 2030). The westbound direct connector acts like an accident (due to high volumes entering $I-10$ ) and worsens congestion upstream of Geronimo Drive. The eastbound direct connector provides significant congestion relief for afternoon peak hour traffic between Airway Boulevard and Zaragoza Road. HDR does not recommend constructing the direct connector from eastbound I-10 to northbound Buffalo Soldier Road because Montana Avenue has not yet been upgraded to a four-lane tollway with two-lane frontage roads in each direction. HDR does not recommend constructing the direct connector from southbound Buffalo Soldier Road to westbound I-10 because this direct connector creates more congestion on I-10.

A four-lane divided freeway tying Airway Boulevard to Border Highway is recommended for further analysis. The route would run adjacent to Western Refinery and have access points at both Market Street and Buffalo Soldier Road. This connection causes more congestion than relief on I-10 when modeled without the Zaragoza Port of Entry (which didn't exist at the time of this study). HDR does not recommend constructing this freeway because there are many utility and ROW conflicts and a railroad in close proximity. The desired additional north-south connectivity in the east EI Paso area should be provided by the I-10 Connect project which is to be constructed.

It is recommended that the westbound US 62 (Paisano Drive) entrance ramp to l-10 be permanently closed. Currently, the amount of vehicles traveling on the far right lane (destined for US 54/Mexico) interacting with vehicles entering the freeway creates a bottleneck location on the freeway which disrupts the balanced flow of traffic. Ramp closure would improve freeway traffic congestion and increase mainlane speed at both upstream and downstream locations (creating a more balanced flow of traffic). HDR recommends this suggestion for further evaluation. The stated benefits are appealing, but US 62 (Paisano Drive) is a major arterial, and removing its access to westbound I-10 at this location could negatively impact other parts of the network.

An additional lane is needed in both the eastbound and westbound directions on l-10 between Sunland Park Drive and Executive Center Boulevard to accommodate traffic volumes. HDR recommends this suggestion for further evaluation.

It is recommended that the lane reduction on the westbound frontage road ramp near Sunland Park Drive be extended further to reduce the amount of queuing on several approaches to the interchange. Currently, this lane reduction is beneficial because the transition from one to two lanes acts like a ramp meter, controlling the volume of vehicles entering the mainlanes. However, the location of the lane reduction results in inadequate storage, causing queues to spill back to and congest the Sunland Park Drive intersection. By extending the lane reduction, storage could be increased and queue lengths could be reduced. HDR recommends this suggestion for further evaluation.
(c) Evaluation of Alternatives for Zaragoza/I-10 Interchange (June 2007)

The Zaragoza Road/I-10 interchange is currently operating at saturation levels, and intersections in and around this interchange experience heavy congestion during peak periods. The study recommends the construction of three direct connectors to reduce traffic volumes at intersections along Zaragoza Road. The proposed connections are eastbound I-10 to northbound Pullman Drive, southbound Pullman Drive to westbound I-10, and northbound Zaragoza Road to westbound I-10. Construction of these direct connectors shifts a large amount of traffic to Pullman Drive and to Pellicano Drive (between Pullman Drive and Zaragoza Road). Upgrades to Pellicano Drive and its intersections with Zaragoza Road and Pullman Drive must be further analyzed. There is substantial congestion relief on Zaragoza Road between George Dieter Drive and Rojas Drive in both the northbound and southbound directions. HDR recommends this alternative for further evaluation. It would likely improve operations along Zaragoza Road, but has little effect on I-10 traffic.
(d) Evaluation of Design Alternatives for US 62/SH 20 Intersection (February 2008)

A double roundabout has since been built at this location. The study recommended construction of a single roundabout because it showed consistent improvement in all performance measures for the network (a double roundabout was not analyzed). HDR does not recommend further evaluation. Changes to this intersection would likely have little effect on I-10 traffic.
(e) I-10 and Loop 375 Corridor Simulation Study (August 25, 2009)

This study identified issues along the l-10 corridor from the Texas/New Mexico state line to SH 20 (Mesa Street) ( 12 miles) and along the Loop 375 corridor from I-10 to Franklin Mountains State Park ( 2.1 miles). No Build and Build scenarios were evaluated with year 2015 and 2035 traffic projections. Recommendations begin at the north end of the study area and move south.

At the FM 1905/Mountain Pass Boulevard interchange with l-10, the westbound Mountain Pass Boulevard approach currently has one channelized right turn and one through lane. Provision of an additional through lane would improve operations and reduce queuing. The eastbound FM 1905 approach experiences congestion due to the high right turning volume passing through the signalized intersection. Channelization of this movement and provision of an acceleration lane would improve operation of the eastbound approach. The I-10 southbound entrance ramp is less than 200 ft from the FM 1905/S Desert Boulevard intersection. This is extremely close and relocating this ramp further south would increase the weaving distance available, thus improving traffic operations on this segment. HDR recommends these proposed improvements for further evaluation.

At the Vinton Road/Westway Boulevard interchange with I-10, traffic operation on the northbound approach is adversely affected by the proximity of the northbound exit ramp to Vinton Road/Westway Boulevard. This results in inadequate weaving distance, which could be increased by moving the ramp south. On the eastbound Vinton Road approach, high right turn demand and the existing unchannelized right turn results in extensive queuing. A channelized right turn will improve approach
operation. On the westbound Westway Boulevard approach, the addition of an exclusive right turn bay is recommended. HDR recommends these proposed improvements for further evaluation.

On Loop 375, two weaving segments are problematic. The first is on westbound Loop 375 between the entrance ramp from Resler Drive and the direct connect ramp to southbound I-10. The second is on westbound Loop 375 between the entrance ramp from Northwestern Drive and the intersection of Loop 375 with N Desert Boulevard. Increasing the weaving lengths or removing these weaving segments will improve operations. HDR recommends additional evaluation to develop potential solutions.

At the Artcraft Road/Paseo del Norte Drive interchange with l-10, the eastbound Artcraft Road approach is unable to serve the projected right turn demand. Dual right turns are needed. Widening the northbound approach to five lanes with the provision of a u turn, three left turn lanes, two through lanes, and a dedicated right turn bay is recommended. HDR recommends these proposed improvements for further evaluation.

At the Redd Road/l-10 interchange, dual left turns are recommended on the northbound and southbound approaches by providing a shared left turn/u turn configuration. Extending the existing turn bay on the eastbound Redd Road approach by way of median improvements is recommended. Due to the high volume on southbound I-10 mainlanes, volume south of the interchange on the southbound entrance ramp from Redd Road experiences significant delay when merging with mainlane traffic, resulting in queue spillback from the entrance ramp to S Desert Boulevard. The addition of an auxiliary lane on I-10 between Redd Road and SH 20 (Mesa Street) could mitigate this queuing and delay. HDR recommends these improvements for further evaluation.

At the Thorn Avenue/l-10 interchange, it is necessary to expand Thorn Avenue to a four lane roadway west of I-10 to improve traffic operations. The addition of a channelized right turn bay to the eastbound approach would reduce queuing and further increase capacity. HDR recommends these improvements for further evaluation.

At the SH 20 (Mesa Street) interchange with l-10, dual lefts are warranted on the eastbound and westbound approaches. The northbound entrance ramp from SH 20 (Mesa Street) has a short taper where it meets the l-10 mainlanes, making it difficult for vehicles to find a suitable gap. This results in significant delay, causing queues to spill back to the interchange and create gridlock. Adjustments to this ramp/merge or the addition of an auxiliary lane on l-10 between SH 20 (Mesa Street) and Redd Road could reduce queuing. A right turn bay is recommended for westbound SH 20 (Mesa Street). U turns and triple left turns are recommended for the northbound and southbound approaches. Additional alternatives were considered for the SH 20 (Mesa Street) interchange with I10. A direct connector from N Desert Boulevard to westbound SH 20 (Mesa Street) (tying in west of Osborne Drive) is recommended along with a northbound to southbound u turn. HDR recommends further evaluation to develop/compare potential solutions.

In order to improve I-10 mainlane operations, it is recommended that three ramps in this corridor be upgraded from single-lane ramps to two-lane ramps. These ramps are the northbound exit ramp to Artcraft Road, the northbound exit ramp to Redd Road, and the southbound entrance ramp from Redd Road. Auxiliary lanes are recommended on the northbound I-10 mainlanes between the entrance ramp from SH 20 (Mesa Street) and the exit ramp to Redd Road, and on the southbound I10 mainlanes between the entrance ramp from Redd Road and the exit ramp to SH 20 (Mesa Street). A shift from diamond to X ramp configuration throughout the corridor was analyzed. This moves traffic from the mainlanes to the service roads, improving mainlane operation but resulting in severe service road congestion. For this reason, the study did not recommend the X ramp configuration. HDR will consider these proposed changes for further evaluation.

## (f) I-10 Restriping Plan Report (Unknown Date)

The goal of the restriping is to provide a minimum of eight lanes (four in each direction) on I -10 from Redd Road to Loop 375 ( 25 miles). This would require the reallocation of lane assignments on I-10 at four separate locations and would require new pavement in many areas where the shoulder does not have adequate structural capacity to support mainlane traffic. HDR recommends this suggestion for further evaluation. The restriping is feasible, but no information regarding the projected performance of the new facility was given. Changing the nature of the merge/diverge movements at some ramps (by converting entrance and exit lanes to mainlanes) would likely have adverse impacts.
(g) IAJR Hawkins Boulevard (October 13, 2008)

The proposed ramp reversal has been constructed along with a dedicated right turn at Hawkins Boulevard for westbound traffic. Although the entire l-10 corridor in this area is becoming increasingly congested, the improvements are beneficial to traffic flow in the immediate area of the Hawkins Boulevard interchange.
(h) IAJR Loop 375 (August 2009)

The eight proposed direct connectors were recently constructed. It is expected that this new interchange may shift some traffic from the Zaragoza interchange. The first westbound entrance ramp from Eastlake Boulevard to the I-10 mainlanes exceeds the capacity of a single-lane ramp in the year 2033. There is another ramp downstream which is predicted to be well below its capacity. The study says signage could be placed on the frontage road to better distribute traffic volumes between these two ramps. HDR recommends evaluating alternatives that address the entrance ramp capacity issue.
(i) Montana Avenue Corridor Study (February 27, 2009)

Montana Avenue (a four to six-lane arterial with speed limits from 35 to 60 mph ) is a primary eastwest corridor on the east side of El Paso. The corridor is currently congested at major intersections, and significant future population growth (which is projected) will only add to this problem. An access controlled four-lane divided highway/toll road with frontage roads is proposed from the Border

Highway to Desert Meadows Road to accommodate growth and relieve other east-west routes (such as I-10). The facility could shift some traffic from the I-10 corridor, but not a substantial amount. The proposed highway runs north-south from the Border Highway to the existing Montana Avenue/Buffalo Soldier Road intersection, then follows the alignment of Montana Avenue between Buffalo Soldier Road and Desert Meadows Road. HDR recommends evaluating alternatives to the proposed alignment.

## (j) Zaragoza Preliminary Improvement Concepts (September 11, 2009)

Significant traffic congestion occurs at the Zaragoza Road/I-10 interchange and nearby major intersections. The principal issue is the need to remove (to the greatest extent possible) truck traffic from the existing interchange and find ways to bring this traffic efficiently into the warehouse/distribution facilities in all four quadrants of the interchange. Tight diamond interchanges were proposed along l-10 at Pendale Road and at Don Haskins Drive/Alza Drive to offer alternate routes. I-10 exit ramps to Pendale Road and a frontage road bypass for the eastbound frontage road at Zaragoza Road were also recommended to facilitate access to the new interchanges. HDR recommends the frontage road bypass for the eastbound frontage road at Zaragoza Road for further evaluation. HDR does not recommend constructing the tight diamond interchanges or exit ramps, as these would have little impact to traffic on I-10 and be costly to construct.

Committed Projects TxDOT's Project Tracker and the EI Paso MPO's TIP were utilized to determine currently committed projects along the I-10 corridor.

Table 2-3 lists only projects that are currently committed for I-10.
Table 2-3. TxDOT Committed Projects

| I-10 Corridor Study Nearby Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status | Highway | CSJ | Type of Work | Description | Estimated <br> Cost |  |  |
| Construction <br> Scheduled | I-10 | 212101092 | Rehab and <br> Operational <br> Improvements | Rehab and operational <br> improvements, Phase II | \$14,991,565 |  |  |
| Construction | I-10 | 212101087 | Improve <br> Traffic Signal | Improve traffic signal at <br> SH 20 | \$481,505 |  |  |

I-10 Corridor Study Nearby Projects

| Status | Highway | CSJ | Type of Work | Description | Estimated Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction Scheduled | I-10 | 212102137 | Collector Distributor Lanes | Collector distributor lanes and interchange construction | \$151,106,761 |
| Construction Scheduled | I-10 | 212102132 | Rehabilitation | Diamond grind concrete pavement and repair longitudinal | \$2,316,341 |
| Construction Scheduled | I-10 | 212102152 | Bridge <br> Enhancement | Enhance pedestrian rail, clean \& paint | \$5,301,269 |
| Construction Scheduled | I-10 | 212102155 | Enhancement Project | Aesthetic development, Phase III | \$3,596,591 |
| Construction Scheduled | 1-10 | 212102146 | Install High Mast Lighting | Install high mast lighting | \$1,453,755 |
| Construction Scheduled | I-10 | 212102151 | Enhancement Project | Aesthetic development, Phase II | \$8,077,333 |
| Construction Scheduled | 1-10 | 212104098 | Widen <br> Roadway | Widen roadway to 8 lanes | \$15,135,187 |
| Construction Scheduled | I-10 | 212104093 | Interchange Improvement Including Constructing Direct Connector | Interchange improvements/Construct ion of DC S LP 375 to EB I-10 | \$34,486,587 |
| Finalizing for Construction | 1-10 | $\begin{gathered} 2121010 \\ 91 \end{gathered}$ | Rehab and Operational Improvements | Rehab and operational improvements, Phase III | \$7,100,000 |


| I-10 Corridor Study Nearby Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status | Highway | CSJ | Type of Work | Description | Estimated Cost |
| Finalizing for Construction | I-10 | 212102159 | Upgrade Bridge and Approach Railing | Replace bridge and approach railing | \$688,500 |
| Finalizing for Construction | I-10 | 212102158 | E-3 Rail Replacement | E-3 rail replacement | \$4,394,201 |
| Finalizing for Construction | I-10 | 212102134 | Rehabilitation | Diamond grinding and striping | \$4,500,001 |
| Finalizing for Construction | I-10 | 212102149 | Rehab Existing Road | Remove and replace bonded overlay | \$6,200,000 |
| Finalizing for Construction | I-10 | 212102147 | Add 1 Lane (Operational Improve) | Add 1 lane in each direction by restriping | \$5,200,000 |
| Finalizing for Construction | I-10 | 212104086 | Rehabilitation | Frontage road overlay (seal coat) | \$3,100,000 |
| Under <br> Development | FM 1905 | 255101010 | Overlay | Overlay | \$1,450,000 |
| Under <br> Development | I-10 | 212101094 | Expand from 4 to 6 Lanes | Expand from 4 to 6 lanes | \$61,658,920 |
| Under <br> Development | I-10 | 212102160 | Expands from 6 to 8 Lanes | Expand from 6 to 8 lanes | \$53,230,000 |
| Under <br> Development | SL 375 | 255204046 | Overlay | Rework \& cement treat base \& HMA overlay | \$1,120,000 |
| Under <br> Development | I-10 | 212102157 | Install Overhead Sign Bridges | Install overhead sign bridges | \$4,500,000 |
| Under <br> Development | SL 375 | 255202029 | Add 1 Lane Each Direction | Add 1 lane each direction | \$35,000,000 |


| I-10 Corridor Study Nearby Projects |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status | Highway | CSJ | Type of Work | Description | Estimated Cost |
| Under <br> Development | I-10 | 212103159 | Add 1 Lane (Operational Improve) | Add 1 lane in each direction by restriping | \$1,000,000 |
| Under <br> Development | I-10 | 212103150 | Rehabilitation | Micromill and longitudinal joint repair | \$16,075,000 |
| Under Development | I-10 | 21210361 | Rehab/Interse ction Improvement | Roadway rehabilitation and intersection improvements | \$850,000 |
| Under <br> Development | I-10 | 212103060 | Rehabilitation | Rework \& cement treat base, HMCAC, CRCP, signing \& striping | \$8,500,000 |
| Under <br> Development | I-10 | 212103146 | Construct Interchanges | Construct interchanges | \$14,000,000 |
| Under Development | I-10 | 212104106 | Upgrade Bridge and Approach Railing | Replace bridge and approach railing | \$352,988 |

## 3. Existing Traffic Conditions

### 3.1 Field Visit

A field visit, carried out by HDR, provided firsthand knowledge and experience of the traffic conditions in the study area during the AM and PM peak periods. The following observations were made from the field:

1. Traffic pattern/Congestion locations
2. Travel time calculations
3. Volume calibrations and turning movement counts
4. Geometry and lane assignment verifications at intersections
5. Turn bay measurement validations
6. Queue length observations

### 3.2 Historical Growth and Existing AADTs

TxDOT's Statewide Traffic Analysis Reporting System (STARS) was used to obtain the traffic volumes in the project area to calculate a historic growth rate. Traffic data was also gathered for turning movements online through traffic data online public portal.

A total of 24 stations with counts from 1997 to 2015. Overall, each segment has experienced both growth and losses within various locations. Table 3-1 provides an overall comparison between segments.

Table 3-1. Historic Growth Summary

| Segment | Trend Veh/Year |  |  | Average |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average | High | Low | (140wth |
| Segment 1 | 903.69 | $1,672.00$ | $(140.07)$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Segment 2 | 31.92 | $1,006.70$ | $(882.12)$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Segment 3 | $(2,062.51)$ | $1,797.90$ | $(3,782.10)$ | $-1.6 \%$ |
| Segment 4 | $(54.17)$ | 345.77 | $(1,077.80)$ | $-0.2 \%$ |

Overall, the historic data appears to be quite volatile, with the corridor having peak volumes in 20052007. After 2007 the volumes appear to drop almost $20 \%$ within segments 2 and 3 . This would coinside with the Recession of 2008. When evaluating the 2015 and 2014 counts, an average corridor growth increase of $4.4 \%$ is observed. FHWA recorded a cumulative travel increase of $3.5 \%$ when comparing the year to dates of 2015 to 2014. This would indicate that the I-10 El Paso Corridor is above the national average of growth.

### 3.3 Freeway and Interchange Level of Service

An operational analysis was performed using Highway Capacity Software (HCS7) Facilities, which is based on the procedures outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition (HCM6). The analysis included determining the LOS for mainlane sections, ramp junctions, and weaving areas. The LOS is a measure of effectiveness used to evaluate traffic operations based on density where LOS A represents the least congested operational conditions and LOS F is considered the most congested operational conditions. Analysis for both the northbound and southbound directions for all sections were conducted for the AM and PM Peak. The definitions of segment types are as follows:

- Mainlane Segments: A mainlane segment is defined as a portion of the mainlanes that is connected between two ramp junctions.
- Ramp Merge/Diverge Junctions: The mainlane volume and ramp volume are the controlling features in a ramp junction analysis. According to the HCM 2010, the influence area of a ramp extends 1,500 feet downstream/upstream of an entrance/exit ramp.
- Weaving Segments: A weaving segment is defined by the HCM 2010 as an auxiliary lane that is connected between entrance ramp junctions followed by an exit ramp with less than 2,800 feet between them. The weaving area occurs between the entrance and exit ramps as two or more traffic paths traveling in the same general direction cross each other without the aid of traffic control devices. Weaving segments that are greater than 2800 feet were analyzed as a mainlane segment.
Table 3-2 presents LOS and the ranges of density per vehicle for freeway, merge/diverge, and weave segments.

Table 3-2. Freeway and Ramp LOS Thresholds and Definitions ${ }^{1}$

| LOS | Density (pc/mi/ln) |  |  | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Freeway <br> Segment | Merge/Diverge Segment | Weave <br> Segment |  |
| A | $\leq 11$ | $\leq 10$ | $\leq 10$ | Free-flow operations. |
| B | >11 and $\leq 18$ | $>10$ and $\leq 20$ | $>10$ and $\leq 20$ | Reasonably free-flow, the ability to maneuver is only slightly restricted. |
| C | $>18$ and $\leq 26$ | >20 and $\leq 28$ | $>20$ and $\leq 28$ | Speeds are at or near free-flow, although freedom to maneuver is noticeably restricted. Queues may form behind any significant blockage. |
| D | >26 and $\leq 35$ | >28 and $\leq 35$ | >28 and $\leq 35$ | Speeds decline slightly with increase in flow and freedom to maneuver is more noticeably limited. Queuing occurs with minor incidents. |
| E | >35 and $\leq 45$ | >35 and $\leq 43$ | >35 and $\leq 43$ | Operation is at or near capacity with no usable gaps in the traffic stream. Any disruption causes queuing. |
| F | > 45 | > 43 | > 43 | Demand is greater than capacity, which causes breakdown in flow. These conditions generally exist within queues behind breakdown points. |

(a) Intersection Analysis

Utilizing procedures in the HCM and the MOEs (measures of effectiveness) reported by SYNCHRO 9 traffic simulation software, LOS was determined for intersections within the project limits. Intersection LOS is a qualitative measure of operating conditions and is directly related to average vehicle delay. LOS is reported using the letter designations from A to $F$, as shown in Table 3-3.

[^5]Table 3-3. Interchange LOS Thresholds and Definitions²

| LOS | Control Delay <br> (sec/veh) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Signalized <br> Interchange | Unsignalized <br> Interchange |  |
| A | $\leq 10.0$ | $\leq 10.0$ |  |
| Description |  |  |  |

D $\quad 35.1$ to $55.0 \quad 25.1$ to 35.0

E $\quad 55.1$ to 80.0
$>80.0$
$>50.0$
Ineffective signal progression/long cycle length, many vehicular stops, noticeable cycle failures.

Ineffective signal progression, long cycle length, frequent cycle failures.

Poor signal progression, long cycle length, cycle failures during most cycles.

The results indicate that 12 of the 18 interchanges currently operate within desirable LOS goals (D or better) in the AM period for section 1. Six are shown to operate with poor LOS (E or worse) in the AM period for section one. In the PM period there was a significant increase in interchanges operating with a poor LOS. There were only 8 of 18 interchanges operating at a desirable LOS and 3 of those 8 operating at a LOS D. There are 10 interchanges operating at a poor LOS. The interchanges that changed from a good LOS to a poor LOS are Vinton WB Frontage Road, Artcraft Westbound Frontage Road, Thorn Avenue Eastbound Frontage Road, SH 20 (Mesa Street) Westbound Frontage Road, and Sunland Park Eastbound Frontage Road. The largest delay in this section was 221.6 seconds at Executive Center Drive. For section two, there are a total of 47 interchanges. 39 of the 47 interchanges operate with an acceptable LOS while eight do not. Section 4 has a total of 10 interchanges. In the AM Peak there are 6 of the 10 interchanges operating with an acceptable LOS. The other 4 interchanges all operate with a LOS F with the larges delay being

[^6]3489 sec. The PM peak has no interchanges operating with an acceptable LOS meaning all 10 intersections are operating with a poor LOS.

### 3.4 Trip Patterns

(a) Origin-Destination Data

Streetlight data was utilized to extract Origin-Destination information. Figure 3-1 illustrates Eastbound traffic on I-10 entering from the Texas New Mexico State Line.


Figure 3-1. New Mexico Eastbound I-10 O-D (All-Day Average)
The results above indicate that over half of the traffic originating from New Mexico is departing l-10 in Segment 1 and only $14 \%$ is continuing through the I-10 El Paso Corridor.
(b) Travel Demand Model

Travel demand modeling is used to forecast the demand and behavior for a transportation facility for a specific future time frame. Conceptually, the travel demand model has a traditional four step approach comprising of trip generation, trip distribution, mode choice, and trip assignment. Trip generation determines the origin and destination of trips in a specific zone. Socio-economic factors, land use data, household demographics and are used to determine the amount of trips produced and attracted to a Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ). Trip purposes are used to describe these trips. Typical trip purposes include home-based work, home-based school, home-based shopping, home-based other, and non-home-based. These trip purposes define what the origin and destination is of each trip. Trip distribution determines where the trips will go once exiting the TAZ. A matrix of origin and destinations for each zone and trip purpose is created to identify the attractiveness of a zone based on the number of trips produced in the zone, the number of trips attracted to the zone, and travel time. Mode choice describes the method of transportation used between a trip's origin and destination. This step can be simple or complex depending on the amount of transit in the study area. In the travel demand model, mode choice is performed by going through multiple iterations of the trip distribution and assignment as a part of a feedback loop. Mode choice yields which mode of transportation will be used and the mode split, percentage of people using a certain type of
transportation. The last step is trip assignment. This step determines which route is taken to get from origin to destination. There are different methods of performing this step such as using minimum travel time to determine which route a traveler is most likely going to take. The model then yields traffic volumes for the roads in the network.

HDR was given two travel demand models for the City of El Paso to use and run for data collection. The first, named the Horizon model, has the scenario for the year 2007, 2010, 2020, 2030, and 2040 to use and extract data from. The Horizon travel demand model uses TxDOT trip generation and trip distribution programs that run on TransCAD travel demand modeling software. The model follows the four-step travel demand model. The Horizon Model Interface allows users to configure the following options, Model Setup, Network Update, Run Skim, Assignment, and Reporting. The year 2020 and 2040 were run with the purpose of 2020 being the design year and 2040 being the future year. The output of the Horizon travel demand model was maps for the total traffic, total truck traffic, and volume/capacity ratio. The second model is an updated travel demand model by Cambridge Schematics. This model is currently pending review of the Federal Highway Administration but includes a more in-depth transit data. HDR used this model to update existing information given from the previous model. The new model includes the year 2012 and has a greater transit network.

### 3.5 Truck Freight Patterns

(a) TEXAS STATEWIDE ANALYSIS MODEL VERSION 3 (SAM-V3)

HDR was given one travel demand model for the state of Texas created by Alliance Transportation Group, Inc. for TxDOT. The Texas Statewide Analysis Model Version 3 (SAM-V3) model includes scenarios for the year 2010, 2020, 2030, and 2040. The SAM model is based on the four-step model and is a multimodal travel demand model that focuses on forecasting traffic volumes for passenger and freight transportation, rail ridership, freight rail tonnage, and train and rail projections. The interface includes the model steps of Network Update, Trip Generation, Freight Trip Generation, Trip Distribution, Freight Trip Distribution, Mode Choice, Freight Mode Choice, Assignment, Optional Assignment, and Reports. HDR ran the SAM-V3 model for the years 2020 and 2040 to gather additional information about freight assignment along the l-10 corridor.

## 4. Existing Safety Conditions

### 4.1 Historic Crash Trends

To analyze the current safety impacts along the I-10, crash data from years 2011 through 2015 was obtained from TxDOT and reviewed for crash patterns, trends, and types.

A total of 3701 crashes were reported during the five-year analysis period within the project limits. Of those, 3339 occurred along the mainlanes; 53 occurred along the frontage roads; and 242 occurred on the ramps; and 7 occurred on direct connectors. The locations of the remaining 60 crashes were reported as "other." There were a total of 64 fatal crashes of which the majority happened on the mainlanes. Table 4-1 provides a summary of the crashes by facility and severity. Figure 4-1 through Figure 4-3 breakdown total crashes and fatalities by segment.

Table 4-1. Crash Type and Severity Summary (2011-2015)

| Facility Type | Number of <br> Crashes | Fatality |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Injury* | Non-Injury | No <br> Information |
| Mainlanes |  | 60 | 1347 | 7427 | 651 |
| Frontage Road |  | 0 | 25 | 90 | 8 |
| Ramps | 242 | 3 | 64 | 458 | 55 |
| Direct Connectors | 7 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 1 |
| Other | 60 | 1 | 26 | 99 | 54 |
| Total | 3701 | 64 | 1465 | 8085 | 769 |

*Injury includes incapacitating crashes, non-incapacitating crashes, and possible injury cases


Figure 4-1. Total Crashes by Segment (2011-2015)


Figure 4-2. Total Fatality Crashes by Segment (2011-2015)


Figure 4-3. l-10 Crash Density (2011-2015)
(a) Crash Rates

The crash rate along the project limits was compared with the statewide average from the Texas Strategic Safety Highway Plan to obtain safety ratios as well as crash and fatality rates per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (100MVMT) for the years 2011 through 2015. Per the latest TxDOT EI Paso District Urbanized Areas and Cities Map, the I-10 corridor is within El Paso's large urbanized area, thus the corridor crash crate was compared to the statewide average urban crash rate.

Texas statewide five-year (2011-2015) average crash rate for similar interstate facilities reported 103 crashes per 100MVMT. The entire length of $1-10$ corridor had a five-year average crash rate of 34 crashes per 100MVMT, which is $67 \%$ lower than the five-year statewide average. The results are summarized in Table 4-2.

Table 4-2. I-10 Crash Rate Analysis Summary (2011-2015)

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Yearly Total | 410 | 658 | 411 | 607 | 1705 |
| Average Daily Traffic Volume* | 115,467 | 115,901 | 121,025 | 102,827 | 106,710 |
| I-10 Corridor Crash Rate | 17.50 | 27.98 | 16.73 | 29.09 | 78.73 |
| Statewide Average Crash Rate** | 70.21 | 94.14 | 99.44 | 108.82 | 142.21 |
| Corridor Safety Ratio | 0.25 | 0.30 | 0.17 | 0.27 | 0.55 |
| Five-Year Annual Average Safety Ratio | 0.31 or $69 \%$ less crashes than other urban interstate facilities |  |  |  |  |

*TxDOT Transportation Data Management System
**TxDOT Statewide Traffic Crash Rates for an Urban Interstate facility.

## (b) Crash Contributing Factors

There were over 30 different contributing factors were identified along the corridor. Only the top contributing factors are shown in Table 4-3. Top Crash Contributing Factors by Segment (2011-2015) The table below shows that $35 \%$ (1,306 crashes) of the total number of crashes involved speeding; 10\% (364 crashes) involved driver inattention/distraction, and 9\% (327 crashes) involved unsafe lane changes. Segment 3 contained the majority of these crash factors.

## Table 4-3. Top Crash Contributing Factors by Segment (2011-2015)

|  | Segment 1 | Segment 2 | Segment 3 | Segment 4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Speeding | 267 | 338 | 600 | 101 |
| Driver Inattention/Distraction | 96 | 102 | 134 | 32 |
| Unsafe Lane Change | 85 | 93 | 134 | 15 |
| Followed Too Closely | 13 | 27 | 60 | 5 |
| Fatigued or Asleep | 16 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Faulty Evasive Action | 23 | 15 | 25 | 8 |
| Failed to Drive in Single Lane | 19 | 9 | 8 | 11 |
| Alcohol Related | 29 | 27 | 25 | 23 |
| Other | 167 | 101 | 127 | 88 |
| Information Not Reported | 199 | 215 | 389 | 62 |
| Total Crashes | 914 | 932 | 1506 | 349 |

(c) Crash Types

Over 20 different crash types were identified along the corridor, only the top types are shown below (Table 3-X). The table below shows that $35 \%$ ( 1,306 crashes) of the total number of crashes involved were rear end crashes and 28\% (1,033 crashes) involved one motor vehicle going straight. Segment 3 contained the majority of rear-end, sideswipe, one straight-one stopped, and "other" crashes. Segment 1 contained the most one motor vehicle-going straight crashes.


Figure 4-4. Top Crash Types by Segment (2011-2015)
In summary, over a five-year period, $90 \%$ ( 3,339 crashes) of the crashes were on the l-10 corridor mainlanes. The corridor had a five-year average safety ratio of 0.31 meaning the study segment had $69 \%$ less crash occurrence than similar urban interstate facilities. Although the project area has fewer crash occurrences, the l-10 corridor is in an urbanized area and will continue to be a major east-west route which could likely increase in traffic over the next 20 years. This increase could likely lead to higher crash rates. In order to improve safety along the corridor, alternatives should be explored to improve access, capacity, and the movement trucks and freight along l-10.

## 5. Existing Alternative Modes of Transportation

### 5.1 Bicycle and Pedestrian

The City of El Paso maintains various types of bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the city. The existing bicycle network has over 100 miles of on-street bicycle facilities (e.g., bike routes, bike lanes, and wide shoulders) and over 30 miles of shared use paths (including sidepaths) ${ }^{3}$. In addition to linear facilities, a bike share system called SunCycle, operates an eight-station bike share system in and around the Downtown EI Paso and the UTEP area ${ }^{4}$. Sidewalks are generally located throughout the city and are used for shorter trips. The sidewalks in El Paso provide connections within neighborhoods, commercial and retail areas, downtown, and to bus stops.

In November 2016 the EI Paso MPO completed their Multimodal Plan which outlined the demand of bicycle and pedestrian facilities compare to the availability, or supply, of those facilities. The preliminary findings of this report show that the demand of bicycle and pedestrian facilities is in more demand than there are existing facilities (Figure 5-1 through Figure 5-2) ${ }^{5}$. According to a multimodal behavioral survey in the plan, $6 \%$ of respondents bike to school or work at least once a week; 63\% would bike more if they felt safer in traffic; and $32 \%$ would be willing to bike more if connected lanes existed. Regarding walking, 13\% of respondents walk to school or work at least once a week and $72 \%$ would be willing to walk more if a larger number of safer walking routes existed ${ }^{6}$.

In addition to the Multimodal Plan, the Transportation Policy Board of the EI Paso MPO approved the Active Transportation System in July 2016. This System designates seven key corridors that would promote biking, walking, and improved air quality along the Texas-Mexico border and major thoroughfares within El Paso County.

Bicycle and pedestrian modes are evaluated because these their facilities intersect and are adjacent to l-10. Should there be future improvements to l-10, these facilities would need to be maintained or improved upon. Another reason for evaluation is due to the proximity of the different transit services that intersect or use l-10. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are critical to complete the "last mile," especially to and from transit stops. The following paragraphs describe bicycle facilities as they relate to each segment of the l-10 Corridor. As shown in Figure 5-1 there are several existing bicycle facilities that intersect, terminate, or are parallel to the l-10 Corridor.

[^7]

Figure 5-1. Bicycle Demand-Supply Assessment for 20147


Figure 5-2. Walking Demand-Supply Assessment for 20148

[^8]Segment 1 contains a shared use path along I-10 between Loop 375 and Ohara Road and a shared use path that intersects I-10 along Loop 375. In addition, a bike lane I-10 along Redd Road. Segment 2 contains bike lanes and shared lane markings. Bike lanes are located on Prospect Street and Los Angeles Drive which intersect and terminate at l-10, respectively. Shared lane markings can be found along Yandell Street between downtown to east of US 54 and on Sun Bowl Road which terminates into the l-10 eastbound frontage road. SunCycle bike share stations are clustered downtown and north of I-10 between the interstate and UTEP. In Segment 3, only a bike lane crosses l-10 along Yarborough Drive. All other streets that with bicycle facilities terminate into l-10. These streets include Yandell Drive which has shared lane markings and Lee Trevino Drive and Hunter Drive which have bike lanes. There are no bicycle facilities near I-10 in Segment 4. The closest facility is a widened shoulder on North Loop Drive that is over a mile southwest of I-10.

As shown in Figure 5-3 below there are existing gaps and linkages near the $\mathrm{I}-10$ corridor that need to be connected. The City of El Paso's Bike Plan outlines in detail proposed bicycle connections and which facility types should be used. Bicycle facilities in this plan include bike lanes, cycle tracks, bicycle boulevards, shared roadways, shared use paths, and additional SunCycle bike share stations.


Figure 5-3. El Paso Existing Bicycle Facilities ${ }^{9}$

[^9]
### 5.2 Transit Services

Sun Metro provides fixed route bus service, paratransit service, and Rapid Transit System (RTS) service throughout El Paso and its surrounding areas. It provides service to shopping centers, employment centers, public facilities, healthcare facilities, and education. Transit services in El Paso serve over 820,000 people throughout 255 square miles, employs nearly 600 people, and as of 2013 has an annual ridership of over $16.5 \mathrm{M}^{10}$. According to the El Paso Multi Modal Plan summary report, approximately $8 \%$ of residents use transit to commute to work or school at least once a week ${ }^{11}$. The existing and proposed transit network in El Paso is comprehensive and uses all thoroughfare types, including l-10.

Transit services were evaluated because their services impact the l-10 corridor in two ways: 1) they affect the capacity of the I-10 mainlanes by using the Corridor as a part of their system's routes and 2) proposed Corridor alternatives may affect transit system operations, connections, and "last mile" linkages to destinations or other forms of transportation. Figure 5-4 shows the full-service network of Sun Metro's transit system. The following sections describe the different service types Sun Metro operates.

## (a) Fixed Route Bus Service

Sun Metro's fixed route bus service contains over 59 routes and 3,363 bus stops ( 490 shelters) throughout the City of El Paso. This operation supports its patrons by providing connectivity throughout the city by its eight transfer centers and six Park and Ride facilities. Sun Metro has a fixed bus route fleet of 167 buses that are compressed natural gas (CNG), which emit $50 \%$ less pollutants than a typical bus ${ }^{12}$.

To ensure that the functions of this service is operating efficiently, a variety of metrics can be used to measure the systems performance. These measures include route-level average and ranked data for ridership, passengers per mile, and passengers per hour, average trip length, and the origin and destination of trips.

Since this service spans a large area, we must take into consideration the context of the bus routes and their connections relative to the location of each Corridor segment. Figure $5-4$ shows Sun Metro's fixed route bus service.

[^10]

Figure 5-4. Sun Metro Fixed Route Bus System
Segment 1 contains two Express/Special routes and one Westside route which uses I-10 and its frontage roads between Loop 375 and Sunland Park Road. There are no routes along l-10 between Sunland Park Road and Executive Center Boulevard, however, there are segments of the Express/Special routes that run parallel to the Corridor along SH 20 (Mesa Street) and US 62 (Paisano Drive). East-west connections across I-10 are maintained within this segment at Loop 375, Thorn Avenue, Country Club Road, and Sunland Park Road. The AI Jefferson Westside Transfer Center in located just east of I-10 on Remcon Circle.

Six routes use I-10 in the Segment 2 area (Downtown) between Santa Fe Street and US 54. These routes are mostly Express/Special routes and one Downtown route. The Express/Special routes provide limited stop access up to Loop 375 along I-10; UTEP along SH 20 (Mesa Street); Loop 375 along US 54; and to various neighborhoods in southeast El Paso. There are no routes that use I-10 between Executive Center Boulevard and Santa Fe Street. Two routes run parallel to l-10 between these cross-streets. North-south connections across l-10 are maintained by several Downtown,

Express/Special, South Central, and Eastside routes. In addition, there are four transfer centers/terminals within the Segment 2 area: the Glory Road Transfer Center; Union Depot; the Union Plaza Transit Terminal; and the Bert Williams Downtown Santa Fe Transit Center.

Segment 3 contains five Express/Special routes and four Eastside routes that use l-10. These routes provide access to the neighborhoods within southeast El Paso as well as the El Paso International Airport. No routes use l-10 east of Lomaland Drive, however Rojas Drive is used as a parallel route. North-south and east-west connection across $\mathrm{l}-10$ are maintained by the South Central, Express/Special, Eastside, and North Central routes. The Eastside Terminal and the Mission Valley Transfer Center are the closest transfer centers to this segment.

Segment 4 does not contain any routes on I-10. Sun Metro's fixed route bus service area extends slightly past Loop 375 and only services neighborhoods to the north and south of I-10.

Currently, the fixed bus route service does not offer a continuous regional alternative within the project limits along I-10. The Express/Special routes offer longer routes on and parallel to l-10. Regardless of the route, riders are still required to make a stop downtown. In addition, routes that use the l-10 corridor share the mainlanes with traffic. This increases delay during peak-hour trips and causes a more unreliable trip in general.

## (b) Paratransit and Job Express Services

The LIFT is Sun Metro's paratransit service for ADA paratransit-eligible clients that provides curb-tocurb, on-demand transportation up to 1.5 miles beyond its fixed route bus service within the El Paso city limits using small buses equipped with hydraulic mobility device lifts and tie downs. This service also has a door-to-door service for those that qualify ${ }^{13}$. LIFT only has one facility and it is located on Fred Wilson Road near US 54.

Similar to LIFT, the Job Express service is an on-demand, shared ride service that provides low-income clients with job and employment related trips such as providing trips to and from work, searching for employment, and daycare ${ }^{14}$.
(c) Rapid Transit System

Since 2010 The City of El Paso and Sun Metro have been planning for and implementing a four-line (Mesa, Alameda, Dyer, and Montana) rapid transit system (RTS) that would radiate from downtown El Paso thorough the region ${ }^{15}$. This system, known as the Sun Metro Brio, would 60 -foot articulated buses that would share a traffic lane. Station stops would be about a mile apart and buses would run

[^11]a frequent as every 10 minutes in the peak-hours. This would allow passengers to reach their destinations faster than the conventional fixed route bus system.

The SH 20 (Mesa Street) corridor, the first of the four lines, opened in the fall of 2014. This corridor is 8.6 miles long and provides service between the Downtown Transfer Center and the Westside Transfer Center. Construction on the second corridor, Alameda, is tentatively scheduled to be completed in early 2018. This corridor is 14.5 miles long and provides service between the Downtown Transfer Center, Five Points Transit Terminal, and the Mission valley Transfer Centers. The Dyer and Montana corridors are tentatively scheduled to be operational in 2018 and 2020, respectively. The Dyer corridor will be 10.2 miles long and provide service between the Downtown Transfer Center, Five Points Terminal, and the Northeast Terminal. The Montana corridor will be 16.8 miles long and provide service between the Five Points Terminal, Eastside Terminal, the Transit Operations Center, and the proposed Far East Transfer Center ${ }^{16}$. Figure 5-5 shows the location of the existing Mesa corridor and proposed Alameda, Dyer, and Montana RTS corridors.

To ensure that this service is operating efficiently, a variety of metrics can be used to measure the systems performance. These measures include route-level average and ranked data for ridership, passengers per mile, and passengers per hour, average trip length, and the origin and destination of trips.

[^12]

Figure 5-5. Sun Metro Brio Existing and Proposed Corridors
The existing SH 20 (Mesa Street) corridor and the three proposed corridors do not use I-10 for any of their RTS service, however, the RTS services does cross I-10 at Oregon Street (Mesa), Kansas Street (proposed Dyer), and Piedras Street (proposed Alameda), all within Segment 2 of the Corridor. The SH 20 (Mesa Street) corridor and the proposed Alameda corridor run somewhat parallel to I-10 and only extend as far north as SH 20 (Mesa Street) and l-10 intersection (Mesa) and as far south as Loop 375 (proposed Alameda).
(d) Streetcar

Construction of the 4.8-mile streetcar route (Figure 5-6) from Downtown El Paso to the University of Texas El Paso campus is currently underway. The route will consist of two loops: a Downtown Loop and an Uptown Loop. The intent of the proposed streetcar route is to provide connectivity between UTEP and Downtown including neighborhoods, retail centers, public facilities, and the medical center. Once operational, Sun Metro will operate and maintain the Streetcars and associated facilities ${ }^{17}$.

The proposed streetcar route will cross I-10 on Oregon Street and Stanton Street within Segment 2. The Downtown Loop will provide a stop at the Downtown Transfer Center.

[^13]

Figure 5-6. Proposed El Paso Streetcar Route
(e) Light Rail

El Paso does not currently have a light rail system, but the City's comprehensive plan, Plan El Paso, explores the possibility of converting parts of the RTS network or freight rail network to light rail service ${ }^{18}$.

[^14]
### 5.3 Passenger Rail (Amtrak)

Two Amtrak routes (Texas Eagle and Sunset Limited) have stops in El Paso. Texas Eagle begins in Chicago and ties into Sunset Limited in San Antonio. Sunset Limited begins in New Orleans and ends in Los Angeles. Amtrak routes facilitate travel across the country, and individual routes primarily contribute to the overall Amtrak network rather than catering specifically to the travel needs of any individual state/region. Due to the speed and frequency of Amtrak trips through El Paso, Amtrak is not a great option for commuters making trips of short length or duration. One-way end to end trips last nearly two full days and only pass through El Paso three times a week (going each direction). For these reasons, $96 \%$ of the passengers on Sunset Limited in 2005 were taking leisure trips. The remaining $4 \%$ were making business trips ${ }^{19}$.

Within the project area, Amtrak runs parallel to I-10. In Segment 4, the tracks are consistently offset about 2 miles to the southwest of I-10. In Segment 3, this margin decreases from 2 miles to 1000 feet. Tracks run within 200 feet of I-10 for a significant portion of Segment 2, getting as close as 40 feet to the edge of travelled way. Amtrak utilizes El Paso Station just west of downtown for boarding. Towards the end of Segment 2, the tracks veer west and head into New Mexico. See Figure 5-7 for the Amtrak alignment through the project area.


Figure 5-7. Amtrak Alignment in El Paso

[^15]
### 5.4 Freight Transport

El Paso is a significant entry point into the U.S. from Mexico and serves as a commercial freight, truck and air hub for the region. In addition, it is anticipated that combined rail and truck traffic will increase nearly $50 \%$ by $2025^{20}$. Rail and truck freight transport is important in this study because they have the ability to affect the capacity and travel conditions of I-10 and the surround street network. In principle, if alternatives can be developed to improve the ways freight is transported through El Paso, travel conditions such as access, delay, safety, and congestion would ultimately improve. According to the EMPO, future plans related to freight transport include the use freight shuttles that would move containers only. Some of the benefits of freight shuttles include less traffic congestion, improved safety, lower emissions, and lower prices on goods achieved through a more efficient shipping practice ${ }^{21}$. As shown in Figure 5-8, Horizon 2040 proposes freight shuttle Ports of Entry (POEs) at the Zaragoza and Billy the Kid POEs.


Figure 5-8. Proposed Freight Shuttle for Zaragoza East and Billy the Kid POEs
(a) Rail Freight

Only three companies provided all rail service to El Paso; these companies include UPRR, Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), and Ferromex. UPRR is the most dominant railroad in El Paso. They operate four rail yards and are responsible for about 40 trains per day passing through El Paso. Of these trains, $25 \%$ travel to the Midwest and the remainder travel through Texas via Dallas or Houston. BNSF has only a single line that terminates at its rail yard just west of Downtown. This yard serves local customers and interchanges rail cars with UPRR and Ferromex. Feromex is the largest railroad

[^16]in Mexico. Its trains pass through Juárez into El Paso where cars are transferred to either UPRR or BNSF railyards. Ferromex trains are only allowed to pass through El Paso between 12:00 AM and 6:00 AM because of the traffic conflicts they create during the daytime. The existing railroad has 68 at-grade crossings, which at times causes traffic delay when longer trains pass through. Figure 5-9 shows the existing railroads and yards in El Paso ${ }^{22}$.


Figure 5-9. Existing Rail Network

[^17]In general, the UPRR rail line runs parallel to l-10 corridor the entire length of the study area. UPRR's Dallas yard and BNSF's yard are both adjacent to I-10 in Segment 2. UPRR's Alfalfa yard is just over a mile southwest of I-10 near Segment 3.

Relevant plans and studies that focus on rail locally and throughout the El Paso Region include the El Paso Downtown 2015 Plan, Plan El Paso, the El Paso Regional Freight Rail Study, and the Santa Teresa International Rail Study. The El Paso Downtown 2015 Plan and Plan El Paso, discuss using the west end of UPRR's Dallas railyard to develop a large park space near city hall ${ }^{23}$ or residential mixed use ${ }^{24}$, respectively. The EI Paso Regional Freight Rail Study focused on providing an analysis of freight rail mobility for the region (TxDOT's El Paso District). The results of this study included a review of the existing rail system and improvements planned for the region. An initiative that came from this report was the Santa Teresa International Rail Study. This study evaluated rail bypass alternatives between Chihuahua and New Mexico. The recommended alternative (ALT HYB) would terminate at the BNSF rail line in New Mexico, west of I-10 and just north of the limit of Section $1^{25}$.

## (b) Truck Freight

This subsection of the report is focused on the origins and destinations of freight and the network of roadways that are used to transport it. As of 2016, trucks consisted of $10 \%$ of vehicles that travel along Segment 1 during peak periods, $5 \%$ of vehicles that travel along Segment 2 during peak periods, $7 \%$ of vehicles that travel along Segment 3 during peak periods, and $20 \%$ of vehicles that travel along Segment 4 during peak periods. Truck freight uses the l-10 corridor and surrounding street network and is distributed throughout El Paso in one of four ways: 1) through trips; 2) POE destinations; 3) local destinations; and 4) intermodal destinations such as rail yards and the airport. Figure 5-10 shows these elements as they relate to the l-10 corridor.

Through truck freight is freight passing through El Paso along l-10 east to Dallas-Fort Worth area or San Antonio or west to New Mexico. 26\% of truck freight passed through El Paso in 2016.

There are five POEs parallel to the l-10 corridor within the El Paso region. These include the Fabens POE; the Ysleta-Zaragoza POE (Segment 3); the Bridge of the Americas (BOTA) POE (Segment 2/3); the Paso Del Norte POE (Segment 2); and the Stanton POE (Segment 2). Of these POEs, truck freight is restricted to the BOTA and Zaragoza POEs. The operating hours for the BOTA are from 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM, while the Zaragoza POE operates six hours longer (6:00 AM to midnight). Because the BOTA POE closes earlier in the evening, truck freight shifts to the Zaragoza POE and causes congestion and delays ${ }^{26}$.

[^18]Local distribution of truck freight includes freight traveling to, from, or within El Paso. These trips originate or end at various commercial, industrial, or manufacturing locations. Intermodal destinations include the BNSF and UPRR rail yards and the El Paso International Airport.


Figure 5-10. Truck Freight Origin and Destinations by Land Use
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## 1. Ramping Alternatives

In order to determine the safety impact of various entrance ramp designs, predictive crash analysis was performed for three scenarios: Direct Merge, Merge Lane, and Lane Add.

The direct merge scenario includes no speed change lane (modeled as 0.04 miles, which is the minimum).

The merge lane scenario includes a speed change lane (modeled as 0.30 miles, which is the maximum).

The lane add scenario includes an additional lane after the entrance ramp gore.
The freeway was modeled as a one mile, 8 lane, symmetrical facility with an entrance ramp in either direction. Symmetry allows for results to be divided in half to determine the impacts of a single ramp design. AADTs of 150000 in 2022 and 200000 in 2042 were used for the mainlanes, and AADTs of 7500 and 10000 were used for each ramp. A summary of the results of the predictive crash analysis are shown in the table that follows. All values are in crashes/yr.

Table 1-1. Predictive Crash Analysis Results

| Alt | Total | \% Dec. | K | A | B | C | PDO | Ranking <br> (1-3, 3 being <br> worst) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direct <br> Merge | 27.7 | 0 | 0.15 | 0.35 | 2.45 | 4.8 | 19.95 | 3 |
| Merge <br> Lane | 25.25 | -9.70 | 0.15 | 0.35 | 2.3 | 4.45 | 18 | 2 |
| Lane <br> Add | 23.15 | -19.65 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 2.15 | 4.15 | 16.4 | 1 |

The "Lane Add" scenario was modeled as 10 lanes instead of 8 lanes due to the additional lane in each direction. Results shown in the table are for half of the facility (one ramp and mainlanes for one direction of travel).

## 2. Corridor-Wide Alternatives

Below are the results of the ISATe predictive crash analysis for the No Build and four build alternatives. A one-mile straight segment (with no ramps) of the typical section was modeled for each case. All values are in crashes per year for the years 2022-2042.

Table 2-1. ISATe Predictive Crash Analysis Results Summary

| Alt | Total | K | A | B | C | PDO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Build | 527.5 | 2.2 | 5.8 | 40.4 | 81.0 | 398.0 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 452.2 | 2.1 | 5.5 | 38.3 | 76.8 | 329.5 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 415.0 | 2.0 | 5.1 | 35.3 | 70.9 | 301.8 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 452.2 | 2.1 | 5.5 | 38.3 | 76.8 | 329.5 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 524.4 | 2.4 | 6.1 | 42.1 | 84.3 | 389.7 |

Overall traffic was the same for each alternative. The largest projected 2042 PHV for each segment and a peak hour factor of 0.1 was used for analysis, and 2022 volumes were determined using the projected growth rate for the corridor. The traffic volumes used were as follows:

Table 2-2. ISATe Predictive Crash Analysis Overall AADTs

| Segment 1 |  | Segment 2 |  | Segment 3 |  | Segment 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 2042 | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 2}$ | 2022 | 2042 |
| 90100 | 133400 | 155600 | 230300 | 155500 | 230200 | 48800 | 72200 |

The No Build alternative was modeled as four lanes in Segments 1 and 4 and as six lanes in Segments 2 and 3.

Alternative 1 was modeled as six lanes in Segments 1 and 4 and as eight lanes in Segments 2 and 3.

Alternative 2 was modeled as six lanes in Segments 1 and 4 and as eight lanes in Segments 2 and 3. The inside shoulder was modeled as 12 ' due to software limitations (ISATe allows a maximum inside shoulder width of 12 '), but the median width accounts for 15 ' inside shoulders.

Alternative 3 was modeled exactly the same as Alternative 1 due to software limitations (ISATe has no input for the 2' buffer). It is likely that potential high differences in speed between the adaptive lanes and mainlanes will lead to more severe crashes because the facilities are not physically separated.

For Alternative 4, the barrier separated adaptive lanes were modeled separately as a four-lane facility due to software limitations (the minimum number of lanes for a facility is four). The mainlanes were modeled as 4 lanes in Segments 1 and 4, and as six lanes in Segments 2 and 3. It was assumed that during peak periods 1000 vph will use each barrier separated adaptive lane in Segment 1, 1700 vph will use each barrier separated adaptive lane in Segments 2 and 3, and 500 vph will use each barrier separated adaptive lane in Segment 4. These volumes were scaled to AADTs (using the peak hour factor of 0.1) and subtracted from the overall volumes for the mainlane analysis. Table 1 includes the combined mainlane and adaptive lane crashes for this alternative (traffic for four lanes was modeled on the barrier separated adaptive lanes and then crashes were divided in half before being added to the mainlane crashes). The traffic and crash breakdown can be found in Tables 3-5.

Table 2-3. Alternative 4 Mainlane Traffic

| Segment 1 |  | Segment 2 |  | Segment 3 |  | Segment 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | $\mathbf{2 0 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 2}$ |
| 76600 | 113400 | 132700 | 196300 | 132600 | 196200 | 42100 | 62200 |

Table 2-4. Alternative 4 Barrier Separated Adaptive Lane Traffic

| Segment 1 |  | Segment 2 |  | Segment 3 |  | Segment 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 2042 | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 2}$ | 2022 | 2042 |
| 27000 | 40000 | 45900 | 68000 | 45900 | 68000 | 13500 | 20000 |

*Shows traffic for four-lane facility

Table 2-5. Alternative 4 Mainlane and Adaptive Lane Crashes

|  | Total | K | A | B | C | PDO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mainlanes | 480.3 | 2.1 | 5.4 | 37.5 | 75.2 | 360.1 |
| Barrier <br> Separated <br> Adaptive Lanes* | 88.2 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 9.1 | 18.1 | 59.2 |
| *Shows crashes for four-lane facility |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Page 3 of the ISATe User Manual states, "The predictive method for freeways does not account for the influence of the following conditions on freeway safety: Freeways with limited access managed lanes that are buffer-separated from the general-purpose lanes."

Page 58 of the ISATEe User Manual states, "ISATe can be used to evaluate freeways with barrierseparated managed lanes. The managed lanes are considered to be part of the median... The safety of the managed lanes is not addressed by this technique. The estimate of expected average crash frequency only includes crashes that occur in the general-purpose lanes."
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## 1. Study Background

HDR was retained by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) El Paso District to perform operational traffic analysis for a corridor-wide feasibility and planning study of current and future transportation needs for the IH 10 corridor. IH 10 is a major east to west Interstate Highway spanning approximately 2,460 miles in the Southern United States. Figure 1 shows the entire expanse of the IH 10 corridor. The section of IH 10 in Texas begins at Orange, Texas, and passes through the Cities of Houston and San Antonio before making its way to the City of El Paso, Texas. For this reason, IH 10 is a vital link for freight and commercial traffic between East and West Texas and points beyond. The study area is from the Texas-New Mexico state line to FM 3380 near Turnillo, Texas, and is approximately 55 miles in length.


Figure 1: IH 10 US Corridor

### 1.1 Purpose and Need

Because of the vital importance that IH 10 has on interstate and international commerce, any considerable delay will have significant costs. This cost was summarized by Texas' 100 Most Congested Road website, which estimates that regionally El Paso sees approximately 12.8 M hours of delay each year on approximately 293 miles of roadway. This delay costs travelers an estimated $\$ 282.5 \mathrm{M}$ a year and waste approximately 5.8 M gallons of fuel. Not only does this congestion have an adverse effect on daily travelers within the region, but this congestion also has a severe effect on the economy with an estimated $\$ 48.5 \mathrm{M}$ cost to industries that rely on the trucking industry. Figure 2


Source: Texas A\&M Transportation Institute
Figure 2: Regional Snapshot of Congestion Impact
provides a snapshot of the overall cost and fuel wasted due to added delay.

The purpose of this traffic study was to determine how the existing IH 10 corridor operates, which includes determining existing delay and capacity constraints from mainlanes and ramps as well as frontage roads and intersections. The traffic study also went further to determine how future traffic volumes will be impacted if nothing is down to improve the system.

Preliminary research has found that IH 10 has one of the top 100 congested segments in the State of Texas. This segment, from North Mesa to US 54, currently ranks number 86 . This section, which is approximately 11 miles in length, has over 555,000 hours of delay and has a congestion cost of over $\$ 11.9 \mathrm{M}$. Another segment on IH 10, which is between US 54 and Hawkins, is currently ranked number 134 in the State. This four-mile segment has over 550,000 hours of delay and has a congestion cost of over $\$ 11.8 \mathrm{M}$. Table 1 puts in perspective how much IH 10 cost users each year and how much of the total percentage it accounts for based on the Top 100 Congested Road research.

Table 1: Impacts of Congestion on IH 10

| Total Delay (hours) | $2,162,229$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Congest Cost | $\$ 48,260,481$ |
| Percent of Regional Roads | $11 \%$ |
| Percent of Regional Delay | $17 \%$ |
| Percent of Regional Cost | $17 \%$ |

Source: Texas A\&M Transportation Institute Texas' Most Congested Roadways - 2019

Figure 3 provides a snapshot of each segment on IH 10 with their subsequent statistics from Texas A\&M Transportation Institute Texas' Most Congested Roadways - 2019.

CanAm Hwy / IH 10 / US 85 / US 180 (Rank: 1,229| El Paso) From Woodrow Bean Transmountain Rd / SL 375 to N Mesa St / SH 20 in El Paso County.

| Total Delay: 91,477 Hours | TCI: 1.03 I Congestion adds 1 min to a trip. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Delay per Mile: 18,955 Hours | CSI: 1.04 I Congestion adds 1 min in the peak direction. |
| Daily Volume: 88,701 Vehicles | PTI: 1.06 Traffic variability adds 1 min to trip planning. |
|  | "Sased on a 20 min trip. |

Congestion Cost: $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 1 0 7 , 4 4 4}$


Peak Delay | Off-Peak Delay I Weekend Delay (Segment 1000017)

CanAm Hwy/ iH 10 IUS 85 IUS 180 (Rank. 465 El Paso) From N Mesa St / SH 20 to CanAm Hwy / W Paisano Dr / US 85 in El Paso County.

Total Delay: $\mathbf{1 6 3 , 7 1 2}$ Hours
Delay per Mile: 64,631 Hours Daily Volume: 113,011 Vehicles

TCI: $1.10 \mid$ Congestion adds 2 min to a trip CSI: 1.14 | Congestion adds 3 min in the peak direction. PTI: 1.21 | Traffic variability adds 4 min to trip planning. Eased on a 20 min trig.

Congestion Cost: \$4,162,065


Peak Delay | Off-Peak Delay | Weekend Delay (Segment 1000016)

IH 10 / US 180 (Rank: 316 | El Paso)
From CanAm Hwy / W Paisano Dr / US 85 to N Mesa St / SH 20 in EI Paso County.
Total Delay: 461,974 Hours
Delay per Mile: 81,434 Hours
Daily Volume: 141,620 Vehicles

TCI: 1.13 | Congestion adds 3 min to a trip.
CSI: 1.21 | Congestion adds 4 min in the peak direction PTI: 1.31 | Traffic variability adds 6 min to trip planning 'Based on a 20 min trio

Congestion Cost: \$10,741,445


Peak Delay I Oft-Peak Delay I Weekend Delay (Segment 1000015)

Gateway Blvd / IH 10 / US 180 (Rank: 86 | El Paso) From N Mass St f 5H 20 to Patriot Fwy / US 64 in EI Paso County.
 Dily Volurne. 179,606 Vehicles

TCI: 1.251 Congestion adds 5 min to a tio.
CS. 1.38 - Congestive ydis 8 min in Ure veak diection. PTI. 1.82 Traffic veriasjlity adds 12 min to vip planning sasedona 20 minto

Congestion Cost: $\$ 11,029,452$


Pauk Dalay | Off-Paak Dalay | Weskend Dalay
Seyment P008014]

Gateway Blvd / IH 10 (Rank: 134 | El Paso) From Patriot Fwy / US 54 to Hawkins Blvd in El Paso County.

| Total Delay: 550,345 Hours | TCI: 1.19 \| Congestion adds 4 min to a trip. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Delay per Mile: 134,460 Hours | CSI: 1.22 \| Congestion adds 4 min in the peak direction |
| Daily Volume: 164,219 Vehicles | PTI: 1.42 \| Traffic variability adds 8 min to trip planning. |
|  | 'Based on a 20 min sip. |

Congestion Cost: $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 , 8 4 4 , 1 5 4}$


Peak Delay I Off-Peak Delay I Weekend Delay (Segment 1000013)

Gateway Blvd / IH 10 (Rank: 428 | El Paso) From Hawkins Blvd to Lee Trevino Dr in El Paso County.

Total Delay: 259,087 Hours
Delay per Mile: 68,614 Hours Daily Volume: 138,219 Vehicles

TCI: $\mathbf{1 . 1 1}$ | Congestion adds 2 min to a trip.
CSI: 1.17 | Congestion adds 3 min in the peak direction. PTL: 1.27 | Traffic variability adds 5 min to trip planning. "Based on a 20 min trip.

Congestion Cost: $\mathbf{5 5 , 6 4 6 , 8 2 5}$


Peak Delay I Off-Peak Delay I Weekend Delay (Segment 1000012)

Gateway Blvd / IH 10 (Rank: 1,305 | El Paso) From Lee Trevino Dr to Joe Battle Blvd/ SL 375 in El Paso County.

| Total Delay: 56,926 Hours | TCI: $1.04 \mid$ Congestion adds 1 min to a trip. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Delay per Mile: 16,063 Hours | CSI: $1.05 \mid$ Congestion adds 1 min in the peak direction. |
| Daily Volume: 82,951 Vehicles | PTI: $1.11 \mid$ Traffic variability adds 2 min to trip planning. |



Peak Delay | Off-Peak Delay | Weekend Delay
(Segment 1000011)

CSI: 1.05 | Congestion adds 1 min in the peak direction "Eased on a 20 min trip

Congestion Cost: $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 4 1 2 , 8 9 2}$

Gateway Blvd / IH 10 (Rank: 1,561 | EI Paso) From Joe Battle Blvd / SL 375 to Horizon BIvd / FM 1281 in El Paso County.

Total Delay: 17,631 Hours
Delay per Mile: 4,525 Hours Daily Volume: $\mathbf{2 6 , 2 2 0}$ Vehicles

TCI: 1.04 | Congestion adds 1 min to a trip CSI: 1.06 I Congestion adds 1 min in the peak direction. PTI: 1.07 | Traffic variability adds 1 min to trip planning. "Eased on a 20 min trip.

Congestion Cost: $\mathbf{\$ 4 1 6 , 2 0 4}$


Peak Delay | Off-Peak Delay I Weekend Delay (Segment 1000010)

Source: Texas A\&M Transportation Institute Texas’ Most Congested Roadways - 2019 El Paso District,
Figure 3: IH 10 Congestion Ranking by Segment

The congestion in the region and especially on IH 10, is expected only to increase. Census data, which was taken from the Freight Mobility Plan, shows that there was a population growth of 17.3 percent from 2000 to 2010 with the most significant growth in El Paso County. This can be viewed in Table 2. Employment also increased overall at 7.9 percent. With the population and employment growth in the region increasing, this will only increase the strain that IH 10 already experiences every day.

Table 2: Population and Employment Growth

|  | POPULATION |  |  | EMPLOYMENT |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | 2010 Census | 2000 Census | Growth Rate | 2010 <br> Employment | 2000 <br> Employment | Growth Rate |
| Brewster | 9,232 | 8,866 | $4.1 \%$ | 4,591 | 4,188 | $9.6 \%$ |
| Culberson | 2,398 | 2,975 | $-19.4 \%$ | 1,096 | 957 | $14.5 \%$ |
| El Paso | 800,647 | 679,622 | $17.8 \%$ | 270,603 | 251,417 | $7.6 \%$ |
| Hudspeth | 3,476 | 3,344 | $3.9 \%$ | 1,171 | 800 | $46.4 \%$ |
| Jeff Davis | 2,342 | 2,207 | $6.1 \%$ | 1,000 | 895 | $11.7 \%$ |
| Presidio | 7,818 | 7,304 | $7.0 \%$ | 2,259 | 1,912 | $18.1 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 825,913 | 704,318 | $17.3 \%$ | 280,720 | 260,169 | $7.9 \%$ |

Source: El Paso District Profile Texas Freight Mobility Plan 2018
With the anticipated growth of both population and employment, additional analysis was conducted to locate where the growth is anticipated to occur. From El Paso's MPO TDM, population growth is expected to occur between the border with New Mexico and Vinton and near America's Interchange (Loop 375 and IH 10). This will likely increase congestion on IH 10 because of travelers commuting to and from their residences. The employment growth is anticipated to grow along the entirety of IH 10, which may constrain capacity improvements because of geographic constraints. Figure 4 shows the anticipated location of growth.


Figure 4: Location of Anticipated Growth

Another key indicator for the future demand on IH 10 is the historical growth of daily volume. Figure 5 shows TxDOT Planning Map historical traffic growth trends for each segment of IH 10. As shown in the figure, most of the locations show low to moderate traffic growth during the past 20 years. In Figure 5, each solid line represents the Average Annual Daily Traffic taken from TxDOT Planning Map. The dashed line represents the trend line for each segment of IH 10. Even though the trends show low to moderate increase of volume, the historical trend indicates that the slope of each trend line is positive and therefore, traffic is growing.


Figure 5: Historical Traffic Volume Trend
Going further than population and employment growth, freight is expected to increase on IH 10 . El Paso's Freight Mobility Plan estimates that overall tonnage that is being shipped in and out of the region will increase by 64 percent by the year 2045. This increase will likely increase the number of heavy vehicles that are present on IH 10 and add more delay to an already overburdened facility. Table 3 provides a county breakdown of the growth in tonnage.

Table 3: Freight Tonnage Growth

| County | 2016 Tonnage | 2045 Tonnage | \% Change <br> 2016-2045 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brewster | 120,635 | 285,818 | $137 \%$ |
| Culberson | $1,123,176$ | 723,682 | $-36 \%$ |
| El Paso | $33,567,333$ | $55,866,640$ | $66 \%$ |
| Hudspeth | 320,359 | 372,510 | $16 \%$ |
| Jeff Davis | 292,783 | 564,078 | $93 \%$ |
| Presidio | 194,870 | 461,992 | $137 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $35,619,157$ | $58,274,720$ | $64 \%$ |
| S |  |  |  |

Source: El Paso District Profile Texas Freight Mobility Plan 2018

Because all the trends point to an increase in population, employment, and freight, the need to preserve the right of way and to increase capacity on IH 10 is vital. The improvements suggested in the Feasibility Study will allow El Paso to remain relevant economically, improve mobility for the residents of the region, and improve safety on the facility.

### 1.2 Project Location

Since IH 10 study area is 55 miles in length, it encompassed a wide range of land use and freeway cross-section types, which range from rural areas to dense urban areas. Because of these distinct patterns, IH 10 was segmented into four study segments. Figure 6 shows the limits of each segment.


Figure 6: IH 10 Study Segments
a) Segment 1

In Segment 1, IH 10 is a four-lane divided highway from Antonio Street to North Mesa Street and a six-lane divided highway from North Mesa Street to Executive Center Boulevard. This section has a posted speed limit of 75 miles per hour (mph) from Antonio Street to Redd Road, where the speed limit decreases to 60 mph . This section has continuous frontage roads from Antonio Street to North Mesa Street with a posted speed limit of 55 mph .

Land use is primarily residential with several industrial sites and a few major entertainment and retail attractions. These attractions include Wet ' N ’ Wild Waterworld near the New Mexico State Line, the Outlet Shoppes at El Paso just north of the Loop 375 interchange, and Sunland Park Mall between Sunland Park Drive and the SH 85 interchange. Long stretches of undeveloped land border IH 10 north of Loop 375, but some significant development is taking place around the Loop 375 interchange. South of Artcraft Road/Paseo del Norte density increases, and land use is primarily residential. The two-mile stretch of uneven terrain along IH 10 between the SH 85 interchange and Executive Center Boulevard is an unrestricted manufacturing district and is undeveloped.

The north end of Segment 1 has a wide unpaved median, frontage roads, and two mainlanes in each direction. Near the Redd Road interchange, the median is paved. South of Mesa Street, there are no frontage roads and three mainlanes in each direction. The ongoing GO 10 project is adding mainlanes and collector-distributor roads to the corridor between Mesa Street and Executive Center Boulevard.

In addition to the mainlanes, ramps, and frontage roads, the following interchanges were analyzed:

- FM 1905 (Antonio Street)
- SH 37 (Vinton Road)
- Loop 375
- SH 178 (Artcraft Road)
- Redd Road
- Thorn Avenue
- SH 20 (Mesa Street)
- Sunland Park Drive
- Executive Center Boulevard
b) Segment 2

In Segment 2, IH 10 is primarily an eight-lane highway from Executive Center Boulevard to Yandell Drive. Once entering the business district at Yandell Drive, the lanes decrease to a six-lane highway. From Dallas Street to Copia Street, the lanes increase to a ten-lane highway, and from Copia Street to Raynolds Street is then reduced to an eight-lane highway. The posted speed limits for this section is 60 mph . The westbound (WB) frontage road exists east of downtown, and the eastbound (EB) frontage road exists east of Piedras Street. The mainlanes are depressed through downtown with steep walls connecting the outside shoulder edges to ground level.

Land use in this segment is widely varied but dominated by commercial, industrial, and residential uses. Major trip attractors include Downtown, the Bridge of the Americas Port of Entry, and The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP). Segment 2 is extremely dense except for the 1.5 mile stretch between Executive Center Boulevard and UTEP. BNSF rail lines run along the eastbound side of IH 10 for the majority of Segment 2, and a BNSF rail yard exists between downtown and Piedras Street. In addition to the mainlanes, ramps, and frontage roads, the following interchanges were analyzed:

- Schuster Avenue
- Piedras Street
- Porfirio Diaz Street
- Raynor Street
- Franklin Avenue
- Copia Street
- Central Business District Intersections
- Raynolds Street
- Cotton Street
c) Segment 3

In Segment 3, IH 10 is an eight-lane highway from Raynolds Street to McRae Boulevard and a sixlane highway from McRae Boulevard to Eastlake Boulevard with continuous frontage roads throughout the entire section. The posted speed limit for the mainlanes and frontage road is 60 mph and 45 mph , respectively. The median is paved, and inside shoulders are narrow at spots. Several recent studies include the following for Segment 3:

- Analysis of Mitigation Strategies for IH 10 Corridor Hot Spots (August 2007)
- Zaragoza Preliminary Improvement Concepts (September 11, 2009)

Land use in this segment is dominated by commercial and residential except for an industrial area on the eastbound side of IH 10 between Marlow Road and Tony Lama Street. Major attractions in this segment include the El Paso International Airport, Fort Bliss, The Fountains at Farah, Cielo Vista Mall, University Medical Center, the Zaragoza Port of Entry, and Bassett Place. Ramp density along Segment 3 is dense.

In addition to the mainlanes, ramps, and frontage roads, the following interchanges were analyzed:

- Paisano Drive
- Geronimo Drive
- Hawkins Boulevard
- Giles Road/McRae Boulevard
- Yarbrough Drive
- Pendale Road
- Trowbridge Drive
- Airway Boulevard
- Hunter Drive/Viscount Boulevard
- Corral Drive/Sumac Drive
- Lomaland Drive
- George Dieter Drive/Zaragoza Road
d) Segment 4

In Segment 4, IH 10 is a four-lane highway from Eastlake Boulevard to Turnillo Road with a posted speed limit of 75 mph . There are continuous frontage roads from Eastlake Boulevard to Darrington Road that have posted speed limits of 55 mph . Commercial, industrial, and agricultural zones surround the Loop 375 interchange. The remainder of this segment is primarily residential, with small businesses interspersed. There is very little development along IH 10 in Segment 4 except at the Loop 375 and Horizon Boulevard interchanges.

In addition to the mainlanes, ramps, and frontage roads, the following interchanges were analyzed:

- Eastlake Boulevard
- Fabens Road
- Horizon Boulevard
- Turnillo Road


### 1.3 Data Collection

The IH 10 study area encompasses a wide range of land use and freeway cross-section types, which range from rural and transitional areas in Segments 1 and 4 to dense urban areas in Segments 2 and 3. Each segment has distinct traffic patterns/congestion locations and times and a different mix of traffic; therefore, an extensive effort was made to collect high-resolution traffic data.
a) Field Visit

A field visit was carried out as part of the data collection efforts. The purpose was to gain firsthand knowledge and experience of the traffic conditions in the study area during the AM and PM peak periods. The following information was gathered from the field and applied to the traffic modeling efforts:

- Traffic patterns/Congestion locations/Bottlenecks
- Operations on mainlanes and frontage roads
- Geometry and lane assignment verifications at intersections
- Queue lengths
- Signage
- No RTOR
- Speed limits
- Flashing yellow indications
- Truck limitations
- School zones
- Restricted movements
- Signal timing and phasing confirmation
b) Intersections/Turning Movements Counts (TMC)

Using TxDOT's Traffic Count Database System (TCDS), HDR acquired the majority of data needed for the analysis of the mainlanes, ramps, and frontage roads. The City of El Paso's online database provided the majority of the TMCs for the cross streets. The count years from the City's database ranged from 2014 to 2016 and were grown to the existing year. Supplemental traffic data was collected by HDR's subconsultant GRV IES to fill in data gaps as needed. The collected traffic volume data was balance and utilized in the traffic projection efforts discussed below. Also, origin-destination (O-D) data obtained from Streetlight Data helped in the alternatives analysis to determine travelers' destinations.
c) Travel Demand Model

HDR coordinated with El Paso's Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to acquire the latest travel demand model (TDM). The TDM is used to forecast the demand and behavior for a transportation facility for a specific future time frame. Conceptually, the TDM has a four-step approach comprising of the following:

1. Trip Generation

Trip generation determines the origin and destination of trips in a specific zone. Socio-economic factors, land use data, and household demographics are used to determine the number of trips produced and attracted to a Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ). Trip purposes are used to describe these trips. Typical trip purposes include home-based work, home-based school, home-based shopping,
home-based other, and non-home based. These trip purposes define what the origin and destination are of each trip.

## 2. Trip Distribution

Trip distribution determines where trips go once exiting a TAZ. A matrix of origin and destinations for each zone and trip purpose is created to identify the attractiveness of a zone based on the number of trips produced in the zone, the number of trips attracted to the zone, and travel time.

## 3. Mode Choice

Mode choice describes the method of transportation used between a trip's origin and destination. This step can be simple or complex, depending on the amount of transit in the study area. In the TDM, mode choice is performed by going through multiple iterations of the trip distribution and assignment as a part of a feedback loop. Mode choice determines which modes of transportation are used, and the mode split, which is the percentage of people using a specific type of transportation.

## 4. Trip Assignment

Finally, trip assignment determines which route is taken to get from origin to destination. There are different methods of performing this step, such as using minimum travel time to determine which route a traveler is most likely going to take. The model then yields traffic volumes for the roads in the network.

The El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) provided HDR two TDMs for the El Paso metropolitan area to use and run for data collection. The first, named the Horizon model, has scenarios for the years 2007, 2010, 2020, 2030, and 2042 to use and extract data. The Horizon TDM uses TxDOT trip generation and trip distribution programs that run on TransCAD TDM software. The model follows the four-step TDM. The Horizon Model Interface allows users to configure the following options:

- Model Setup
- Run Skim
- Reporting
- Network Update
- Assignment

The year 2020 and 2042 were run with the purpose of 2020 being the design year and 2042 being the future year. The output of the Horizon TDM was mapped for the total traffic, total truck traffic, and volume/capacity ratio.

The second model is an updated TDM by Cambridge Schematics. This model is currently pending review of the Federal Highway Administration but includes more in-depth transit data. HDR used this model to update existing information given from the previous model. The new model includes the year 2012 and has a more significant transit network.
d) Texas Statewide Analysis Model Version 3 (Sam-V3)

HDR was given one TDM for the state of Texas created by Alliance Transportation Group, Inc. for TxDOT. The Texas Statewide Analysis Model Version 3 (SAM-V3) model includes scenarios for the
years 2010, 2020, 2030, and 2042. The SAM model is based on the four-step model and is a multimodal TDM that focuses on forecasting traffic volumes for passenger and freight transportation, rail ridership, freight rail tonnage, and train and rail projections. The interface includes the following model steps:

- Network Update
- Freight Trip Generation
- Freight Trip Distribution
- Freight Mode Choice
- Optional Assignment
- Trip Generation
- Trip Distribution
- Mode Choice
- Assignment
- Reports

HDR ran the SAM-V3 model for the years 2020 and 2042 to gather additional information about freight assignment along the IH 10 corridor.

### 1.4 Peak Hour Determination and Traffic Volume Balancing

The peak periods of 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM were used to determine the peak hours for the morning and evening. Mainlane count locations, along with exit and entrance ramp count locations, were used to determine the peak hours for each segment. The peak hours were determined to be:

- $\quad$ Segment 1:
- 7:00 AM to 8:00 AM
- 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM
- Segment 3:
- 7:30 AM to 8:30 AM
- 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM
- $\quad$ Segment 2
- 8:00 AM to 9:00 AM
- 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM
- $\quad$ Segment 4:
- 7:00 AM to 8:00 AM
- 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM

Irregularities between mainlane, ramp, and intersection count locations were removed by balancing traffic between those locations. These peak hours were used to develop the base year 2017 traffic and design year 2042 traffic projections. The counts also took into account adjacent or other traffic studies for balancing purposes.

## 2. Traffic Projections Methodology

This section outlines the methodology used to develop growth rates for traffic volume projections for the Base Year (2022) and Design Year (2042) for each study segment of IH 10.

### 2.1 Growth Rate Determination

The following datasets were reviewed to help develop and recommend the growth rate:

- Historical traffic count information obtained from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) Statewide Traffic Analysis and Reporting System (STARS) (Ref. 1)
- Socio-economic data from Horizon Travel Demand Model (TDM) provided by El Paso MPO and TxDOT
a) TxDOT STARS Database

The volumes along the IH 10 corridor available on the TxDOT STARS system were collected from the available 21 data locations. The historical volume data at these locations were used to calculate a linear growth rate for the years 1999 to 2016 and 2012 to 2016. Table 4 summarizes the growth rates obtained from the historical data:

Table 4: Growth Rates from TxDOT STARS

| Sub-Segment | Linear Growth Rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1999-2016 | 2012-2016 |
| Valley Chili-Vinton | 1.46\% | 1.22\% |
| Vinton-SH16 | NA | 3.20\% |
| SH16-Artcraft | 2.08\% | 3.88\% |
| Redd-Mesa | 2.88\% | 6.32\% |
| Mesa-Sunland | 2.90\% | 2.16\% |
| Sunland-ECB | 1.76\% | 3.58\% |
| Section 1 Average | 2.22\% | 3.40\% |
| ECB-Schuster | 2.00\% | 4.62\% |
| Schuster-Santa Fe | 1.70\% | 3.85\% |
| Cotton-Piedras | 1.05\% | 2.74\% |
| Piedras-US54 | 0.12\% | 1.29\% |
| US54-Paisano | -0.54\% | -1.10\% |
| Section 2 Average | 0.87\% | 2.28\% |
| Paisano-Geronimo | -1.06\% | -0.45\% |
| Airway-Hawkins | -2.20\% | -7.96\% |
| Hunter-Yarbrough | -1.59\% | -7.07\% |
| Yarbrough-Lomaland | -0.80\% | -3.01\% |
| Lee Trevino-Zaragoza | -2.50\% | -4.30\% |
| Zaragoza-375 | 1.24\% | -2.76\% |
| Section 3 Average | -1.15\% | -4.26\% |
| Eastlake-Horizon | -2.50\% | -0.65\% |
| Horizon-Darrington | 2.17\% | 1.31\% |
| Darrington-San Felipe | 1.88\% | 1.67\% |
| San Felipe-Turnillo | 1.63\% | 3.41\% |
| Section 4 Average | 0.79\% | 1.44\% |
| Average | 0.58\% | 0.57\% |

The average linear growth rate is 0.58 percent from 1999 to 2016. The resultant average growth rate observed is low, mainly due to the negative growth rates in the various sections of Segments 2, 3 , and 4 along the IH 10 corridor.
b) Horizon - Travel demand Model:

HDR reviewed the socio-economic data from Horizon TDM provided by TxDOT and Local MPO. This forecast of population and employment serves as the basis for the model's forecast of traffic volumes. There are 154 TAZs adjacent to the IH 10 corridor, and the employment and population data for the years 2017, 2020, 2030, and 2040 for these TAZs were extracted from the model. This
data was then used to calculate the linear growth rate for population and employment along different sections on IH10 corridor.

Table 5 and Table 6 show the growth rates (GR) between the years 2007 to 2040 for population and employment:

Table 5: Employment Growth Rates - Horizon model

|  | Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sections | $2007-$ | $2010-$ | $2012-$ | $2014-$ | $2017-$ | $2020-$ | $2030-$ | Linear |  |  |
|  | 2010 | 2012 | 2014 | 2017 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | GR |  |  |
| Seg 1 | $1.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $1.81 \%$ |  |  |
| Seg 2 | $-4.6 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $1.27 \%$ |  |  |
| Seg 3 | $-3.7 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.56 \%$ |  |  |
| Seg 4 | $4.6 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $2.88 \%$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average | $1.63 \%$ |  |  |

Table 6: Population Growth Rates - Horizon model

|  | Sections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Population |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007- | $2010-$ | $2012-$ | $2014-$ | $2017-$ | $2020-$ | $2030-$ | Linear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2010 | 2012 | 2014 | 2017 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | GR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seg 1 | $2.1 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.39 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seg 2 | $1.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $2.51 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seg 3 | $1.2 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.31 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seg 4 | $1.1 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $1.51 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Average: $\quad 1.43 \%$

The average growth rate along the IH 10 corridor for employment is 1.63 percent, and for the population, it is slightly lower at 1.43 percent.
c) Growth Rate Recommendations:

Based on the information herein and for feasibility, HDR recommends, following the TPP methodology, a corridor-wide conservative growth rate of two (2) percent to forecast traffic for the 20 years from 2017 to 2037, and a corridor-wide conservative growth rate of one and a half (1.5) percent for the 15 years from 2037 to 2052, as shown in Table 7. A single growth rate is to be used for all sections along the IH 10 Corridor to be consistent and maintain continuity of traffic flow/analysis.

Table 7: Recommended Growth Rates

| Analysis Period | Linear Growth Rate |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2017 to 2037 | $2.0 \%$ |
| 2037 to 2052 | $1.5 \%$ |

### 2.2 Heavy Vehicle Percentage

Knowing the percentage of heavy vehicles in a corridor is essential. Heavy vehicles adversely affect traffic in two ways (Ref. 2):

- They are larger than passenger cars, so they occupy more roadway space and create more significant time headways between vehicles.
- They have more reduced operating capabilities than passenger cars, particularly concerning acceleration, deceleration, and the ability to maintain speed on upgrades.

Heavy vehicles cause queuing, slow the speed of traffic, and reduce capacity by taking up more space. These factors negatively affect the LOS of roadway segments. Table 8 provides a summary of heavy vehicle percentages that were collected during the supplemental traffic count for each segment and peak period.

Table 8: Percent Heavy Vehicles by Segment

| Peak Period | Segment 1 |  | Segment 2 |  | Segment 3 |  | Segment 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
| Heavy Vehicle \% | $8 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
|  | $11 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $19 \%$ |

### 2.3 Adaptive Lane Development and Analysis

a) Background Research

Freight movement is a critical component of the Texas economy. Unfortunately, traffic congestion and delay on Texas highways significantly drives up cost. One much-studied but less-implemented potential solution to relieve congestion on freeways is to provide truck-accessible adaptive lanes. In addition to giving trucks more reliable travel times, these facilities may improve capacity on the general-purpose lanes, provided that the adaptive lanes are exclusively for trucks. Also, increase safety benefits for all travelers may result in separating trucks from passenger vehicles. However, many current adaptive facilities cannot convert to truck-only lanes due to design standard criteria and, therefore, need integration into long-range planning objectives.

As part of the Reimagine IH 10 Feasibility study, HDR looked at implementing adaptive lanes in the proposed alternatives. The presence of much industrial activity in El Paso led to the idea of analyzing the adaptive lanes for truck access. This section explores the newest research performed on other proposed truck lanes in the United States and provides a recommendation to TxDOT EI Paso District regarding the implementation of an adaptive lane.
b) Benefits of Truck-Only Lanes

A 2010 report from the National Cooperative Freight Research Program (NCHRP) (Ref. 4) summarized the benefits of a truck-only lane as it applies not only to trucks but to passenger vehicles as well. Table 9 provides this summary.

Table 9: Potential Benefits of CMV-Only Lanes

| Category | Benefit | Group Benefiting | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Operational Efficiency | Higher Travel Speeds Less Delay Improved Level of Service ${ }^{1}$ | General Purpose (GP) ${ }^{2}$ Lane Users CMV-Only Lane Users | Vehicle separation allows all vehicles to travel at their designated speeds without conflict. Slower commercial vehicles are not present in right (slow) travel lanes. Less weaving. Improved operational efficiency. |
| Safety | Enhanced Safety | General Purpose Lane Users CMV-Only Lane Users | Fewer, less severe crashes as a result of vehicle separation (and minimal car-truck interaction). |
|  | Enhanced Travel Options | CMV-Only Lane Users | Increased trip reliability and reduced transportation costs of fuel consumption due to severe congestion or delay caused by truck- car accidents. |
| Economic | Improved Freight Productivity | CMV-Only Lane Users | The productivity of freight movement in and around major metropolitan areas and along long- haul intercity corridors is an essential factor in ensuring local, regional, and national economic competitiveness. |
| Environmental | Reduced Vehicle Emissions | General Purpose Lane Users CMV-Only Lane Users | Stop-and-go traffic conditions improve as congestion is decreased on general-purpose lanes, and air pollution emissions from slowed or stalled cars and trucks will be reduced. |

Notes:

1. Level of Service (LOS) is a designation used to assess the state of performance of transportation systems. Usually, LOS categories are defined by the letters A, B, C, D, E, and F; wherein A stands for the best state of performance of the system while F stands for the worst. LOS categories are typically defined based on the performance objectives of a system, such as mobility (in which case, level of congestion measured in terms of volume-capacity (V/C) ratio, for example, is used to define LOS categories), or safety.
2. The mixed-flow lanes (lanes carrying both auto and truck traffic) of a highway are also referred to as general-purpose (GP) lanes.

The report includes an extensive literature review of studies from around the country and research from available data related to truck traffic on freeways. The report indicated that proposed locations of truck-only lanes have the following characteristics:

1. Congested corridors with high truck volumes and significant contribution of truck traffic to congestion (e.g., I-710 and SR 60 in Southern California)
2. Major through-truck routes that go through metropolitan areas and have high truck volumes and congestion (e.g., the Mid-City Freight way in Chicago and I-5 in Seattle)
3. Congested corridors providing access to major ports or intermodal facilities (e.g., I-710 in Southern California, Miami Tunnel, and Savannah, Georgia)

Table 10 summarizes the findings from various studies of urban corridors.

Table 10: Summary Comparison of Performance Evaluation Results, Urban Corridors

| Travel Time Savings |  | Reliability |  | Safety |  | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mixed-Flow <br> Lanes (\%) | Truck-Only Lanes (\%) | Mixed-Flow <br> Lanes (\%) | Truck-Only Lanes (\%) | Mixed-Flow <br> Lanes (\%) | Truck-Only Lanes (\%) |  |
| 14 | 16 | 47 | 59 | 26 | 36 | I-710 Major Corridor Study |
| 29 | 23 | 85 | 82 | 6 | 27 | I-15 Comprehensive Corridor Study |
| - | 17 | - | 39 | - | 15 | Georgia Statewide Truck Lane Needs Identification Study |
|  | 9 | - | - | - | - | PSRC FAST corridor study |

The conclusion of the report separates the findings into three categories:

1. Mobility/congestion relief:

For truck-only lanes to be effective, trucks have to contribute significantly to peak-hour congestion and have high-utilization during peak-hours. Below certain ADT thresholds, truckonly lanes are not economically favorable. The thresholds from NCHRP Report 649 are summarized below:

- Bidirectional daily total traffic volume on the corridor should be at least 15,000 per lane.
- Bidirectional daily total truck volume on the corridor should be at least 20,000 trucks per day.
- Bidirectional daily total truck volume should exceed 20,000 trucks for a minimum distance of 10 mi along the corridor, or the corridor should provide access to major freight generators at the termini.
- The corridor on which truck-only lanes are to be implemented should have at least two general-purpose lanes in each direction. Also, truck-only lanes should have at least two lanes in each direction.

2. Safety/Reliability:

Data from performance evaluation consistently indicates that truck-only lanes have higher safety benefits than mixed-flow lane alternatives. However, estimates of the safety benefits did not incorporate differences in capacities between truck-only and mixed-flow lanes nor safety improvements from truck-auto separation, which makes it challenging to understand the actual safety benefits of truck lanes.
3. Port and Intermodal Terminal Access:

Studies show that new truck routes near industrial areas and intermodal terminals are an attractive alternative to trucks during congested hours and prevent them from using city streets according to O-D patterns. Connections to intermodal terminals tend to exhibit node-to-node travel patterns, which allows designers to limit access and reduce cost.
c) Analysis Scenarios

Three different adaptive lane scenarios were evaluated, which are:

- Truck-only adaptive lane
- Passenger-vehicle-only adaptive lane
- Mixed-flow adaptive lane
d) Proposed Route and T-intersection

Figure 7 shows a map of the major freight demand points along the corridor. Based on these demand points and the locations with substantial industrial activity, an adaptive lane may be appropriate from Artcraft Rd/Redd Rd in Segment 1 to the Loop 375 Interchange in Segment 3. This adaptive lane would have an access point at Robert E Lee (REL) Rd that gives trucks direct access to the airport and the industrial area on Hawkins Blvd. Potential passenger vehicle traffic assumes the same access points for analysis.
e) Streetlight Data

The bulk of the analysis is based on origin-destination data provided by Streetlight Data which can be viewed on Table 11.

Table 11: Sample of Streetlight Data

| Device Type | Commercial |
| :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Weight | Heavy |
| Origin Zone ID | 1001 |
| Destination Zone ID | 1014 |
| Ramp Name | 10131014 - EB Redd Entrance |
| Day Type | Average Weekday (T-Th) |
| Day Part | Midday (10 am - 3 pm) |
| O-D Traffic (StL Index) | 27,511 |
| Origin Zone Traffic (StL Index) | 37,774 |
| Destination Zone Traffic (StL Index) | 43,755 |

The three most important pieces of information for each data point are the O-D traffic index, the Origin Zone traffic index, and the Destination Zone traffic index. Per Streetlight's website, the indices measured represent relative activity, or normalized volume, which includes data collected from 2014
to 2017 and does not indicate actual volume. In other words, the Origin Zone Traffic index represents relative activity measured at the Origin Zone of a data point; the Destination Zone Traffic index represents relative activity measured at the Destination Zone of a data point, and the O-D Traffic index represents the relative traffic flow that passed from the Origin Zone to the Destination Zone of each data point. Therefore, an O-D traffic index represents relative activity at a specific O-D gate that is associated with that data point. The O-D traffic index represents all the traffic that traveled from the origin gate to the destination gate. The way to read the above data point is as follows:

On an average weekday, between 10 AM and 3 PM, the normalized volume of heavy commercial vehicles that travel through gate 1001 is 37,774 ; the normalized volume that travels through gate 1014, which is right after the Redd Rd entrance, is 43,755 ; and the normalized volume that travels from gate 1001 to gate 1014 is 27,511.

Based on proposed access points, the adaptive lane would run from gate 1014 to gate 1058 in the eastbound direction and from gate 2017 to gate 2061 in the westbound direction.
f) Analysis

The first step is to determine the peak hour for trucks; usually, this peak hour is offset from regular peak hours. HDR hired GRV IES to take traffic counts at a specific section of each segment, which was used to determine the present truck peak hours as well as the peak hour truck volumes along the corridor. The existing hourly volumes were projected to the Year 2042 volumes based on a two percent linear growth rate from 2017 to 2037 and a 1.5 percent linear growth rate from 2037 to 2042.

$$
100 \times(1+0.02 \times 20+0.015 \times 5)=147.5=148 \text { trucks in } 2042
$$

Table 12 summarizes the peak hours and the projected truck volumes according to the recorded segment snapshots.

Table 12: Projected Peak Hour Truck Volumes by Segment

|  | Segment Snapshots | Peak Hour | Peak Hour Volume | Projected Peak Hour Volume (2042) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { D } \\ & \frac{1}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \text { \zh26 } \end{aligned}$ | Seg 1 (Artcraft to Redd) | 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM | 368 | 543 |
|  | Seg 2 (Cotton to Piedras) | 1:30 PM to 2:30 PM | 533 | 787 |
|  | Seg 3 (Hawkins to Viscount) | 1:45 PM to 2:45 PM | 573 | 846 |
|  | Seg 4 (Horizon to Darrington) | 12:45 PM to 1:45 PM | 343 | 506 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ㄷ } \\ & \frac{1}{3} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{0}{4} \\ & \$ \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | Seg 1 (Artcraft to Redd) | 11:45 AM to 12:45 PM | 450 | 664 |
|  | Seg 2 (Cotton to Piedras) | 1:00 PM to 2:00 PM | 367 | 542 |
|  | Seg 3 (Hawkins to Viscount) | 1:00 PM to 2:00 PM | 544 | 803 |
|  | Seg 4 (Horizon to Darrington) | 12:30 PM to 1:30 PM | 295 | 436 |

Streetlight data is collected according to the following timeslots:

- All Day (12 am to 12 am )
- Peak AM (6 am to 10 am )
- $\quad$ Peak PM (3 pm to 7 pm )
- Early AM (12 am to 6 am$)$
- Midday (10 am to 3 pm )
- Late PM (7 pm to 12 am )

The peak hours for each segment all fall under the midday category, which is an expected outcome. With this parameter confirmed, the origin-destination data for heavy commercial vehicles was obtained from gate 1014 to each gate along the corridor until gate 1058 in the eastbound direction. After obtaining the data, the O-D indices were plotted against their respective entrances and exits to check for anomalies in the data set, as shown in Figure 7.


Figure 7: Origin Destination Gate Locations
The graph of the O-D indices shows a reasonable continuous decline as trucks exit along the way. Theoretically, the graph should show a significant decline at each major ingress/egress point without much spiking or increases in indices throughout the corridor. In other words, since O-D indices all take gate 1014 as their origin, there should be no additional trips generated from the entrances between the endpoints. However, the data collection system is identifying the new trucks that enter as the same trucks that exited, which produces the dips shown. This assumption will be the basis for the analysis below.

To find out how much truck traffic can be transferred onto the adaptive lanes and thereby reduce traffic on the general-purpose lanes, we need to analyze truck traffic from each access point to each
of the other ones. Since there are three access points for the entire length covered by the adaptive lanes, three travel paths were analyzed: Artcraft Rd to REL Rd, REL Rd to Loop 375, and Artcraft Rd to Loop 375.

With the filters mentioned above already in place, an additional filter was added that displays the 0$D$ data from one gate to the rest of the gates along the corridor. For the eastbound direction, since the current proposed adaptive lane entrance and exit is right before Thorn Avenue and right after Zaragoza Drive, respectively, entry and exit points were placed at gates 1014 and 1058.

Using this data, the O-D Index for the eastbound direction is 28,140 . Even though this is a normalized number and not the actual volume, this number can be divided by the origin index at gate 1014 to get a percentage of trucks that may use the adaptive lane to travel from Artcraft Rd to Loop 375. Assuming that 100 percent of eligible trucks will use the adaptive lane, 64 percent of truck traffic from the Artcraft Rd area will take the adaptive lane. Following the same logic for the westbound direction, 67 percent of trucks that enter near the Loop 375 entrance will take the adaptive lane all the way north to the Artcraft Rd exit.

Since there is an access point at REL Rd, the relative ingress/egress volumes near that location, which are trucks coming from and going to the airport and other industrial areas near Hawkins Blvd, were determined. This determination was done by first taking the difference between the O-D indices at relevant exits. For the eastbound direction, these exits include Trowbridge Dr, Geronimo Dr, Hawkins Blvd, and Hunter Dr, and the resulting sum of the indices at these exits is 12,619. Dividing this number by the origin index, the percentage of trucks that access the entrance of Artcraft Rd and uses the exit at REL Rd is approximately 29 percent.

Following the same logic for the westbound direction determined that 17 percent of trucks enter near Loop 375 and exit near REL Rd.

Ingress volumes were found by resetting the O-D filter parameters to determine how many trucks begin at each gate and travel to the same ending destination. Using the same approach as above, the indices for those accessing adaptive lanes were found to be 13,224 and 5,996 , which in turn is 17 percent and 14 percent for the eastbound and westbound directions, respectively.

## Actual Volume Calculations

The obtained percentages can be multiplied by the projected peak hour traffic volumes near the origin to get actual truck volumes. Conveniently, the point of capture of the available traffic count in Segment 1 is between Artcraft Rd and Redd Rd, which is where the eastbound adaptive lane entrance is located. For the westbound direction, traffic volumes were not available near Loop 375; however, since the origin index at Loop 375 is similar to the origin index at Artcraft Rd, the relative activity at the two locations are assumed to be the same. Multiplying each percentage by the projected volume gives the projected truck volumes traveling to and from each access point, and a factor of three is used to convert truck volume to equivalent vehicle volume. Table 13 summarizes the results.

Table 13: Projected Volumes on Proposed Truck-Only Adaptive Lanes

|  | Route | Origin | Destination | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O-D } \\ & \text { Index } \end{aligned}$ | Origin Index | Percentage | Projected Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Artcraft to Loop $375$ | 1014 | 1058 | 28140 | 43755 | 64\% | 350 |
|  | Artcraft to REL | 1014 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1041-1042, } \\ & 1045-1048 \end{aligned}$ | 12619 | 43755 | 29\% | 157 |
|  | REL to Loop 375 | $\begin{aligned} & 1042,1043 \\ & 1046,1048 \end{aligned}$ | 1058 | 15057 | 43755 | 34\% | 187 |
| $\frac{m}{3}$ | Loop 375 to Artcraft | 2017 | 2061 | 28307 | 42559 | 67\% | 362 |
|  | Loop 375 to REL | 2017 | $\begin{aligned} & 2027,2029, \\ & 2032,2034 \end{aligned}$ | 7169 | 42559 | 17\% | 92 |
|  | REL to Artcraft | 2029-2035 | 2061 | 7253 | 42559 | 17\% | 93 |
|  |  |  | Projected Volumes |  | Equivalent Vehicle Volume |  |  |
| EB | Artcraft to REL |  | 507 |  | 1521 |  |  |
|  | REL to Loop 375 |  | 537 |  | 1611 |  |  |
| WB | Loop 375 to REL |  | 454 |  | 1362 |  |  |
|  | REL to Artcraft |  | 455 |  | 1365 |  |  |

Finally, a similar process was followed for the two other scenarios. Table 14 provides a comparison of all scenarios.

Table 14: Summary of Potential Adaptive Lane Volumes by Scenarios

| Scenario | Direction of Travel | Travel Segment | Projected Equivalent Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Morning Peak | Midday Peak | Evening Peak |
| Passenger Vehicles Only | EB | Artcraft to REL | 1074 | 993 | 1385 |
|  |  | REL to Loop 375 | 1422 | 1242 | 2011 |
|  | WB | Loop 375 to REL | 1726 | 1240 | 1634 |
|  |  | REL to Artcraft | 1066 | 808 | 1304 |
| Trucks With Passenger Vehicles | EB | Artcraft to REL | 1830 | 2514 | 2429 |
|  |  | REL to Loop 375 | 2178 | 2853 | 3103 |
|  | WB | Loop 375 to REL | 2371 | 2602 | 2321 |
|  |  | REL to Artcraft | 1666 | 2173 | 1991 |
| Truck Only | EB | Artcraft to REL | 756 | 1521 | 1044 |
|  |  | REL to Loop 375 | 756 | 1611 | 1092 |
|  | WB | Loop 375 to REL | 645 | 1362 | 687 |
|  |  | REL to Artcraft | 600 | 1365 | 687 |

g) Assumptions

- The index for the end-to-end travel volume was divided by the origin index at the beginning of each respective travel direction to obtain a percentage. The indices calculated from middle gates were divided by the endpoint origin indices so that the percentages would have a common denominator
- The analysis assumes that 100 percent of trucks are eligible to use the adaptive lanes. However, many factors, including drivers' preferences and government-issued parameters (for example, weight limits), may limit drivers from using the facility.
- Additionally, the projected volumes used to calculate peak hour volume includes buses as a commercial vehicle. School buses are highly unlikely to use the adaptive lanes, as the restricted access points would hinder them. For these two reasons, the actual utility of the truck-only lanes may be lower than expected.
- When calculating the difference between indices, engineering judgment was used to determine whether to include or exclude specific values in the actual calculations. For example, when calculating the O-D index for the westbound direction from Loop 375 to REL Rd in the morning, using the following data in Table 15 was used.

Table 15: Origin and Destination Index

| Origin ID | Destination ID | Ramp Name | O-D Index |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | 2026 | $20252026-$ WB McRae Entrance | 14350 |
| 2017 | 2027 | $20262027-$ WB Hawkins Exit | 12648 |
| 2017 | 2028 | $20272028-$ WB Viscount Entrance | 12772 |
| 2017 | 2029 | $20282029-$ WB Airway Exit | 9934 |
| 2017 | 2030 | 2031 | $20292030-$ WB Hawkins Entrance |

- It is sufficient to calculate the difference between the first and the last indices to capture the decrease in number at the exits. It makes sense that the O-D index should not be increasing at the entrances, and in general, this can be confirmed in the above numbers. What little change we do observe is discarded as noise in the data and not counted in calculations.
- Where the westbound origin index is similar to the eastbound origin index, the projected volume at the eastbound origin (between Artcraft Rd and Redd Rd) is also used to get the westbound projected volume. The assumption is that if the indices are similar, then the relative activity at the two points must be similar as well. Thus, any measurement at the eastbound origin can be used for the westbound origin, since there is no direct traffic count that measured the Loop 375 access point. If the indices are not close (more than 10 percent),
then a percentage based on the difference between the indices is also applied in addition to the calculated percentages to get the projected volume.
h) Summary and Conclusion

Assuming a single freeway lane carries 2,200 vehicles per hour per lane (vphpl), the truck-only lane appears underutilized, even at the highest peak hour. The projected percentage of trucks in Segments 2 and 3 is seven percent and nine percent, which are presented in Table 16. The truck percentages are less than half of the example presented in the NCHRP Report 649. According to the NCHRP Report 649, there are certain thresholds for designing truck-only lanes, below these threshold adaptive lanes may not be more beneficial than general or mixed-flow lanes. This could explain the apparent underutilization of the proposed truck-lanes. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, the numbers obtained from the calculations represent eligible trips, but many factors such as driver preferences and government-imposed regulations may limit the actual number of trucks that use the adaptive lane.

Table 16: Projected Average Daily Traffic (ADT) and Average Daily Truck Traffic (ADTT)

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Segment } \\ \mathrm{s} \end{gathered}$ | EB |  | WB |  | Bidirectional |  | Percentage S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Projected ADT | Projected ADTT | Projected ADT | Projected ADTT | Projected ADT | Projected ADTT |  |
| Seg 1 | 61049 | 8018 | 62390 | 9265 | 123439 | 17283 | 14\% |
| Seg 2 | 151294 | 11011 | 127171 | 7592 | 278465 | 18603 | 7\% |
| Seg 3 | 131823 | 11517 | 117827 | 11013 | 249650 | 22530 | 9\% |
| Seg 4 | 24731 | 7324 | 23981 | 6415 | 48712 | 13739 | 28\% |

The growth rate is another critical factor in the projected volume of trucks. The analysis assumed uniform growth rates for both autos and trucks. However, estimates from the Federal Highway Administration's Freight Analysis Framework dictate the annual growth rate of trucks to be 3.3 percent (Ref 5). This could have a significant impact on projected volumes.

Additionally, the truck peak hour is confirmed to be offset from general traffic peak hours, which means the truck-only lane may not bring congestion relief to other travelers. Since the standard peak hour is not corresponding with truck peak hours, having a truck-only lane may take away an additional capacity during peak hours and worsen congestion.

A possibility is to make the adaptive lane a mixed-flow lane; however, many drivers will not want to share a lane with heavy vehicles due to mobility and safety concerns (Ref. 5). Therefore, at least two mixed-flow lanes should be implemented in each direction. This recommendation matches the NCHRP Report 649 guidelines as well as the calculated data, which shows high potential combined volume during the midday peak hour. However, the feasibility of such a task may be limited by ROW constraints. Further research, including varying the projected volumes through differing growth rates as well as meeting with local truckers' associations, would be beneficial in determining accurate travel patterns for El Paso in 2042 and thereby a feasible solution.

## 3. Traffic Analysis Methodology

The traffic analysis comprised of using a microsimulation model and a deterministic model (Synchro and HCS). These models calculate and extract the measures of effectiveness (MOE) for the entire corridor study.

### 3.1 Measures of Effectiveness

MOEs were used to compare the Existing, No Build against the Build alternatives and captured the impacts of the proposed improvements. Multiple model runs were generated to test whether or not the Build alternative improved over the No Build alternative.

Once the models ran, the following MOEs were evaluated:

- Segments travel time, speeds, and density
- Mainlane Segments: A mainlane segment's definition as a portion of the mainlanes that connect between two ramp junctions.
- Ramp Merge/Diverge Junctions: The mainlane volume and ramp volume are the controlling features in a ramp junction analysis. According to the Highway Capacity Manual 6 (HCM) (Ref. 6), the influence area of a ramp extends 1,500 feet downstream/upstream of an entrance/exit ramp.
- Weaving Segments: A weaving segment is defined by the HCM (Ref. 6) as an auxiliary lane that connects an entrance ramp and a downstream exit ramp. The weaving area occurs between the entrance and exit ramps as two or more traffic paths traveling in the same general direction cross each other without the aid of traffic control devices.
- Network Travel Time- Network travel time identifies the total amount of time, including moving time, delay time, and stopped time, that it takes for all vehicles to travel through the study area network.
- Intersection delay/LOS - LOS is a qualitative measure of operating conditions at a location and is directly related to vehicle control delay at intersections. LOS has a letter designation ranging from $A$ to $F$ (free flow to heavily congested), with LOS D as the limit of acceptable operation. Utilizing procedures in HCM and the MOEs reported by Vissim, LOS will be determined for intersections within the study corridor.
- Average network travel time/speed - Average speed is measured in miles per hour and identifies the average speed of all vehicles in the network. Average speed is a useful measure of effectiveness to assess the impact of network changes on alternative models.
- Network latent demand/throughput - The number of vehicles unable to access the overall network during the simulation represents latent demand. Network input links will have their length extended in the model to capture existing latent demand. Under future conditions, this value will be used to compare the overall network performance of alternatives. Specific locations where this occurs will be noted and discussed in the operational analysis.


### 3.2 Microsimulation: VISSIM Model Development Methodology

One of the most important analytical tools of traffic engineering is a microscopic simulation. A transportation system simulation employing a simulation model allows the prediction of the effects of modified lane configurations, traffic control, and any changes made in the transportation system on the system's operational performance. Operational performance is measured in terms of measures of effectiveness (MOEs), which include:

- Average Vehicle Speed
- Delays
- Vehicle Miles Of Travel
- Vehicle Stops
- Vehicle Hours Of Travel
- Fuel Consumption

These MOEs provide useful insight in the selection of future alternative improvements to handle issues related to traffic such as congestion, delay, and queues.

The IH 10 study corridor was modeled using the microscopic simulation model VISSIM (version 7.00). VISSIM (a German acronym which translated means "traffic in towns - simulation") has two main components: a traffic simulator and a signal state generator. The traffic simulator is a microscopic traffic flow simulation model, which includes a car following and a lane change logic model. The signal state generator is the signal control software that uses detector information from the traffic simulator and updates the status of the traffic signals on a discrete-time step basis (as small as one-tenth of a second).

VISSIM is classified as a microscopic simulation model because it models vehicles and other components as individual units and updates them every second. After defining the street geometry, traffic control, and vehicular volumes, VISSIM outputs many MOEs, such as average delay, queue length, and speed, which can then be used as a basis for comparison of alternatives. VISSIM also has the capability of modeling various modes of transit, such as buses, trains, and rail. VISSIM has a user-friendly 3D animation tool that can be used to show the existing and future transportation network in 3D animation form. The significant features of the VISSIM model are identified as follows:

- Link types and connectors
- Load factor (number of passengers/vehicle)
- Priority rules (right of way designations)
- Pre-time/actuated signal control
- Fleet components (bus, truck, car)
- Automobile routing and turning movement
- Stop and yield signs;
- Data collection


### 3.3 Base/Existing Model

Because of the complexity of Segment 2 and Segment 3HDR developed two VISSIM models. Segment 2 consists of nine interchanges and part of the central business district that straddles the IH 10 corridor. Segment 3 consists of 12 interchanges. Field observations and aerial photographs were used to obtain accurate geometrics. The major component inputs for the network VISSIM model included the following:
a) Roadway Geometry

The first step in defining a network is describing the network geometry. VISSIM uses the concept of links and connectors to establish the roadway network. Links are one-directional segments of streets or freeways, and connectors are usually the intersection of two or more links. In the case of a twoway street, each roadway block would consist of two one-directional links, as shown in Figure 8.


Figure 8: Intersection Link to Connector Diagram
b) Speed limits

The speed limits obtained from the field visit for the mainlanes were put in VISSIM as desired speed decisions. Additional reduced speed areas were configured for the turning traffic to attain lower turning speeds. The speed distributions were changed to match the $S$ curve with the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed as the speed limit for the purpose of calibration. Figure 9 shows a default example speed distribution used in the VISSIM models. These speed distributions were adjusted to match the travel time runs and field conditions. In addition, the direct connectors were coded with reduced speed areas to depict the posted speed limit and driving behavior observed in the field.


Figure 9: Speed Distribution S-Curve
c) Traffic volumes

Entry volumes were coded as input when building the model, and output volumes were used to calibrate the model to ensure the appropriate distribution of traffic through the simulated network. When coding the model, turning movement input describes how traffic is distributed to departure links. When a simulation is run, traffic volumes enter the network through entry links and are distributed through the network according to routing decisions assigned to each intersection approach.
d) Heavy vehicle percentage

The vehicle classifications were added to the vehicle input for each of the links. The vehicles were classified based on the heavy vehicle percentages to predefined classes in VISSIM: Cars and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) based on the traffic counts.
e) Signal timings

Existing conditions analysis involved coding basic interval timing (BIT), signal timing splits, and offsets in VISSIM. The traffic signal information obtained from the cities was coded in Synchro for accuracy
and then imported into the VISSIM models to simulate the operation of existing signalized intersections.
f) Model Calibration

After the network was coded, all the existing data was incorporated to compile existing conditions for AM peak and PM models. These models were then calibrated based on the methodology contained in the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Traffic Analysis Toolbox Volume III: Guidelines for Applying Traffic Microsimulation Modeling Software. Calibration is an essential step in the development of the base model. If the model is incorrectly calibrated, it may lead to misleading results. The following steps were followed in calibrating the base model:

1. The global parameters that affect driving behavior, such as headway time and look ahead and look back distances, were changed for different link types such as mainlanes, ramps, frontage roads, and cross streets.
2. The link specific factors, such as lane change distances, were refined to represent the field observations accurately.
3. Travel time runs, which were conducted in a field review, were compared to the VISSIM travel times to check if the model is accurately calibrated.
4. Visual confirmation of existing field conditions, especially observed vehicle queue lengths, was conducted using VISSIM's animation output.
5. GEH values were calculated as per the FHWA reference. GEH is a statistical formula used in model calibration to compare two sets of volumes. GEH statistic is a form of the Chi-squared statistic that incorporates both relative and absolute errors (Ref. 3). To accurately model existing traffic volumes, it was verified that more than 85 percent of the links have a GEH statistic of less than five.
g) Existing Conditions

Aerials and as-builts were used to help build the existing models for Segment 2 and Segment 3. These models were calibrated to replicate existing conditions and used to develop the base year 2017 and projected year 2042.

### 3.4 Deterministic Model

a) Highway Capacity Methodology Analysis

An operational analysis was performed using Highway Capacity Software (HCS) 7, which is based on the procedures outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 6 (Ref 2). The analysis included determining the level of service (LOS) for main lane sections, ramp junctions, and weaving areas. LOS is a measure of effectiveness used to evaluate traffic operations based on density where LOS A represents the least congested operational conditions, and LOS F is considered the most congested operational conditions. The HCS analysis was performed on all Segments mentioned in the introduction. The HCS MOEs are presented in Table 17, Table 18, and Table 19. Analysis for both the westbound and eastbound directions for all segments was conducted for the AM and PM Peak Hour. All the segments were measured and categorized into basic, weaving and overlap segments based on the methodology in HCM. Factors such as Heavy vehicles, Acceleration lengths, deceleration lengths, peak hour factors were inputted to each model.

Table 17: LOS Criteria for Basic Freeway Segments

| LOS | Density $(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln})$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $\leq 11$ |
| B | $>11-18$ |
| C | $>18-26$ |
| D | $>26-35$ |
| E | $>35-45$ |
| F | Demand exceeds Capacity |

Source: HCM 6 12-15, Page 12-19
Table 18: LOS Criteria for Weaving Segments

| Density (pc/mi/ln) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | Freeway Weaving Segments | Weaving Segments on Multilane Highways or C-D Roadways |
| A | $0-10$ | $0-12$ |
| B | $>10-20$ | $>12-24$ |
| C | $>20-28$ | $>24-32$ |
| D | $>28-35$ | $>32-36$ |
| E | $>35$ | $>36$ |
| F | Demand exceeds capacity |  |

Source: HCM 6 Exhibit 13-6, Page 13-10
Table 19: LOS Criteria for Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments

| LOS | Density $(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln})$ | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| A | $\leq 10$ | Unrestricted operations |
| B | $>10-20$ | Merging and diverging maneuvers noticeable to drivers |
| C | $>20-28$ | Influence area speeds begin to decline |
| D | $>28-35$ | Influence area turbulence becomes intrusive |
| E | $>35$ | Turbulence felt by virtually all drivers |
| F | Demand exceeds capacity | Ramp and freeway queues form |

Source: HCM 6 Exhibit 14-3, Page 14-7
b) Synchro Analysis

Utilizing procedures in the HCM and the measures of effectiveness (MOE) reported by SYNCHRO 9 traffic simulation software, LOS was determined for all intersections within the project limits. Intersection LOS is a qualitative measure of operating conditions and is directly related to average vehicle delay. LOS is reported using the letter designations from $A$ to $F$, as shown in Table 20.

Table 20: Intersection LOS Thresholds and Definitions

| LOS | Control Delay (sec/veh) <br> Signalized <br> Interchange |  | Unsignalized <br> Interchange |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | $\leq 10.0$ | $\leq 10.0$ | Very low vehicle delays, short cycle length/exceptionally favorable <br> signal progression. |
| B | 10.1 to 20.0 | 10.1 to 15.0 | Low vehicle delays, short cycle length/highly favorable signal <br> progression, more vehicular stops than LOS A. |
| C | 20.1 to 35.0 | 15.1 to 25.0 | Favorable signal progression/moderate cycle length, potential cycle <br> failures, significant number of vehicular stops. |
| D | 35.1 to 55.0 | 25.1 to 35.0 | Ineffective signal progression/long cycle length, many vehicular <br> stops, noticeable cycle failures. |
| E | 55.1 to 80.0 | 35.1 to 50.0 | Ineffective signal progression, long cycle length, frequent cycle <br> failures. |
| F | $>80.0$ | $>50.0$ | Poor signal progression, long cycle length, cycle failures during most <br> cycles. |

Source: HCM 6 Exhibit 19-18, Page 19-16 - Signalized Intersection \& Exhibit 20-2, Page 20-6

## 4. Segment 1

### 4.1 Existing Condition Analysis

Existing condition analysis provided the base models to obtain an understanding of the current operations. Segment 1 analysis used HCS for mainlane analysis and Synchro for intersection operations to determine the current deficiencies along the corridor.
a) Segment 1 Existing Mainlane Level of Service Analysis

The existing condition analysis for eastbound Segment 1 showed the majority of segments operating at LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the AM peak, with five freeway segments operating at LOS E or worse, which accounts for 13 percent of the segments, while 87 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The majority of the failing segments were near the BHW project. Table 21 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 21: Segment 1 EB Existing Mainlane LOS Analysis

| Segment Name | SegmentType | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { \# of } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| IH 10 North->Antonio Ex. | Basic | 2 | 860 | 6.5 | A | 1,280 | 10.0 | A |
| Antonio Ex. | Diverge | 2 | 860 | 11.3 | B | 1,280 | 15.8 | B |
| Antonio Ex.->Antonio Ent | Basic | 2 | 710 | 5.4 | A | 1,060 | 8.3 | A |
| Antonio Ent.- | Merge | 2 | 1,200 | 15.0 | B | 1,470 | 17.8 | B |
| Antonio Ent.->Valley Chili Ex. | Overlap | 2 | 1,200 | 10.8 | B | 1,470 | 13.6 | B |
| Valley Chili Ex. | Diverge | 2 | 1,200 | 15.1 | B | 1,470 | 18.1 | B |
| Valley Chili Ex.->Valley Chili Ent | Basic | 2 | 1,170 | 8.9 | A | 1,450 | 11.3 | B |
| Valley Chili Ent | Merge | 2 | 1,250 | 15.0 | B | 1,590 | 18.4 | B |
| Valley Chili Ent->Vinton Ex. | Basic | 2 | 1,250 | 9.5 | A | 1,590 | 12.4 | B |
| Vinton Ex. | Diverge | 2 | 1,250 | 15.1 | B | 1,590 | 18.9 | B |
| Vinton Ex. ->Vinton Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,130 | 8.6 | A | 1,410 | 11.0 | A |
| Vinton Ent.- | Merge | 2 | 1,550 | 16.6 | B | 1,790 | 19.1 | B |
| Vinton Ent.->SH 16 Ex. | Basic | 2 | 1,550 | 11.7 | B | 1,790 | 13.9 | B |
| SH 16 Ex. | Diverge | 2 | 1,550 | 18.5 | B | 1,790 | 21.3 | C |
| SH 16 Ex. ->SH 16 Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,050 | 8.0 | A | 1,390 | 10.8 | A |
| SH 16 Ent. ->Loop 375 Ent. | Merge | 2 | 1,480 | 16.3 | B | 1,840 | 19.9 | B |
| Loop 375 DC Ent. ->Loop 375 Ent. | Merge | 2 | 1,870 | 18.2 | B | 2,420 | 23.5 | C |
| Loop 375 DC Ent.->Artcraft Ex. | Basic | 2 | 1,870 | 14.2 | B | 2,420 | 19.3 | C |
| Artcraft Ex.->Artcraft Ex. | Diverge | 2 | 1,870 | 21.2 | C | 2,420 | 27.2 | C |
| Artcraft Ex. ->Artcraft Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,500 | 11.4 | B | 1,980 | 15.5 | B |
| Artcraft Ent.->Redd Ex. | Weaving | 3 | 2,700 | 25.1 | C | 3,040 | 28.5 | D |
| Redd Ex. ->Redd Ent. | Basic | 2 | 2,270 | 21.5 | C | 2,640 | 25.7 | C |


| Segment Name | Segment Type | \# of <br> Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Redd Ent | Merge | 2 | 3,400 | 32.0 | D | 3,360 | 38.0 | F |
| Redd Ent.->Mesa Ex. | Basic | 2 | 3,400 | 33.3 | D | 3,360 | 34.1 | D |
| Mesa Ex. | Diverge | 2 | 3,400 | 36.1 | F | 3,360 | 36.8 | F |
| Mesa Ex. ->Mesa Ent. | Basic | 2 | 2,870 | 27.2 | D | 2,650 | 25.8 | C |
| Mesa Ent | Merge | 4 | 3,620 | 17.1 | B | 3,540 | 17.2 | B |
| Mesa Ent. -> Resler Ent. | Basic | 3 | 3,620 | 22.9 | C | 3,540 | 23.0 | C |
| Resler Ent. | Merge | 3 | 4,810 | 31.8 | D | 4,450 | 30.0 | D |
| Resler Ent.->Sunland Park Ext | Overlap | 3 | 4,810 | 33.2 | D | 4,450 | 32.2 | D |
| Sunland Park Ext | Diverge | 3 | 4,810 | 33.2 | D | 4,450 | 32.2 | D |
| Sunland Park Ext->Sunland Park Ent | Basic | 3 | 3,840 | 24.2 | C | 2,940 | 19.1 | C |
| Sunland Park Ent | Merge | 3 | 4,280 | 29.7 | D | 3,260 | 22.8 | C |
| Sunland Park Ent | Merge | 3 | 5,260 | 37.8 | F | 4,200 | 30.1 | D |
| Sunland Park DC Ent->US 85 DC Ent | Basic | 3 | 5,260 | 34.8 | D | 4,200 | 27.3 | D |
| US 85 DC Ent | Merge | 3 | 5,460 | 39.3 | F | 4,230 | 30.2 | D |
| US 85 DC Ent->Executive Center Ex | Basic | 3 | 5,460 | 36.9 | E | 4,230 | 27.4 | D |
| Executive Center Ex | Diverge | 3 | 5,460 | 37.2 | F | 4,230 | 30.2 | D |
| Executive Center Ex | Basic | 3 | 5,190 | 34.1 | D | 4,040 | 26.2 | D |

The existing condition analysis for westbound Segment 1 showed the majority of segments operating at LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with six segments operating at LOS E or worse, which accounts for 18 percent of the segments, while 82 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The majority of the failing segments were near the BHW interchange. Table 22 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 22: Segment 1 WB Existing Mainlane LOS Analysis

| Segment Name | Segment <br> Type | \# of <br> Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |  |  |
| Executive Center Ex->Executive <br> Center Ent | Basic | 3 | 3,490 | 24.7 | C | 4,510 | 28.8 | D |
| Executive Center Ent | Merge | 3 | 3,740 | 29.3 | D | 4,970 | 35.7 | F |
| Executive <br> Park Exit | Center Ent->Sunland | Basic | 3 | 3,740 | 26.5 | D | 4,970 | 32.4 |
| Sunland Park Exit | Diverge | 3 | 3,740 | 28.4 | D | 4,970 | 34.2 | D |
| Sunland Park Exit->US 85 DC Ent | Basic | 3 | 2,630 | 18.6 | C | 3,740 | 23.8 | C |
| US 85 DC Ent | Merge | 3 | 3,060 | 23.4 | C | 4,450 | 31.3 | D |
| US 85 DC Ent->Sunland Park Ent | Basic | 3 | 3,060 | 21.7 | C | 4,450 | 28.4 | D |


| Segment Name | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Sunland Park Ent | Merge | 3 | 3,730 | 29.2 | D | 5,700 | 42.8 | F |
| ```Sunland Park Ent->Resler Dr DC Ext``` | Overlap | 3 | 3,730 | 29.2 | D | 5,700 | 42.8 | F |
| Resler Dr DC Ext | Diverge | 3 | 3,730 | 30.0 | D | 5,700 | 40.1 | F |
| Resler Dr DC Ext->Mesa St Ext | Basic | 3 | 3,240 | 23.0 | C | 4,500 | 62.4 | F |
| Mesa St Ext | Diverge | 2 | 3,240 | 40.6 | F | 4,500 | 43.1 | F |
| Mesa St Ext->Mesa St Ent | Basic | 2 | 2,560 | 27.2 | D | 3,080 | 22.2 | C |
| Mesa St Ent | Merge | 2 | 2,980 | 36.3 | F | 3,850 | 33.3 | D |
| Redd St Ext | Diverge | 2 | 2,980 | 35.8 | F | 3,850 | 33.7 | D |
| Redd St Ext->Redd St Ent | Basic | 2 | 2,330 | 24.8 | C | 2,700 | 18.5 | C |
| Redd St Ent->Paseo del Norte Ext | Weaving | 3 | 2,750 | 21.3 | C | 3,190 | 17.1 | B |
| Paseo del Norte Ext->Paseo del Norte Ent | Basic | 2 | 1,810 | 15.4 | B | 2,070 | 10.0 | A |
| Paseo del Norte Ent | Merge | 2 | 2,180 | 24.5 | C | 2,400 | 17.8 | B |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Paseo del Norte Ent->Loop } 375 \\ & \text { DC Ext } \end{aligned}$ | Overlap | 2 | 2,180 | 21.9 | C | 2,400 | 14.7 | B |
| Loop 375 DC Ext | Diverge | 2 | 2,180 | 26.8 | C | 2,400 | 18.6 | B |
| Loop 375 DC Ext | Diverge | 2 | 1,910 | 23.9 | C | 2,100 | 15.7 | B |
| HWY 16 Ext->HWY 16 Ent | Basic | 2 | 1,610 | 13.7 | B | 1,670 | 7.0 | A |
| HWY 16 Ent | Merge | 2 | 1,820 | 21.3 | C | 2,040 | 14.6 | B |
| HWY 16 Ent->SH 16 Entrance | Basic | 2 | 1,820 | 15.5 | B | 2,040 | 9.8 | A |
| SH 16 Entrance | Diverge | 2 | 1,820 | 22.9 | C | 2,040 | 16.0 | B |
| Westway Exit->Westway Exit | Basic | 2 | 1,450 | 12.3 | B | 1,610 | 6.5 | A |
| Westway Exit | Merge | 2 | 1,600 | 18.9 | B | 1,740 | 11.7 | B |
| Westway Entrance->Antonio Exit | Basic | 2 | 1,600 | 13.6 | B | 1,740 | 7.5 | A |
| Antonio Exit | Diverge | 2 | 1,600 | 20.5 | C | 1,740 | 12.1 | B |
| Antonio Exit->Antonio Entrance | Basic | 2 | 1,320 | 11.2 | B | 1,210 | 3.5 | A |
| Antonio Entrance | Merge | 2 | 1,560 | 15.3 | B | 1,460 | 6.1 | A |
| Antonio Entrance->IH 10 North | Basic | 2 | 1,560 | 13.3 | B | 1,460 | 5.4 | A |

b) Segment 1 Existing Intersection Level of Service Analysis

The existing condition analysis for the intersections along Segment 1 shows the majority of them operate at LOS D or better. The study determined that both AM, and PM peak hours had the same number of poor operating intersections. These intersections are shown in Table 23 and are highlighted in red.

Table 23: Segment 1 - Existing Intersection LOS

| Segment 1 Intersections | Control Type | Existing 2017 AM |  | Existing 2017 PM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Level of Service | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (sec/veh) } \end{aligned}$ | Level of Service | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { (sec/veh) } \end{aligned}$ |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Antonio | Signal Control | B | 18.7 | B | 17.1 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Antonio | Signal Control | B | 19.7 | C | 26.6 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Vinton/Westway | Signal Control | A | 9.4 | B | 12.0 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Vinton/Westway | Signal Control | B | 13.7 | B | 13.2 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Loop 375 | Signal Control | C | 21.7 | B | 16.0 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Loop 376 | Signal Control | B | 16.7 | C | 23.1 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Artcraft/Paseo del Norte | Signal Control | F | 235.7 | D | 50.7 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Artcraft/Paseo del Norte | Signal Control | C | 21.9 | E | 55.7 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Redd | Signal Control | C | 30.5 | D | 42.4 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Redd | Signal Control | D | 35.5 | D | 44.8 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Thorn | Signal Control | B | 15.0 | C | 28.6 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Thorn | Signal Control | C | 24.0 | B | 15.9 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& N Mesa* | Signal Control | B | 11.5 | B | 11.2 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& N Mesa* | Signal Control | B | 13.4 | C | 20.7 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Sunland Park* | Signal Control | E | 64.0 | F | 122.6 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Sunland Park* | Signal Control | D | 44.8 | F | 87.5 |

### 4.2 No Build Operational Analysis

No build analysis is essential for the evaluation of the condition for the future year, which forms the basis for comparison and selection of the preferred alternatives. The 2042 No Build models were used as a comparison tool to MOE of the build alternatives. The No Build models assumed committed projects in the study, which are the Border Highway West and Mesa Park Projects.
a) Segment 1 No Build Mainlane Level of Service Analysis

The Year 2042 No Build condition analysis for eastbound Segment 1 determined that there will be fewer segments operating at LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with ten segments operating at LOS E or worse, which accounts for 33 percent of the segments, while 67 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The majority of the failing segments were near the BHW interchange; however, Table 24 shows that the failing segments are spreading out away from BHW towards Mesa and Executive Center Boulevard. With no improvement to capacity, likely, congestion and delay will severely increase over the next 20 years. The No Build analysis incorporated committed projects along Segment 1.

Table 24: Segment 1 EB 2042 No Build Mainlane LOS Analysis

| Segment Name | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Segment } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | \# of <br> Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| IH 10 West->Antonio Ext. | Basic | 2 | 1,270 | 9.7 | A | 1,900 | 15.0 | B |
| Antonio Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 1,270 | 15.4 | B | 1,900 | 22.2 | C |
| Antonio Ext. ->Antonio Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,050 | 8.0 | A | 1,570 | 12.4 | B |
| Antonio Ent. | Merge | 2 | 1,780 | 20.2 | C | 2,180 | 24.3 | C |
| Antonio Ent.->Valley Chili Ext. | Overlap | 2 | 1,780 | 16.3 | B | 2,180 | 20.5 | C |
| Valley Chili Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 1,780 | 20.9 | C | 2,180 | 25.5 | C |
| Valley Chili Ext.->Valley Chili Ent | Basic | 2 | 1,730 | 13.3 | B | 2,140 | 17.0 | B |
| Valley Chili Ent | Merge | 2 | 1,850 | 20.5 | C | 2,350 | 25.5 | C |
| Valley Chili Ent->Vinton Ext. | Basic | 2 | 1,850 | 14.2 | B | 2,350 | 18.9 | C |
| Vinton Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 1,850 | 21.2 | C | 2,350 | 26.8 | C |
| Vinton Ext. ->Vinton Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,670 | 12.8 | B | 2,080 | 16.5 | B |
| Vinton Ent. | Merge | 2 | 2,290 | 23.2 | C | 2,640 | 27.0 | C |
| Vinton Ent.->SH 16 Ext. | Basic | 2 | 2,290 | 17.8 | B | 2,640 | 21.8 | C |
| SH 16 Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 2,290 | 26.0 | C | 2,640 | 30.1 | D |
| SH 16 Ext. ->SH 16 Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,550 | 11.9 | B | 2,050 | 16.2 | B |
| SH 16 Ent. | Merge | 2 | 2,190 | 22.6 | C | 2,720 | 28.0 | D |
| Loop 375 DC Ent. | Merge | 2 | 2,770 | 26.3 | c | 3,580 | 36.7 | F |
| Loop 375 DC Ent.->Artcraft Ext. | Basic | 2 | 2,770 | 22.4 | C | 3,580 | 34.5 | D |
| Artcraft Ext.->Artcraft Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 2,770 | 30.3 | D | 3,580 | 39.2 | F |
| Artcraft Ext. ->Artcraft Ent. | Basic | 2 | 2,220 | 17.2 | B | 2,930 | 24.5 | C |
| Artcraft Ent.->Redd Ext. | Weaving | 3 | 4,000 | 45.0 | F | 4,500 | 60.0 | F |


| Segment Name | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Redd Ext. ->Redd Ent. | Basic | 2 | 3,360 | 26.8 | D | 3,910 | 79.4 | F |
| Redd Ent. | Merge | 2 | 5,030 | 47.6 | F | 4,980 | 42.8 | F |
| Redd Ent.->Mesa Ext. | Basic | 2 | 5,030 | 44.8 | E | 4,980 | 39.2 | E |
| Mesa Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 5,030 | 43.1 | F | 4,980 | 40.7 | F |
| Mesa Ext. ->Mesa Ent. | Basic | 2 | 4,250 | 31.4 | D | 3,930 | 59.5 | F |
| Mesa Ent.->Sunland Park Ext. | Weaving | 4 | 5,360 | 45.0 | F | 5,250 | 45.0 | F |
| Sunland Park Ext. ->Sunland Park Ent. | Basic | 3 | 3,920 | 18.4 | C | 3,010 | 3.6 | A |
| Sunland Park Ent.->Mesa Park Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 8,080 | 45.0 | F | 6,260 | 45.0 | F |
| Mesa Park Ext.->Executive Center Ent | Basic | 4 | 7,680 | 15.8 | B | 5,980 | 16.3 | B |

HCS analysis was done in HCS7 Facilities Module
No Build Analysis considers geometrical improvements from other committed projects shown in the table
The Year 2042 No Build condition analysis for eastbound Segment 1 determined that there will be fewer segments operating at LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with nine segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 32 percent of the segments, while 68 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The majority of the failing segments were near the BHW interchange; however, Table 25 shows that the failing segments are spreading out away from BHW towards Mesa and Executive Center Boulevard. With no improvement to capacity, likely, congestion and delay will severely increase over the next 20 years. The No Build analysis incorporated committed projects along Segment 1.

Table 25: Segment 1 WB 2042 No Build Mainlane LOS Analysis

| Segment Name | Segment <br> Type | \# of <br> Lanes | AM Peak |  |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |  |  |
| Executive Center Ext. ->Mesa Park <br> Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,180 | 25.5 | C | 6,690 | 34.4 | D |  |
| Mesa Park Ent | Merge | 4 | 5,540 | 30.1 | D | 7,360 | 41.8 | F |  |
| Mesa Park Ent.->Sunland Park Ext. | Basic | 4 | 5,540 | 27.3 | D | 7,360 | 40.2 | E |  |
| Sunland Park Ext | Diverge | 5 | 5,540 | 19.8 | B | 7,360 | 45.0 | F |  |
| Sunland Park Ext.->Sunland Park | Basic | 3 | 3,170 | 19.6 | C | 3,760 | 63.3 | F |  |
| Ent | Weaving | 4 | 4,800 | 45.0 | F | 6,660 | 45.0 | F |  |
| Sunland Park Ent->Mesa Ext. | Basic | 2 | 3,790 | 78.1 | F | 4,560 | 4.1 | A |  |
| Mesa Ext.->Mesa Ent | Merge | 2 | 4,410 | 42.5 | F | 5,700 | 16.7 | B |  |
| Mesa Ent | Overlap | 2 | 4,410 | 42.5 | E | 5,700 | 19.6 | C |  |
| Mesa Ent->Redd Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 4,410 | 40.6 | F | 5,700 | 20.5 | C |  |
| Redd Ext | Basic | 2 | 3,450 | 26.3 | D | 3,990 | 0.0 | A |  |
| Redd Ext.->Redd Ent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Segment Name | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Redd Ent->Paseo del Norte Ext. | Weaving | 3 | 4,070 | 25.5 | C | 4,720 | 45.0 | F |
| Paseo del Norte Ext.->Paseo del Norte Ent | Basic | 2 | 2,680 | 15.0 | B | 3,060 | 26.6 | D |
| Paseo del Norte Ent | Merge | 2 | 3,230 | 25.3 | C | 3,550 | 36.6 | F |
| ```Paseo del Norte Ent->Loop 375 DC Ext.``` | Overlap | 2 | 3,230 | 22.8 | C | 3,550 | 36.6 | E |
| Loop 375 DC Ext | Diverge | 2 | 3,230 | 27.8 | C | 3,550 | 39.0 | F |
| Loop 375 DC Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 2,830 | 23.7 | C | 3,110 | 34.0 | D |
| SH 16 Ext. ->SH 16 Ent. | Basic | 2 | 2,390 | 12.7 | B | 2,470 | 20.1 | C |
| SH 16 Ent | Merge | 2 | 2,700 | 20.8 | C | 3,020 | 30.9 | D |
| SH 16 Ent.->Westway Ext. | Basic | 2 | 2,700 | 15.1 | B | 3,020 | 26.1 | D |
| Westway Ext | Diverge | 2 | 2,700 | 22.4 | C | 3,020 | 33.6 | D |
| Westway Ext. ->Westway Ent. | Basic | 2 | 2,150 | 10.8 | A | 2,390 | 19.3 | C |
| Westway Ent | Merge | 2 | 2,370 | 17.5 | B | 2,580 | 26.7 | C |
| Westway Ent.->Antonio Ext. | Basic | 2 | 2,370 | 12.5 | B | 2,580 | 21.2 | C |
| Antonio Ext | Diverge | 2 | 2,370 | 19.0 | B | 2,580 | 29.1 | D |
| Antonio Ext. ->Antonio Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,960 | 9.3 | A | 1,800 | 14.2 | B |
| Antonio Ent | Merge | 2 | 2,310 | 13.8 | B | 2,160 | 19.6 | B |
| Antonio Ent.->IH 10 West | Basic | 2 | 2,310 | 12.0 | B | 2,160 | 17.2 | B |

HCS analysis was done in HCS7 Facilities Module
No Build Analysis considers geometrical improvements from other committed projects shown in the table
b) Segment 1 No Build Intersection Level of Service Analysis

The Year 2042 No Build condition analysis for the intersections along Segment 1 determined a significant reduction in operating conditions. The study showed that the PM peak hour has seven intersections with reduced LOS. These intersections are shown in Table 26 and are highlighted in red. The No Build analysis considers geometrical improvements from other committed projects.

Table 26: Segment 12042 No Build Intersection LOS


| Segment 1 Intersections | Control Type | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Level of Service | Delay (sec/veh) | Level of Service | Delay (sec/veh) |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Vinton/Westway | Signal Control | C | 20.7 | B | 13.1 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Vinton/Westway | Signal Control | B | 14.4 | B | 15.5 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Loop 375 | Signal <br> Control | C | 27.7 | C | 23.1 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Loop 376 | Signal <br> Control | B | 17.5 | C | 27.5 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Artcraft/Paseo del Norte | Signal <br> Control | F | 441.2 | F | 123.4 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Artcraft/Paseo del Norte | Signal Control | D | 50.4 | F | 118.2 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Redd | Signal Control | E | 74.7 | F | 126.3 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Redd | Signal Control | F | 114.5 | F | 129.4 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Thorn | Signal Control | B | 17.0 | C | 30.4 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Thorn | Signal Control | D | 51.8 | B | 19.8 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& N Mesa* | Signal <br> Control | A | 9.0 | B | 15.3 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& N Mesa* | Signal Control | B | 16.4 | C | 27.7 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Sunland Park* | Signal <br> Control | C | 23.0 | E | 69.1 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Sunland Park* | Signal Control | C | 29.0 | F | 100.8 |
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### 4.3 Recommended Alternative Analysis

The build alternatives for Segment 1 included Alternative 2 (Texas-New Mexico State Border to Redd Road) and Alternative 3 (Redd Road to Executive Center Boulevard) (Ref 6). Both alternatives include changes in ramping, auxiliary lanes, and additional capacity in some areas. Full lane widths (12') are provided along with continuous frontage roads and desirable border width (20') for sidewalks and utilities. Alternative 2 provides 15 ' wide inside shoulders, which improve safety, allow for more effective incident management, and may be used as a peak period or special purpose lanes in the future. Alternative 3 provides full shoulder widths (10'). The inside most lane in each direction of travel is separated from general-purpose lanes by a two-foot buffer and serves as an adaptive lane. These adaptive lanes could be designated for special uses to benefit trucks or transit and remove these larger vehicles from mainlane traffic. Refer to Section 4 of the Feasibility Report for a detailed description of the Recommended Alternative.
a) Segment 1 Build Mainlane Level of Service Analysis

The Year 2042 Build condition analysis for eastbound Segment 1 determined that the majority of segments improved from an unacceptable LOS E or worse to LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with only three segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 11 percent of the segments, while 89 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The proposed alternative provided the capacity needed to improve traffic flow for the major of the segment and improve the conditions near the BHW area. Table 27 provides details regarding demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 27: Segment 1 EB 2042 Build Mainlane LOS

| Segment Name | Segment Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# of } \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| IH 10 EB to Antonio OFR | Basic | 3 | 1,270 | 6.9 | A | 1,900 | 10.7 | A |
| Antonio OFR | Diverge | 3 | 1,270 | 12.5 | B | 1,900 | 17.2 | B |
| Valley Chili OFR | Diverge | 3 | 1,050 | 10.1 | B | 1,570 | 13.9 | B |
| Valley Chili OFR to Lane Add | Basic | 3 | 1,000 | 5.5 | A | 1,530 | 8.6 | A |
| Lane Add to Antonio ONR | Basic | 4 | 1,000 | 4.1 | A | 1,530 | 6.4 | A |
| Antonio ONR to Vinton OFR | Weaving | 5 | 1,730 | 59.7 | A | 2,140 | 59.4 | A |
| Vinton OFR to Valley Chili ONR | Basic | 4 | 1,550 | 6.4 | A | 1,870 | 7.9 | A |
| Valley Chili ONR to Future Corridor OFR | Weaving | 5 | 1,670 | 63.0 | A | 2,080 | 62.4 | A |
| Future Corridor OFR to Vinton ONR | Basic | 4 | 1,300 | 5.3 | A | 1,780 | 7.5 | A |
| Vinton ONR to Loop 375 OFR | Weaving | 5 | 1,610 | 57.9 | A | 2,060 | 57.3 | A |
| Loop 375 OFR to Future Corridor ONR | Basic | 4 | 690 | 2.8 | A | 1,110 | 4.7 | A |


| Segment Name | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Future Corridor ONR | Merge | 4 | 1,000 | 5.9 | A | 1,390 | 7.4 | A |
| Future Corridor ONR to Loop 375 DC ONR | Basic | 4 | 1,000 | 4.1 | A | 1,390 | 5.9 | A |
| Loop 375 DC ONR | Merge | 4 | 1,580 | 9.3 | A | 2,250 | 13.4 | B |
| Loop 375 DC ONR to SH 16 ONR | Basic | 4 | 1,580 | 6.5 | A | 2,250 | 9.5 | A |
| SH 16 ONR to Redd OFR | Weaving | 5 | 2,220 | 57.5 | A | 2,920 | 56.5 | B |
| Redd OFR to Artcraft ONR | Basic | 4 | 1,580 | 6.5 | A | 2,330 | 9.8 | A |
| Artcraft ONR to Thorn OFR | Weaving | 5 | 3,360 | 11.4 | F | 3,900 | 12.2 | F |
| Thorn OFR to Lane Drop | Basic | 4 | 2,580 | 8.0 | A | 2,850 | 8.3 | A |
| Lane Drop to Thorn ONR | Basic | 3 | 2,580 | 10.7 | A | 2,850 | 11 | B |
| Thorn ONR | Merge | 3 | 4,250 | 24.6 | C | 3,920 | 20 | B |
| Thorn ONR to N Mesa ONR | Basic | 3 | 4,250 | 20.0 | C | 3,920 | 17 | B |
| N Mesa ONR to Sunland Park OFR | Weaving | 5 | 5,360 | 51.4 | C | 5,240 | 15.3 | F |
| Sunland Park OFR to US 85 OFR | Basic | 4 | 4,770 | 17.0 | B | 3,840 | 10.6 | A |
| US 85 OFR | Diverge | 4 | 4,770 | 18.3 | C | 3,840 | 11.6 | B |
| US 85 OFR to Sunland Park CD ONR | Basic | 3 | 3,920 | 17.4 | B | 3,000 | 9.4 | A |
| Sunland Park CD ONR | Weaving | 5 | 8,080 | 10.7 | F | 6,250 | 10.9 | F |
| Mesa Park OFR to Executive Center ONR | Basic | 4 | 7,680 | 13.0 | B | 5,970 | 14 | B |

The Year 2042 Build condition analysis for westbound Segment 1 determined that the majority of segments improved from an unacceptable LOS E or worse to LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with only six segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 18 percent of the segments, while 82 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The proposed alternative provided the capacity needed to improve traffic flow for the major of the segment and improve the conditions near the BHW area. Table 28 provides details regarding demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 28: Segment 1 WB 2042 Build Mainlane LOS

| Segment Name | Segment <br> Type | $\#$ of <br> Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |  |
| Executive Center OFR to Mesa Park <br> ONR | Basic | 4 | 5,180 | 22.2 | C | 6,690 | 31.3 | D |
| Mesa Park ONR | Merge | 4 | 5,540 | 26.8 | C | 7,360 | 36.5 | E |
| Mesa Park ONR to Sunland Park OFR | Basic | 4 | 5,540 | 24.1 | C | 7,360 | 36.8 | E |


| Segment Name | Segment Type | \# of <br> Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Sunland Park OFR | Diverge | 5 | 5,540 | 45.0 | E | 7,360 | 45 | E |
| Sunland Park OFR to US 85 ONR | Basic | 3 | 3,170 | 17.8 | B | 3,760 | 21 | C |
| US 85 ONR | Merge | 4 | 3,750 | 17.0 | B | 4,710 | 47.5 | F |
| US 85 ONR to Sunland Park ONR | Basic | 4 | 3,750 | 15.8 | B | 4,710 | 104.8 | F |
| Sunland Park ONR to N Mesa OFR | Weaving | 5 | 4,800 | 24.5 | F | 6,660 | 10.7 | F |
| N Mesa OFR to Thorn OFR | Basic | 4 | 3,790 | 15.7 | B | 4,560 | 4.3 | A |
| Thorn OFR | Diverge | 4 | 3,790 | 16.9 | B | 4,560 | 8.9 | A |
| Thorn OFR to Lane Add | Basic | 3 | 2,830 | 15.5 | B | 2,850 | 0 | A |
| Lane Add to Thorn ONR | Basic | 4 | 2,830 | 11.7 | B | 2,850 | 0 | A |
| Thorn ONR | Merge | 5 | 3,450 | 9.9 | A | 3,990 | 4.3 | A |
| Artcraft OFR | Diverge | 5 | 3,450 | 12.7 | B | 3,990 | 6.9 | A |
| Artcraft OFR to Redd ONR | Basic | 4 | 2,060 | 8.4 | A | 2,330 | 0 | A |
| Redd ONR | Merge | 5 | 2,680 | 7.7 | A | 3,060 | 2.7 | A |
| Redd ONR to Loop 375 OFR | Basic | 5 | 2,680 | 8.8 | A | 3,060 | 2.5 | A |
| Loop 375 OFR | Diverge | 5 | 2,680 | 9.2 | A | 3,060 | 2.8 | A |
| Loop 375 OFR to Loop 375 OFR DC | Basic | 4 | 2,240 | 9.2 | A | 2,420 | 0.4 | A |
| Loop 375 OFR DC | Diverge | 4 | 2,240 | 14.4 | B | 2,420 | 6.9 | A |
| Loop 375 OFR DC to Future Corridor OFR | Basic | 4 | 1,840 | 7.5 | A | 1,980 | 0 | A |
| Future Corridor OFR | Diverge | 4 | 1,840 | 11.9 | B | 1,980 | 5.7 | A |
| Future Corridor OFR to Loop 375 ONR | Basic | 4 | 1,560 | 6.3 | A | 1,660 | 0 | A |
| Loop 375 ONR to Vinton OFR | Weaving | 5 | 2,110 | 60.3 | A | 2,150 | 60.6 | A |
| Vinton OFR to Future Corridor ONR | Basic | 4 | 1,830 | 7.4 | A | 1,830 | 0.7 | A |
| Future Corridor ONR to Valley Chili OFR | Weaving | 5 | 2,150 | 62.4 | A | 2,390 | 60.2 | A |
| Valley Chili OFR to Vinton ONR | Basic | 4 | 1,940 | 7.9 | A | 2,000 | 1.4 | A |
| Vinton ONR to Antonio OFR | Weaving | 5 | 2,050 | 64.3 | A | 2,100 | 61.6 | A |
| Antonio OFR to Lane Drop | Basic | 4 | 1,840 | 7.5 | A | 1,710 | 0.2 | A |
| Lane Drop to Valley Chili ONR | Basic | 3 | 1,840 | 10.0 | A | 1,710 | 0.3 | A |
| Valley Chili ONR | Merge | 3 | 1,950 | 11.6 | B | 1,810 | 2 | A |
| Valley Chili ONR to Antonio ONR | Basic | 3 | 1,950 | 10.6 | A | 1,810 | 0.8 | A |


| Segment Name | Segment Type | \# of <br> Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Antonio ONR | Merge | 3 | 2,300 | 14.3 | B | 2,170 | 4.8 | A |
| Antonio ONR to IH 10 WB | Basic | 3 | 2,300 | 12.6 | B | 2,170 | 2.9 | A |

## b) Segment 1 Build Intersection Level of Service Analysis

The Year 2042 Build condition analysis for the intersections along Segment 1 determined a significant improvement in LOS over the No Build analysis. The study showed that the PM peak hour has three intersections with poor LOS. These intersections are shown in Table 29 and are highlighted in red. The recommended improvements are also located in the table below.

Table 29: Segment 12042 Build Intersection LOS Analysis

| Segment 1 Intersections | Improvements | Control Type | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | LOS | Delay (Sec/veh) | LOS | Delay (Sec/veh) |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Antonio | Added Capacity, Added Turn Bay | Signal Control | B | 17.5 | C | 26.8 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Antonio | Added Capacity | Signal Control | B | 16.2 | C | 27.5 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Vinton/Westway |  | Signal Control | C | 20.7 | B | 12.9 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Vinton/Westway |  | Signal Control | B | 14.2 | B | 14.9 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Loop 375 |  | Signal Control | C | 27.7 | C | 23.0 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Loop 376 |  | Signal Control | B | 16.7 | C | 26.8 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Artcraft/Paseo del Norte | Converted to Single Point Urban (SPUI) | Signal Control | C | 32.8 | D | 47.6 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Artcraft/Paseo del Norte |  | Signal Control | D | 50.4 | F | 118.2 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Redd | Added Capacity | Signal Control | C | 34.6 | D | 36.6 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Redd | Added Capacity | Signal Control | D | 45.9 | D | 45.9 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Thorn |  | Signal Control | B | 18.9 | C | 28.0 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Thorn |  | Signal Control | C | 27.8 | B | 15.5 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& N Mesa* |  | Signal Control | C | 25.9 | B | 15.1 |


| Segment 1 Intersections | Improvements | Control Type | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | LOS | Delay (Sec/veh) | LOS | Delay (Sec/veh) |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& N Mesa* |  | Signal Control | B | 18.7 | C | 27.7 |
| IH 10 EB Frontage Road \& Sunland Park* | Added <br> Capacity | Signal Control | D | 43.3 | E | 75.9 |
| IH 10 WB Frontage Road \& Sunland Park* | Added <br> Capacity | Signal <br> Control | D | 35.1 | E | 69.0 |

### 4.4 Findings

a) Segment 1 Build Mainlane Level of Service Analysis Summary

Based on the analysis, there is a significant improvement in LOS between the No Build alternative and the Build alternative. below provides a summary of the comparison between each alternative. The figure shows a reduction of the number of segments in the LOS E and F column between the No Build and Build alternatives for both AM and PM peak hours.


Figure 10: Segment 1 Mainlane Level of Service Summary
b) Segment 1 Intersection Level of Service Analysis Summary

Based on the analysis, there is a significant improvement between the No Build alternative and the Build alternative. below provides a summary of the comparison between each alternative. The figure shows a reduction of the number of segments in the LOS E\&F column between the No Build and Build alternatives for both AM and PM peak hours.


Figure 11: Segment 1 Intersection Level of Service Summary

## 5. Segment 2

### 5.1 Existing Condition Analysis

Existing condition analysis provided the baseline analysis to obtain an understanding of the current operations. Segment 2 analysis used VISSIM to determine the current deficiencies along the corridor.
a) Segment 2 Existing Mainlane Level of Service Analysis

The existing condition analysis for eastbound Segment 2 showed the majority of segments operating at LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with five segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 15 percent of the segments, while 85 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The majority of the failing segments were near Cotton St and US 54 because the weaving and ramp volume are over the maximum capacity for these types of freeway segments. Table 30 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 30: 2017 Segment 2 EB Existing Mainlane LOS Analysis- VISSIM Analysis

| Segment Name | Segment <br> Type | \# of <br> Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Segment 1 -> Executive Ext. | Basic | 3 | 5,299 | 39.5 | E | 4,220 | 24.6 | C |
| Executive Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 264 | 30.7 | D | 192 | 19.9 | B |
| Executive Ext. -> Executive Ent. | Basic | 3 | 5,009 | 37.4 | E | 4,018 | 23.4 | C |
| Executive Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 759 | 27.8 | C | 835 | 19.7 | B |
| Executive Ent. -> Schuster Ext. | Merge | 4 | 5,687 | 35.5 | E | 4,844 | 21.2 | C |
| Schuster Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 558 | 56.5 | F | 392 | 30.7 | D |
| Schuster Ext. -> Schuster Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,056 | 22.6 | C | 4,442 | 19.4 | C |
| Schuster Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 197 | 6.1 | A | 475 | 14.7 | B |
| Schuster Ent. -> Porfirio Diaz <br> Ext. | Merge | 5 | 5,256 | 20.3 | C | 4,920 | 20.0 | B |
| Schuster Ent. -> Porfirio Diaz <br> Ext. | Basic | 4 | 5,253 | 23.5 | C | 4,913 | 22.0 | C |
| Porfirio Diaz Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 86 | 3.5 | A | 96 | 3.9 | A |
| Porfirio Diaz Ext. -> Porfirio Diaz <br> Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,143 | 22.8 | C | 4,793 | 20.9 | C |
| Porfirio Diaz Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 316 | 8.4 | A | 542 | 14.4 | B |
| Porfirio Diaz Ent. -> Santa Fe <br> Ext. | Merge | 5 | 5,451 | 21.4 | C | 5,322 | 20.0 | C |
| Porfirio Diaz Ent. -> Santa Fe <br> Ext. | Basic | 4 | 5,459 | 31.5 | D | 5,330 | 26.5 | D |
| Santa Fe Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 1,042 | 10.7 | B | 424 | 3.9 | A |


| Segment Name | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Santa Fe Ext. -> Kansas Ent. | Basic | 3 | 4,426 | 26.6 | D | 4,919 | 29.8 | D |
| Kansas Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 820 | 20.0 | B | 1,489 | 42.0 | E |
| Kansas Ent. -> Campbell Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,232 | 23.4 | C | 6,390 | 31.4 | D |
| Campbell Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 300 | 3.7 | A | 1,282 | 15.9 | B |
| Campbell Ent. -> Dallas Ext. | Merge | 6 | 5,488 | 16.0 | B | 7,608 | 25.7 | C |
| Campbell Ent. -> Dallas Ext. | Basic | 5 | 5,555 | 19.4 | C | 7,665 | 32.2 | D |
| Dallas Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 309 | 11.6 | B | 192 | 6.9 | A |
| Dallas Ext. -> Cotton Ent. | Basic | 5 | 5,224 | 18.1 | C | 7,401 | 34.0 | D |
| Cotton Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 564 | 20.5 | C | 1,221 | 56.0 | F |
| Cotton Ent. -> Piedras Ext. | Weaving | 6 | 5,776 | 16.9 | B | 8,516 | 45.5 | F |
| Piedras Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 379 | 7.5 | A | 497 | 11.0 | B |
| Piedras Ext. -> 478 Ext. | Basic | 6 | 5,390 | 15.5 | B | 7,833 | 65.1 | F |
| 478 Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 211 | 3.9 | A | 477 | 11.0 | B |
| 478 Ext. -> 54 Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 5,182 | 21.3 | C | 7,186 | 77.9 | F |
| 54 Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 1,234 | 13.1 | B | 1,896 | 21.4 | C |
| 54 Ext. -> 478 Ent. | Basic | 3 | 3,939 | 23.4 | C | 5,254 | 32.9 | D |
| 478 Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 478 | 11.5 | B | 606 | 14.9 | B |
| 478 Ent. -> Segment 3 | Weaving | 4 | 4,410 | 19.9 | C | 5,847 | 32.8 | D |

The existing condition analysis for westbound Segment 2 showed the majority of segments operating at LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the AM peak, with four segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 11 percent of the segments, while 89 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The majority of the failing segments were near Cotton St and US 54. Table 31 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 31: 2017 Segment 2 WB Existing Mainlane LOS Analysis - VISSIM Analysis

| Segment Name | Segment Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# of } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{gathered}$ | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Segment 3 -> 54 Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,043 | 27.2 | D | 4,873 | 21.8 | C |
| 54 Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 636 | 27.0 | C | 378 | 15.6 | B |
| 54 Ent. -> 478 Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 7,016 | 26.8 | D | 5,623 | 20.4 | C |
| 478 Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 364 | 6.8 | A | 496 | 9.2 | A |
| 478 Ext. -> 54 Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,594 | 29.9 | D | 5,072 | 22.2 | C |
| 54 Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 2,120 | 32.3 | D | 1,255 | 18.5 | B |
| 54 Ent. -> Piedras Ext. | Weaving | 6 | 8,726 | 34.4 | D | 6,340 | 19.2 | C |


| Segment Name | Segment Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# of } \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Piedras Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 561 | 12.9 | B | 464 | 9.7 | A |
| Piedras Ext. -> 478 Ent. | Basic | 5 | 8,151 | 30.8 | D | 5,873 | 20.5 | C |
| 478 Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 194 | 4.6 | A | 214 | 5.1 | A |
| 478 Ent. -> Cotton Ext. | Weaving | 6 | 8,283 | 26.2 | D | 6,050 | 17.6 | B |
| Cotton Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,176 | 31.2 | D | 625 | 15.3 | B |
| Cotton Ext. -> Piedras Ent. | Basic | 5 | 7,150 | 25.4 | C | 5,459 | 18.8 | C |
| Piedras Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 367 | 8.9 | A | 358 | 8.5 | A |
| Piedras Ent. -> Dallas Ent. | Merge | 6 | 7,444 | 21.9 | C | 5,763 | 16.7 | B |
| Piedras Ent. -> Dallas Ent. | Basic | 5 | 7,486 | 27.5 | D | 5,800 | 20.1 | C |
| Dallas Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 219 | 5.3 | A | 336 | 8.1 | A |
| Dallas Ent. -> Campbell Ext. | Merge | 6 | 7,663 | 28.8 | D | 6,119 | 17.9 | B |
| Dallas Ent. -> Campbell Ext. | Basic | 5 | 7,648 | 45.1 | F | 6,122 | 22.7 | C |
| Campbell Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 1,618 | 17.4 | B | 955 | 8.8 | A |
| Campbell Ext. -> Kansas Ext. | Basic | 4 | 5,938 | 50.0 | F | 5,109 | 28.7 | D |
| Kansas Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 754 | 61.5 | F | 575 | 24.8 | C |
| Kansas Ext. -> Santa Fe Ent. | Basic | 3 | 5,200 | 31.9 | D | 4,577 | 27.4 | D |
| Santa Fe Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 503 | 13.2 | B | 1,034 | 27.7 | C |
| Santa Fe Ent. -> Porfirio Diaz Ext. | Weaving | 4 | 5,677 | 25.4 | C | 5,588 | 25.1 | C |
| Porfirio Diaz Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 351 | 8.7 | A | 166 | 3.7 | A |
| Porfirio Diaz Ext. -> Schuster Ext. | Basic | 4 | 5,337 | 23.6 | C | 5,435 | 23.9 | C |
| Porfirio Diaz Ext. -> Schuster Ext. | Basic | 5 | 5,217 | 20.7 | C | 5,356 | 19.7 | C |
| Schuster Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 1,209 | 11.4 | B | 415 | 3.7 | A |
| Schuster Ext. -> Schuster Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,097 | 17.8 | B | 5,014 | 22.0 | C |
| Schuster Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 186 | 4.9 | A | 313 | 8.3 | A |
| Schuster Ent. -> Executive Ext. | Merge | 5 | 4,287 | 14.9 | B | 5,331 | 19.0 | B |
| Schuster Ent. -> Executive Ext. | Basic | 4 | 4,243 | 21.1 | C | 5,279 | 36.9 | E |
| Executive Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 783 | 43.7 | F | 993 | 80.6 | F |
| ```Executive Ext. -> Executive Ent.``` | Basic | 3 | 3,352 | 19.5 | C | 4,143 | 24.7 | C |
| Executive Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 190 | 5.1 | A | 387 | 10.4 | B |
| Executive Ent. -> Segment 2 | Basic | 4 | 3,526 | 15.5 | B | 4,510 | 20.3 | C |
| Executive Ent. -> Segment 2 | Basic | 3 | 3,534 | 20.7 | C | 4,521 | 27.1 | D |

## b) Segment 2 Existing Intersection Level of Service Analysis

The existing condition analysis for the intersections along Segment 2 determined the majority of intersections operating at LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with five intersections operating at LOS E or worse. These intersections are shown in Table 32 and are highlighted in red.

Table 32: Segment 2 Existing Intersection LOS for Year 2017

| Intersection | Control Type | AM |  | PM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| Santa Fe \& Yandell Dr | Signalized | 14.9 | B | 16.2 | B |
| Santa Fe \& Wyoming | Signalized | 16.0 | B | 12.3 | B |
| Santa Fe \& Missouri | Signalized | 10.4 | B | 8.9 | A |
| Santa Fe \& Franklin | Signalized | 14.8 | B | 15.9 | B |
| Yandell \& El Paso St | Signalized | 5.6 | A | 7.0 | A |
| Wyoming \& El Paso | Signalized | 13.2 | B | 17.8 | B |
| Oregon \& Montana | Signalized | 5.2 | A | 8.1 | A |
| Oregon \& Yandell | Signalized | 7.4 | A | 18.0 | B |
| Oregon \& Wyoming | Signalized | 7.3 | A | 10.2 | B |
| Oregon \& Missouri | Signalized | 10.2 | B | 10.5 | B |
| Oregon \& Franklin | Signalized | 13.0 | B | 17.8 | B |
| Mesa \& Rio Grande | Signalized | 9.0 | A | 17.1 | B |
| Mesa \& Montana | Signalized | 5.7 | A | 12.6 | B |
| Mesa \& Yandell | Signalized | 5.4 | A | 17.7 | B |
| Mesa \& Wyoming | Signalized | 17.2 | B | 30.9 | C |
| Mesa \& Missouri | Signalized | 8.2 | A | 6.4 | A |
| Mesa \& Franklin | Signalized | 8.3 | A | 9.9 | A |
| Stanton \& Rio Grande | Signalized | 14.0 | B | 15.9 | B |
| Stanton \& Montana | Signalized | 24.2 | C | 26.0 | C |
| Stanton \& Yandell | Signalized | 6.2 | A | 8.7 | A |
| Stanton \& Wyoming | Signalized | 5.5 | A | 18.5 | B |
| Stanton \& Missouri | Signalized | 6.5 | A | 8.3 | A |
| Stanton \& Franklin | Signalized | 16.2 | B | 12.6 | B |
| Kansas \& Rio Grande | Signalized | 9.7 | A | 10.1 | B |
| Kansas \& Montana | Signalized | 9.5 | A | 9.8 | A |
| Kansas \& Yandell | Signalized | 65.7 | E | 39.7 | D |
| Kansas \& Wyoming | Signalized | 12.9 | B | 15.2 | B |
| Kansas \& Missouri | Signalized | 5.2 | A | 9.0 | A |
| Kansas \& Franklin | Signalized | 14.9 | B | 11.9 | B |


| Intersection | Control Type | AM |  | PM |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| Campbell \& Rio Grande | Signalized | 3.2 | A | 2.2 | A |
| Campbell \& Montana | Signalized | 10.8 | B | 13.8 | B |
| Campbell \& Yandell | Signalized | 12.4 | B | 16.3 | B |
| Campbell \& Missouri | Signalized | 18.9 | B | 9.9 | A |
| Campbell \& Franklin | Signalized | 12.5 | B | 13.9 | B |
| ECB WBFR | Signalized | 28.6 | C | 92.9 | F |
| Raynolds WBFR | Signalized | 16.2 | B | 36.2 | D |
| Raynolds EBFR | Signalized | 21.7 | C | 113.1 | F |
| Copia WBFR | Signalized | 17.7 | B | 18.6 | B |
| Copia EBFR | Signalized | 20.0 | B | 23.6 | C |
| Raynor WBFR | Signalized | 11.2 | B | 17.8 | B |
| Raynor EBFR | Signalized | 20.5 | C | 15.4 | B |
| Piedras WBFR | Signalized | 11.6 | B | 20.5 | C |
| Piedras EBFR | Signalized | 22.6 | C | 12.1 | B |
| Cotton WBFR | Signalized | 10.6 | B | 32.0 | C |
| Cotton EBFR | Signalized | 12.6 | B | 29.0 | C |
| Dallas WBFR | Signalized | 13.4 | B | 11.9 | B |
| Porfirio Diaz WBFR | Unsignalized | 9.5 | A | 80.7 | F |
| Porfirio Diaz EBFR | Unsignalized | 26.6 | C | 19.0 | B |
| Schuster WBFR | Signalized | 34.2 | C | 21.7 | C |
| Schuster EBFR | Signalized | 106.4 | F | 22.5 | C |
| ECB EBFR | Signalized | 26.3 | C | 18.9 | B |

### 5.2 No Build Operational Analysis

The 2042 No Build models were used as a comparison tool to measure the effectiveness of the build alternatives. The No Build models assumed committed projects in the analysis.
a) Segment 2 No Build Mainlane Level of Service Analysis

The Year 2042 No Build condition analysis for eastbound Segment 2 showed that the majority of segments operate at LOS E or worse. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with 25 segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 76 percent of the segments, while only 24 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. With no improvement along the entire segment of capacity congestion and delay will increase over the next 20 years. Table 33 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 33: Segment 2 EB 2042 No Build Mainlane - VISSIM Analysis

| Segment Name | Segment Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# of } \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Segment 1 -> Executive Ext. | Basic | 4 | 7,455 | 51.1 | F | 4,683 | 79.6 | F |
| Executive Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 809 | 19.9 | B | 773 | 99.4 | F |
| Executive Ent. -> Schuster Ext. | Merge | 5 | 8,100 | 55.5 | F | 5,034 | 96.1 | F |
| Executive Ent. -> Schuster Ext. | Basic | 4 | 7,894 | 67.9 | F | 4,615 | 107.5 | F |
| Schuster Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 804 | 56.5 | F | 346 | 29.3 | D |
| Schuster Ext. -> Schuster Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,911 | 74.7 | F | 3,789 | 120.5 | F |
| Schuster Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 311 | 10.1 | B | 510 | 124.3 | F |
| Schuster Ent. -> Porfirio Diaz Ext. | Merge | 5 | 7,194 | 72.8 | F | 4,188 | 125.8 | F |
| Schuster Ent. -> Porfirio Diaz Ext. | Basic | 4 | 7,153 | 79.2 | F | 4,114 | 120.7 | F |
| Porfirio Diaz Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 125 | 5.4 | A | 77 | 3.4 | A |
| Porfirio Diaz Ext. -> Porfirio Diaz Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,944 | 64.3 | F | 3,903 | 113.2 | F |
| Porfirio Diaz Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 446 | 10.8 | B | 522 | 57.1 | F |
| Porfirio Diaz Ent. -> Santa Fe Ext. | Merge | 5 | 7,354 | 50.9 | F | 4,348 | 115.5 | F |
| Porfirio Diaz Ent. -> Santa Fe Ext. | Basic | 4 | 7,346 | 62.3 | F | 4,311 | 116.8 | F |
| Santa Fe Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 1,413 | 15.5 | B | 344 | 3.8 | A |
| Santa Fe Ext. -> Kansas Ent. | Basic | 3 | 5,919 | 37.5 | E | 3,819 | 119.3 | F |
| Kansas Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,107 | 33.9 | D | 926 | 126.2 | F |


| Segment Name | Segment Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# of } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{gathered}$ | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Kansas Ent. -> Campbell Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,991 | 33.7 | D | 4,598 | 124.2 | F |
| Campbell Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 412 | 5.4 | A | 1,306 | 59.9 | F |
| Campbell Ent. -> Dallas Ext. | Merge | 6 | 7,335 | 23.6 | C | 5,792 | 120.8 | F |
| Campbell Ent. -> Dallas Ext. | Basic | 5 | 7,377 | 31.6 | D | 5,746 | 127.7 | F |
| Dallas Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 410 | 16.4 | B | 132 | 5.4 | A |
| Dallas Ext. -> Cotton Ent. | Basic | 5 | 6,821 | 37.9 | E | 5,419 | 129.8 | F |
| Cotton Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 785 | 24.0 | C | 1,044 | 65.5 | F |
| Cotton Ent. -> Piedras Ext. | Weaving | 6 | 7,414 | 50.7 | F | 6,316 | 135.2 | F |
| Piedras Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 485 | 9.9 | A | 378 | 8.9 | A |
| Piedras Ext. -> 478 Ext. | Basic | 6 | 6,688 | 59.9 | F | 5,862 | 107.8 | F |
| 478 Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 267 | 5.1 | A | 373 | 7.4 | A |
| 478 Ext. -> 54 Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 6,241 | 67.1 | F | 5,456 | 105.1 | F |
| 54 Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 1,512 | 15.9 | B | 1,453 | 15.5 | B |
| 54 Ext. -> 478 Ent. | Basic | 3 | 4,605 | 88.4 | F | 3,991 | 119.6 | F |
| 478 Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 660 | 15.1 | B | 761 | 18.4 | B |
| 478 Ent. -> Segment 3 | Weaving | 4 | 5,171 | 78.9 | F | 4,734 | 99.7 | F |

The Year 2042 No Build condition analysis for westbound Segment 2 showed the majority of segments operating at LOS E or worse. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with 18 segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 53 percent of the segments, while only 47 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. With no improvement to capacity, likely, congestion and delay will severely increase over the next 20 years. Table 34 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 34: Segment 2 WB 2042 No Build Mainlane - VISSIM Analysis

| Segment Name | Segment Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# of } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{gathered}$ | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Segment 3 -> 54 Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,974 | 100.6 | F | 4,802 | 52.4 | F |
| 54 Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 945 | 38.4 | E | 537 | 36.7 | E |
| 54 Ent. -> 478 Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 7,092 | 87.5 | F | 5,400 | 54.1 | F |
| 478 Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 366 | 9.6 | A | 463 | 10.3 | B |
| 478 Ext. -> 54 Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,646 | 77.3 | F | 4,730 | 60.3 | F |
| 54 Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 2,393 | 116.8 | F | 1,537 | 61.5 | F |
| 54 Ent. -> Piedras Ext. | Weaving | 6 | 8,986 | 86.3 | F | 6,009 | 65.4 | F |
| Piedras Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 576 | 13.6 | B | 408 | 8.2 | A |
| Piedras Ext. -> 478 Ent. | Basic | 5 | 8,361 | 68.0 | F | 5,372 | 73.6 | F |
| 478 Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 231 | 5.1 | A | 239 | 13.7 | B |
| 478 Ent. -> Cotton Ext. | Weaving | 6 | 8,477 | 79.4 | F | 5,357 | 76.8 | F |
| Cotton Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,197 | 28.4 | D | 499 | 10.8 | B |
| Cotton Ext. -> Piedras Ent. | Basic | 5 | 7,188 | 103.2 | F | 4,634 | 90.0 | F |
| Piedras Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 483 | 11.6 | B | 335 | 76.5 | F |
| Piedras Ent. -> Dallas Ent. | Merge | 6 | 7,503 | 98.7 | F | 4,706 | 96.3 | F |
| Piedras Ent. -> Dallas Ent. | Basic | 5 | 7,486 | 100.7 | F | 4,441 | 104.4 | F |
| Dallas Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 293 | 6.6 | A | 293 | 53.5 | F |
| ```Dallas Ent. -> Campbell Ext.``` | Merge | 6 | 7,740 | 77.8 | F | 4,435 | 109.7 | F |
| ```Dallas Ent. -> Campbell Ext.``` | Basic | 5 | 7,760 | 78.9 | F | 4,327 | 113.3 | F |
| Campbell Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 1,647 | 16.6 | B | 542 | 76.4 | F |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Campbell Ext. -> Kansas } \\ & \text { Ext. } \end{aligned}$ | Basic | 4 | 6,048 | 75.2 | F | 3,638 | 100.8 | F |
| Kansas Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 776 | 58.0 | F | 321 | 113.4 | F |
| ```Kansas Ext. -> Santa Fe Ent.``` | Basic | 3 | 5,323 | 33.4 | D | 3,299 | 20.0 | C |
| Santa Fe Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 659 | 17.0 | B | 816 | 21.3 | c |
| Santa Fe Ent. -> Porfirio Diaz Ext. | Weaving | 4 | 5,961 | 26.7 | C | 4,137 | 18.3 | B |
| Porfirio Diaz Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 373 | 11.6 | B | 118 | 2.7 | A |
| Porfirio Diaz Ext. -> Schuster Ext. | Basic | 4 | 5,601 | 24.9 | C | 4,051 | 17.7 | B |
| Schuster Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 1,266 | 11.8 | B | 312 | 2.8 | A |
| Schuster Ext. -> Schuster Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,308 | 18.7 | C | 3,774 | 16.5 | B |
| Schuster Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 261 | 5.7 | A | 345 | 7.6 | A |


| Segment Name | Segment <br> Type | \# of <br> Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |  |  |
| Schuster Ent. -> Executive <br> Ext. | Merge | 5 | 4,586 | 16.0 | B | 4,162 | 14.8 | B |
| Schuster Ent. -> Executive <br> Ext. | Basic | 4 | 4,594 | 20.0 | C | 4,211 | 18.6 | C |
| Executive Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 972 | 19.2 | B | 926 | 23.9 | C |
| Executive Ext. -> Executive <br> Ent. | Basic | 4 | 3,628 | 15.6 | B | 3,355 | 14.5 | B |

b) Segment 2 No Build Intersection Level of Service Analysis

The Year 2042 No Build condition analysis for the intersections along Segment 2 determined a significant decline in LOS. The PM peak hour has 19 intersections with poor LOS. These intersections are shown in Table 35 and are highlighted in red. The No Build analysis considers geometrical improvements from other committed projects.

Table 35: Segment 2 No Build Intersection LOS for Year 2042

| Intersection | Control Type | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| Santa Fe \& Yandell Dr | Signalized | 15.0 | B | 20.0 | B |
| Santa Fe \& Wyoming | Signalized | 18.6 | B | 23.8 | C |
| Santa Fe \& Missouri | Signalized | 11.4 | B | 25.7 | C |
| Santa Fe \& Franklin | Signalized | 14.0 | B | 51.5 | D |
| Yandell \& El Paso St | Signalized | 6.5 | A | 9.3 | A |
| Wyoming \& El Paso | Signalized | 13.5 | B | 16.6 | B |
| Oregon \& Montana | Signalized | 5.8 | A | 29.3 | C |
| Oregon \& Yandell | Signalized | 7.9 | A | 22.8 | C |
| Oregon \& Wyoming | Signalized | 8.1 | A | 25.2 | C |
| Oregon \& Missouri | Signalized | 12.6 | B | 24.1 | C |
| Oregon \& Franklin | Signalized | 13.3 | B | 46.1 | D |
| Mesa \& Rio Grande | Signalized | 9.9 | A | 120.6 | F |
| Mesa \& Montana | Signalized | 7.1 | A | 60.5 | E |
| Mesa \& Yandell | Signalized | 7.7 | A | 43.8 | D |
| Mesa \& Wyoming | Signalized | 19.7 | B | 86.4 | F |
| Mesa \& Missouri | Signalized | 10.2 | B | 25.7 | C |
| Mesa \& Franklin | Signalized | 8.7 | A | 62.9 | E |
| Stanton \& Rio Grande | Signalized | 14.3 | B | 32.5 | C |
| Stanton \& Montana | Signalized | 27.4 | C | 53.7 | D |
| Stanton \& Yandell | Signalized | 7.0 | A | 13.0 | B |
| Stanton \& Wyoming | Signalized | 7.8 | A | 98.7 | F |


| Intersection | Control Type | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| Stanton \& Missouri | Signalized | 7.6 | A | 117.4 | F |
| Stanton \& Franklin | Signalized | 16.2 | B | 203.9 | F |
| Kansas \& Rio Grande | Signalized | 10.4 | B | 218.9 | F |
| Kansas \& Montana | Signalized | 10.4 | B | 111.6 | F |
| Kansas \& Yandell | Signalized | 59.5 | E | 226.4 | F |
| Kansas \& Wyoming | Signalized | 14.5 | B | 105.9 | F |
| Kansas \& Missouri | Signalized | 10.1 | B | 48.2 | D |
| Kansas \& Franklin | Signalized | 15.6 | B | 17.7 | B |
| Campbell \& Rio Grande | Signalized | 3.6 | A | 3.3 | A |
| Campbell \& Montana | Signalized | 11.6 | B | 48.6 | D |
| Campbell \& Yandell | Signalized | 14.3 | B | 215.6 | F |
| Campbell \& Missouri | Signalized | 21.6 | C | 178.1 | F |
| Campbell \& Franklin | Signalized | 13.3 | B | 120.9 | F |
| ECB WBFR | Signalized | 28.4 | C | 20.5 | C |
| Raynolds WBFR | Signalized | 35.7 | D | 48.1 | D |
| Raynolds EBFR | Signalized | 53.2 | D | 29.0 | C |
| Copia WBFR | Signalized | 47.1 | D | 29.5 | C |
| Copia EBFR | Signalized | 14.6 | B | 12.0 | B |
| Raynor WBFR | Signalized | 11.0 | B | 13.6 | B |
| Raynor EBFR | Signalized | 24.1 | C | 20.9 | C |
| Piedras WBFR | Signalized | 9.7 | A | 12.3 | B |
| Piedras EBFR | Signalized | 37.9 | D | 99.5 | F |
| Cotton WBFR | Signalized | 11.8 | B | 37.6 | D |
| Cotton EBFR | Signalized | 12.2 | B | 12.1 | B |
| Dallas WBFR | Signalized | 21.9 | C | 84.1 | F |
| Porfirio Diaz WBFR | Unsignalized | 14.5 | B | 21.8 | C |
| Porfirio Diaz EBFR | Unsignalized | 23.4 | C | 108.1 | F |
| Schuster WBFR | Signalized | 29.1 | C | 56.7 | E |
| Schuster EBFR | Signalized | 95.0 | F | 89.0 | F |
| ECB EBFR | Signalized | 24.5 | C | 54.7 | D |

### 5.3 Recommended Alternative Analysis

The studied alternative for Segment 2 was Alternative 3. Alternative 3 includes changes in ramping, auxiliary lanes, and additional capacity in some areas (Ref 6). Full lane widths (12') and shoulder widths (10') are provided along with continuous frontage roads and desirable border width (20') for sidewalks and utilities. The inside most lane in each direction of travel is separated from general-purpose lanes by a two-foot buffer and serves as an adaptive lane. These adaptive lanes could be designated for special uses to benefit trucks or transit and remove these larger vehicles from mainlane traffic. Refer to Section 4 of the Feasibility Report for a detailed description of the Recommended Alternative.
a) Segment 2 Build VISSIM Mainlane Level of Service Analysis

By increasing capacity and improving the ramp configurations either with ramp reversals or ramp consolidation on Segment 2, the Year 2042 Build condition analysis for eastbound Segment 2 shows the majority of segments improved from an unacceptable LOS E or worse to LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the AM peak, with only three segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for nine percent of the segments, while 91 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The proposed alternative provided the capacity needed to improve traffic flow for the major of the segment and improve the conditions near the BHW area. Table 36 provides details regarding demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 36: Segment 2 EB 2042 Build Mainlane LOS

| Segment Names | Segment <br> Type | \# of <br> Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Segment 1 -> Executive Ext. | Basic | 4 | 7,513 | 33.7 | D | 5,799 | 25.1 | C |
| Executive Ext. -> Executive <br> Ent. | Basic | 4 | 7,479 | 33.6 | D | 5,774 | 25.3 | C |
| Executive Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,571 | 40.7 | E | 1,551 | 40.2 | E |
| Executive Ent. -> Schuster <br> Ext. | Merge | 5 | 9,067 | 32.8 | D | 7,339 | 26.1 | C |
| Executive Ent. -> Schuster <br> Ext. | Basic | 5 | 9,038 | 32.6 | D | 7,321 | 25.8 | C |
| Executive Ent. -> Schuster <br> Ext. | Diverge | 6 | 8,982 | 31.7 | D | 7,291 | 22.3 | C |
| Schuster Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 942 | 18.5 | B | 620 | 12.0 | B |
| Schuster Ext. -> Franklin <br> Ext. | Basic | 5 | 8,045 | 30.2 | D | 6,680 | 23.9 | C |
| Schuster Ext. -> Franklin <br> Ext. | Basic | 5 | 8,019 | 36.7 | E | 6,669 | 24.2 | C |
| Franklin Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,846 | 47.5 | F | 842 | 19.4 | B |
| Franklin Ext. -> Franklin Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,111 | 28.2 | D | 5,803 | 25.9 | C |
| Franklin Ext. -> Franklin Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,103 | 27.1 | D | 5,801 | 25.7 | C |


| Segment Names | Segment Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# of } \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Franklin Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 847 | 22.6 | C | 1,224 | 32.3 | D |
| Franklin Ent. -> Cotton Ext. | Merge | 5 | 6,933 | 25.8 | C | 7,005 | 26.7 | D |
| Franklin Ent. -> Cotton Ext. | Basic | 4 | 6,950 | 32.3 | D | 7,018 | 32.6 | D |
| Franklin Ent. -> Cotton Ext. | Basic | 5 | 6,921 | 28.5 | D | 6,988 | 28.9 | D |
| Cotton Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,043 | 22.4 | C | 977 | 20.9 | C |
| Cotton Ext. -> Campbell Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,874 | 26.3 | D | 6,000 | 26.9 | D |
| Campbell Ent. | Ramp | 3 | 1,167 | 9.3 | A | 3,311 | 26.9 | C |
| Campbell Ent. -> Cotton Ent. | Merge | 7 | 6,959 | 17.8 | B | 9,200 | 24.0 | C |
| Campbell Ent. -> Cotton Ent. | Merge | 6 | 7,037 | 23.6 | C | 9,315 | 27.7 | D |
| Campbell Ent. -> Cotton Ent. | Basic | 6 | 7,049 | 20.6 | C | 9,339 | 27.5 | D |
| Campbell Ent. -> Cotton Ent. | Basic | 6 | 7,031 | 20.4 | C | 9,311 | 27.5 | D |
| Cotton Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 801 | 9.6 | A | 1,617 | 20.7 | C |
| Cotton Ent. -> 478 Ext. | Weavin g | 8 | 7,849 | 17.1 | B | $\begin{gathered} 10,94 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | 25.8 | C |
| Cotton Ent. -> 478 Ext. | Basic | 7 | 7,813 | 19.9 | C | $\begin{gathered} 10,88 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | 38.8 | E |
| 478 Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 7,518 | 6.1 | A | 686 | 14.4 | B |
| 478 Ext. -> 54 Ext. | Basic | 7 | 7,518 | 19.2 | C | $\begin{gathered} 10,21 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 30.2 | D |
| 54 Ext. | Ramp | 3 | 1,863 | 12.3 | B | 2,770 | 18.8 | B |
| 54 Ext. -> 54 FR Ext. | Basic | 5 | 5,644 | 20.2 | C | 7,423 | 28.4 | D |
| 54 FR Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 711 | 14.9 | B | 845 | 17.9 | B |
| 54 FR Ext. -> Segment 3 | Basic | 4 | 4,925 | 21.9 | C | 6,571 | 30.8 | D |
| 54 FR Ext. -> Segment 3 | Basic | 4 | 4,942 | 21.8 | C | 6,592 | 29.7 | D |
| 54 FR Ext. -> Segment 3 | Diverge | 5 | 4,913 | 17.6 | B | 6,560 | 25.5 | C |

By increasing capacity and improving the ramp configurations on Segment 2, the Year 2042 Build condition analysis for westbound Segment 2 determined that the segments improved from an unacceptable LOS E or worse to LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with only 13 segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 42 percent of the segments, while 58 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. This was a modest improvement in LOS; however, the Findings section that follows shows an overall improvement in Segment 2. The proposed alternative provided the capacity needed to improve traffic flow for the majority of the segment and improve conditions near the BHW area. Table 37 provides details regarding demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 37: Segment 2 WB 2042 Build Mainlane LOS

| Segment Names | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Segment 3 -> 54 FR Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,141 | 67.8 | F | 5,101 | 22.4 | C |
| Segment 3 -> 54 FR Ent. | Basic | 3 | 5,913 | 74.6 | F | 5,087 | 30.6 | D |
| 54 FR Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,556 | 77.0 | F | 1,939 | 46.5 | F |
| 54 FR Ent. -> 54 Ent. | Weaving | 4 | 7,293 | 84.5 | F | 6,998 | 33.5 | D |
| 54 Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 2,685 | 86.8 | F | 1,860 | 23.5 | C |
| 54 Ent. -> Cotton Ext. | Weaving | 6 | 9,740 | 90.5 | F | 8,834 | 28.7 | D |
| 54 Ent. -> Cotton Ext. | Weaving | 7 | 9,574 | 93.8 | F | 8,799 | 28.9 | D |
| Cotton Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,339 | 30.0 | D | 954 | 20.4 | C |
| Cotton Ext. -> Piedras Ent. | Basic | 6 | 8,045 | 92.3 | F | 7,784 | 28.4 | D |
| Piedras Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 729 | 74.9 | F | 830 | 24.1 | C |
| ```Piedras Ent. -> Campbell Ext.``` | Weaving | 7 | 8,619 | 100.4 | F | 8,593 | 27.8 | C |
| ```Piedras Ent. -> Campbell Ext.``` | Weaving | 6 | 8,433 | 83.5 | F | 8,538 | 36.7 | E |
| Campbell Ext. | Ramp | 3 | 2,833 | 95.8 | F | 2,345 | 25.4 | C |
| Campbell Ext. -> Cotton Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,477 | 26.6 | D | 6,133 | 30.2 | D |
| Cotton Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 354 | 8.5 | A | 458 | 11.1 | B |
| Cotton Ent. -> Schuster Ext. | Basic | 5 | 5,834 | 22.0 | C | 6,579 | 25.7 | C |
| Cotton Ent. -> Schuster Ext. | Basic | 4 | 5,846 | 27.7 | D | 6,582 | 32.2 | D |
| Cotton Ent. -> Schuster Ext. | Basic | 4 | 5,837 | 28.7 | D | 6,563 | 32.4 | D |
| Cotton Ent. -> Schuster Ext. | Basic | 4 | 5,851 | 29.5 | D | 6,572 | 32.8 | D |
| Cotton Ent. -> Schuster Ext. | Diverge | 5 | 5,838 | 25.6 | C | 6,543 | 27.9 | D |
| Schuster Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 1,585 | 45.9 | F | 860 | 8.7 | A |
| Schuster Ext. -> Schuster Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,274 | 19.5 | C | 5,689 | 27.3 | D |
| Schuster Ext. -> Schuster Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,285 | 19.6 | C | 5,670 | 27.3 | D |
| Schuster Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 589 | 6.9 | A | 1,862 | 23.8 | C |
| Schuster Ent. -> Executive Ext. | Merge | 6 | 4,865 | 14.6 | B | 7,508 | 24.0 | C |
| Schuster Ent. -> Executive Ext. | Basic | 5 | 4,849 | 17.6 | B | 7,467 | 31.2 | D |
| Schuster Ent. -> Executive Ext. | Basic | 5 | 4,817 | 18.8 | C | 7,400 | 45.0 | E |
| Executive Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 905 | 18.3 | B | 1,397 | 34.9 | D |
| Executive Ext. -> Segment 1 | Basic | 5 | 3,948 | 14.2 | B | 6,058 | 23.7 | C |
| Executive Ext. -> Segment 1 | Basic | 4 | 3,945 | 17.7 | B | 6,044 | 28.7 | D |
| Executive Ext. -> Segment 1 | Basic | 4 | 3,953 | 17.8 | B | 6,057 | 28.7 | D |

b) Segment 2 Build VISSIM Intersection Level of Service Analysis

The Year 2042 Build condition analysis for the intersections along Segment 2 shows a significant improvement in LOS over the No Build analysis. The study showed two intersections with poor LOS in the AM peak hour and four intersections with poor LOS in the PM peak hour. These intersections are shown in Table 38 and are highlighted in red.

Table 38: Segment 22042 Build Alternative Intersection LOS

| Intersection | Improvements | Control Type | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| Santa Fe \& Yandell Dr |  | Signalized | 11.2 | B | 16.8 | B |
| Santa Fe \& Wyoming |  | Signalized | 25.3 | C | 29.5 | C |
| Santa Fe \& Missouri |  | Signalized | 11.5 | B | 31.4 | C |
| Santa Fe \& Franklin |  | Signalized | 11.5 | B | 37.5 | D |
| Oregon \& Montana |  | Signalized | 9.2 | A | 9.8 | A |
| Oregon \& Missouri |  | Signalized | 6.5 | A | 21.8 | C |
| Oregon \& Franklin |  | Signalized | 12.3 | B | 20.7 | C |
| Mesa \& Rio Grande |  | Signalized | 11.5 | B | 25.1 | C |
| Mesa \& Montana |  | Signalized | 18.6 | B | 23.5 | C |
| Mesa \& Yandell |  | Signalized | 27.7 | C | 45.5 | D |
| Mesa \& Wyoming |  | Signalized | 30.0 | C | 50.6 | D |
| Mesa \& Missouri |  | Signalized | 13.2 | B | 42.9 | D |
| Mesa \& Franklin |  | Signalized | 15.6 | B | 84.2 | F |
| Stanton \& Rio Grande |  | Signalized | 9.8 | A | 11.2 | B |
| Stanton \& Montana |  | Signalized | 23.7 | C | 21.4 | C |
| Stanton \& Missouri |  | Signalized | 11.2 | B | 53.2 | D |
| Stanton \& Franklin |  | Signalized | 45.6 | D | 66.2 | E |
| Kansas \& Rio Grande |  | Signalized | 12.0 | B | 10.3 | B |
| Kansas \& Montana |  | Signalized | 10.8 | B | 11.0 | B |
| Kansas \& Missouri |  | Signalized | 19.8 | B | 16.1 | B |
| Kansas \& Franklin |  | Signalized | 30.0 | C | 18.3 | B |
| Campbell \& Rio Grande |  | Signalized | 10.8 | B | 14.8 | B |
| Campbell \& Montana |  | Signalized | 48.9 | D | 42.8 | D |
| Campbell \& Yandell |  | Signalized | 74.8 | E | 55.2 | E |
| Campbell \& Missouri |  | Signalized | 52.1 | D | 56.6 | E |
| Campbell \& Franklin |  | Signalized | 76.8 | E | 43.6 | D |
| ECB WBFR | Added Capacity | Signalized | 44.7 | D | 36.7 | D |
| ECB EBFR | Added Capacity | Signalized | 42.7 | D | 34.2 | C |


| Intersection | Improvements | Control Type | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| Raynolds WBFR |  | Signalized | 31.1 | C | 21.8 | C |
| Raynolds EBFR |  | Signalized | 23.3 | C | 35.4 | D |
| Copia WBFR | Added Capacity | Signalized | 40.1 | D | 22.5 | C |
| Copia EBFR | Added Capacity | Signalized | 25.0 | C | 49.4 | D |
| Raynor WBFR |  | Signalized | 15.6 | B | 19.0 | B |
| Raynor EBFR |  | Signalized | 18.5 | B | 14.5 | B |
| Piedras WBFR |  | Signalized | 13.1 | B | 9.5 | A |
| Piedras EBFR |  | Signalized | 10.3 | B | 11.0 | B |
| Cotton WBFR | Added Capacity | Signalized | 27.3 | C | 39.5 | D |
| Cotton EBFR |  | Signalized | 19.7 | B | 40.7 | D |
| Schuster WBFR | Added Capacity | Signalized | 65.1 | E | 33.4 | C |
| Schuster EBFR |  | Signalized | 14.0 | B | 19.5 | B |

### 5.4 Findings

Based on the analysis, there is an improvement in LOS between the No Build alternative and the Build alternative for the AM peak hour based on Vissim analysis. Table 39 below provides a summary of the comparison between each alternative. The table shows that overall, the Build alternative cost to the user decreases from the No Build alternative while serving more vehicles.

Table 39: Segment 2 AM Peak Hour Measures of Effectiveness Comparison

| MOE | AM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing AM | No Build 2042 AM | Build 2042 AM |
| Total travel time (veh-hr) | 2652.27 | 5499.36 | 5499.34 |
| Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 699 | 3161 | 2663 |
| Calculated Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 639 | 2647 | 2247 |
| Average Delay time per vehicle (sec/veh) | 81 | 275 | 210 |
| Average speed (mph) | 41 | 23 | 27 |
| Number of vehicles served | 28330 | 34703 | 38549 |
| Travel Time (min/veh) | 5.62 | 9.51 | 8.56 |
| Annual Delay Hours | 524,000 | 2,371,000 | 1,998,000 |
| Annual Delay (\$) | \$ 9,520,000 | \$43,060,000 | \$36,280,000 |
| VMT | 107,153.70 | 127,001.44 | 147,836.31 |

Annual delay dollars based on 250 Working days/ 3 hours of peak traffic in each AM \& PM peak / \$18.19 per hour based on TTI's 2015 Urban Mobility Scorecard
Based on the analysis, there is an improvement in LOS between the No Build alternative and the Build alternative for the PM peak hour. Table 40 below provides a summary of the comparison between each alternative. The table shows that overall, the Build alternative cost to the user decreases from the No Build alternative while serving more vehicles.

Table 40: Segment 2 PM Peak Hour Measures of Effectiveness Comparison

| MOE | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing PM | No Build 2042 PM | Build 2042 PM |
| Total travel time (veh-hr) | 2982 | 7875 | 4901 |
| Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 974 | 6103 | 1785 |
| Calculated Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 872 | 4319 | 1574 |
| Average Delay time per vehicle <br> (sec/veh) | 107 | 570 | 135 |
| Average speed (mph) | 37 | 12 | 33 |
| Number of vehicles served | 29307 | 27282 | 42008 |
| Travel Time (min/veh) | 6.11 | 17.32 | 7.00 |
| Annual Delay Hours | 731,000 | $4,578,000$ | $1,339,000$ |
| Annual Delay (\$) | $\$ 13,270,000$ | $\$ 83,140,000$ | $\$ 24,320,000$ |
| VMT | 109307.6 | 95023.0 | 160463.6 |

Notes: Annual delay dollars based on 250 Working days/ 3 hours of peak traffic in each AM \& PM peak / \$18.19 per hour based on TTI's 2015 Urban Mobility Scorecard

## 6. Segment 3

### 6.1 Existing Condition Analysis

Existing condition analysis provided the baseline analysis to obtain an understanding of the current operations. Segment 3 analysis used HCS and Synchro and VISSIM to determine the current deficiencies along the corridor.

## a) Segment 3 Existing Mainlane Level of Service Analysis

The existing condition analysis for eastbound Segment 3 showed the majority of segments operating at LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with seven segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 13 percent of the segments, while 87 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The majority of the failing segments were between US 54, and Trowbridge Dr because either the ramp volume is over the capacity, or a combination of the ramp or basic freeway segment volume push the volume over capacity. Table 41 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 41: Segment 3 EB Existing Mainlane LOS Analysis

| Segment Names | Segment Type | \# of <br> Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Segment 2 -> US 54 Ent. | Basic | 3 | 4,677 | 27.8 | D | 6,565 | 42.9 | E |
| US 54 Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 1,939 | 17.4 | B | 1,600 | 14.2 | B |
| US 54 Ent. -> Chelsea Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 6,603 | 25.3 | C | 8,142 | 34.5 | D |
| Chelsea Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 433 | 8.5 | A | 776 | 16.2 | B |
| Chelsea Ext. ->Raynolds Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,173 | 28.9 | D | 7,350 | 38.3 | E |
| Raynolds Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 397 | 10.6 | B | 446 | 27.9 | C |
| ```Raynolds Ent. -> Trowbridge Ext.``` | Merge | 5 | 6,534 | 31.9 | D | 7,755 | 48.8 | F |
| ```Raynolds Ent. -> Trowbridge Ext.``` | Weaving | 4 | 6,549 | 32.0 | D | 7,776 | 41.7 | E |
| Trowbridge Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 580 | 12.5 | B | 440 | 8.8 | A |
| Viscount Ext. -> Hawkins Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,950 | 27.2 | D | 7,311 | 35.0 | E |
| Geronimo Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 864 | 16.7 | B | 710 | 13.5 | B |
| ```Geronimo Ext. -> Trowbridge Ent.``` | Weaving | 4 | 5,103 | 22.5 | C | 6,603 | 31.9 | D |
| Trowbridge Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,029 | 26.2 | C | 713 | 17.9 | B |
| ```Trowbridge Ent. -> Geronimo Ent.``` | Merge | 5 | 6,124 | 29.6 | D | 7,319 | 41.3 | E |
| Trowbridge Ent. -> Geronimo Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,115 | 27.9 | D | 7,296 | 34.3 | D |
| Geronimo Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 353 | 8.2 | A | 698 | 16.5 | B |
| Geronimo Ent. -> Airway Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 6,468 | 22.9 | C | 7,974 | 28.9 | D |


| Segment Names | Segment Type | \# ofLanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Airway Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 702 | 13.7 | B | 891 | 18.3 | B |
| Airway Ext. -> Airway Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,203 | 23.3 | C | 6,390 | 30.7 | D |
| Hawkins Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 946 | 18.6 | B | 1,179 | 24.8 | C |
| Airway Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 481 | 11.7 | B | 619 | 15.5 | B |
| Airway Ent. -> Viscount Ext. | Merge | 5 | 5,259 | 20.1 | C | 6,468 | 31.6 | D |
| Airway Ent. -> Viscount Ext. | Basic | 4 | 5,255 | 23.8 | C | 6,454 | 31.9 | D |
| Viscount Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 512 | 9.3 | A | 955 | 18.3 | B |
| Viscount Ext. -> Hawkins Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,757 | 20.8 | C | 5,491 | 25.4 | C |
| Hawkins Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 582 | 14.2 | B | 651 | 17.9 | B |
| Hawkins Ent. -> McRae Ext. | Merge | 5 | 5,329 | 22.2 | C | 6,102 | 32.0 | D |
| Hawkins Ent. -> McRae Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,917 | 22.5 | C | 5,410 | 30.8 | D |
| McRae Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 656 | 12.7 | B | 1,091 | 41.9 | E |
| McRae Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 517 | 14.2 | B | 691 | 19.1 | B |
| McRae Ent. -> Yarbrough Ext. | Merge | 5 | 5,038 | 22.3 | C | 5,529 | 26.7 | C |
| McRae Ent. -> Yarbrough Ext. | Basic | 4 | 5,157 | 24.4 | C | 5,647 | 26.9 | D |
| Yarbrough Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 656 | 13.7 | B | 570 | 17.1 | B |
| Yarbrough Ext. -> Yarbrough Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,507 | 19.8 | C | 5,073 | 22.3 | C |
| Yarbrough Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 435 | 10.4 | B | 620 | 15.1 | B |
| ```Yarbrough Ent. -> Lomaland Ext.``` | Weaving | 5 | 4,934 | 17.1 | B | 5,676 | 19.9 | B |
| Lomaland Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 768 | 14.4 | B | 638 | 11.9 | B |
| Lomaland Ext. -> Lee Trevino Ent. | Basic | 4 | 3,408 | 15.1 | B | 4,377 | 19.8 | C |
| Lee Trevino Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,238 | 27.2 | C | 1,074 | 24.0 | C |
| Lee Trevino Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 414 | 10.1 | B | 750 | 19.0 | B |
| Lee Trevino Ent. -> Zaragoza Ext. | Merge | 5 | 3,246 | 11.9 | B | 4,581 | 19.2 | B |
| Lee Trevino Ent. -> Zaragoza Ext. | Basic | 4 | 3,325 | 14.4 | B | 4,684 | 20.9 | C |
| Zaragoza Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 988 | 19.5 | B | 1,212 | 24.2 | C |
| Zaragoza Ext. -> Zaragoza Ent. | Basic | 3 | 2,334 | 13.3 | B | 3,484 | 20.4 | C |
| Zaragoza Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 109 | 2.6 | A | 215 | 5.1 | A |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Zaragoza Ent. -> } 375 \text { Ramp } \\ & \text { Ext. } \end{aligned}$ | Weaving | 4 | 2,441 | 10.4 | B | 3,686 | 16.1 | B |
| 375 Ramp Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 646 | 5.5 | A | 974 | 8.4 | A |
| 375 Ramp Ext. -> 375 FR Ext. | Basic | 3 | 1,784 | 10.2 | A | 2,708 | 16.0 | B |
| 375 FR Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 268 | 5.1 | A | 397 | 7.6 | A |


| Segment Names | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| 375 FR Ext. -> 375 Ramp Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,512 | 13.0 | B | 2,301 | 20.6 | C |
| 375 Ramp Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 440 | 10.6 | B | 829 | 21.5 | C |
| Segment 4 Ext. -> 375 Ramp Ent. | Merge | 3 | 1,943 | 12.5 | B | 3,106 | 25.8 | C |
| Segment 4 Ext. -> 375 Ramp Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,944 | 17.1 | B | 3,123 | 28.8 | D |

The existing condition analysis for westbound Segment 3 showed the majority of segments operating at LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the AM peak, with four segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for seven percent of the segments, while 93 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The majority of the failing segments were near the Yarbrough Dr. Interchange. Table 42 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 42: Segment 3 WB Existing Mainlane LOS Analysis

| Segment Names | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Segment 4 -> 375 Ramp Ext. | Basic | 2 | 4,103 | 38.4 | E | 3,035 | 27.1 | D |
| Segment 4 -> 375 Ramp Ext. | Weaving | 3 | 4,100 | 24.8 | C | 3,032 | 17.7 | B |
| 375 Ramp Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 966 | 8.2 | A | 1,198 | 10.3 | B |
| 375 Ramp Ext. -> Segment 4 Ent. | Basic | 2 | 3,131 | 28.5 | D | 1,835 | 16.1 | B |
| Segment 4 Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 729 | 14.9 | B | 581 | 11.9 | B |
| Segment 4 Ent. -> 375 Ramp Ent. | Weaving | 3 | 3,858 | 23.6 | C | 2,413 | 14.2 | B |
| 375 Ramp Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 377 | 6.7 | A | 257 | 4.5 | A |
| ```375 Ramp Ent. -> George Dieter Ext.``` | Basic | 2 | 3,474 | 32.1 | D | 2,150 | 19.2 | C |
| 375 Ramp Ent. -> George Dieter Ext. | Basic | 2 | 993 | 9.5 | A | 1,435 | 13.9 | B |
| ```3 7 5 \text { Ramp Ent. -> George Dieter} Ext.``` | Weaving | 4 | 4,458 | 19.7 | B | 3,579 | 15.8 | B |
| George Dieter Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 637 | 11.9 | B | 818 | 15.7 | B |
| George Dieter Ext. -> 375 FR Ent. | Basic | 3 | 3,812 | 22.4 | C | 2,757 | 15.9 | B |
| 375 FR Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 468 | 11.1 | B | 499 | 11.8 | B |
| 375 FR Ent. -> George Dieter Ent. | Merge | 4 | 4,268 | 19.1 | C | 3,247 | 14.2 | B |
| 375 FR Ent. -> George Dieter Ent. | Basic | 3 | 4,274 | 25.6 | C | 3,248 | 18.9 | C |
| George Dieter Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 730 | 15.1 | B | 994 | 20.8 | C |
| George Dieter Ent. -> Pendale Ent. | Merge | 4 | 3,949 | 17.5 | B | 3,603 | 15.6 | B |
| Lee Trevino Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,439 | 29.9 | D | 874 | 17.0 | B |
| Pendale Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 488 | 11.9 | B | 566 | 14.0 | B |


| Segment Names | Segment Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# of } \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Pendale Ent. -> Lee Trevino Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,012 | 17.5 | B | 3,907 | 17.1 | B |
| Lee Trevino Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 820 | 20.2 | C | 980 | 24.2 | C |
| Lee Trevino Ent. -> Lomaland Ent. | Merge | 5 | 4,825 | 17.1 | B | 4,877 | 17.4 | B |
| Lee Trevino Ent. -> Lomaland Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,826 | 21.1 | C | 4,880 | 21.4 | C |
| Lomaland Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 660 | 15.9 | B | 736 | 17.7 | B |
| Lomaland Ent. -> Yarbrough Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 5,498 | 19.2 | B | 5,618 | 19.6 | B |
| Yarbrough Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 511 | 9.7 | A | 768 | 14.8 | B |
| Yarbrough Ext. -> Yarbrough Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,974 | 22.2 | C | 4,837 | 21.1 | C |
| Yarbrough Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,142 | 70.4 | F | 876 | 32.6 | D |
| Yarbrough Ent. -> McRae Ext. | Basic | 4 | 6,068 | 31.0 | D | 5,688 | 27.1 | D |
| McRae Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 629 | 16.3 | B | 521 | 9.8 | A |
| McRae Ext. -> McRae Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,435 | 24.3 | C | 5,175 | 22.7 | C |
| McRae Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,034 | 69.8 | F | 657 | 21.0 | C |
| McRae Ent. -> Hawkins Ext. | Basic | 4 | 6,431 | 31.0 | D | 5,812 | 27.7 | D |
| Hawkins Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 623 | 12.0 | B | 916 | 18.5 | B |
| Hawkins Ext. -> Viscount Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,804 | 25.7 | C | 4,906 | 21.5 | C |
| Viscount Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 642 | 16.5 | B | 504 | 12.1 | B |
| Viscount Ent. -> Airway Ext. | Basic | 4 | 6,416 | 30.9 | D | 5,372 | 24.7 | C |
| Airway Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 750 | 14.8 | B | 649 | 12.5 | B |
| Airway Ext. -> Hawkins Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,668 | 25.2 | C | 4,718 | 20.7 | C |
| Hawkins Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 816 | 18.9 | B | 1,107 | 27.5 | C |
| Hawkins Ent. -> Airway Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,466 | 29.7 | D | 5,810 | 26.5 | D |
| Airway Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 692 | 16.3 | B | 742 | 17.7 | B |
| Airway Ent. -> Geronimo Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 7,148 | 25.5 | C | 6,543 | 23.1 | C |
| Geronimo Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 855 | 17.1 | B | 939 | 19.3 | B |
| Geronimo Ext. -> Geronimo Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,281 | 28.3 | D | 5,580 | 24.7 | C |
| Geronimo Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 585 | 16.0 | B | 816 | 24.1 | C |
| Geronimo Ent. -> Paisano Ext. | Basic | 4 | 6,827 | 33.2 | D | 6,381 | 30.4 | D |
| Paisano Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 570 | 12.6 | B | 379 | 7.7 | A |
| Paisano Ext. -> Trowbridge Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,250 | 28.1 | D | 5,983 | 26.7 | D |
| Trowbridge Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 384 | 9.6 | A | 565 | 15.4 | B |
| Paisano Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 607 | 16.4 | B | 620 | 16.3 | B |
| Paisano Ent. -> Raynolds Ext. | Basic | 4 | 7,166 | 39.9 | E | 7,115 | 38.3 | E |
| Raynolds Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 432 | 9.0 | A | 309 | 6.2 | A |
| Raynolds Ext. -> Segment 2 | Basic | 4 | 6,786 | 30.6 | D | 6,851 | 30.9 | D |

## b) Segment 3 Existing Intersection Level of Service Analysis

In Segment 3, one out of the 29 interchanges operated at LOS E or worse in the AM Peak, and two out of the 29 interchanges operated at LOS E or worse in the PM peak. These intersections are shown in Table 43 and are highlighted in red.

Table 43: Segment 3 Existing Intersection LOS

| Intersection | Control Type | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| Raynolds St SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 39.6 | D | 20.4 | C |
| Raynolds St SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 13.5 | B | 23.6 | C |
| Chelsea St SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 15.2 | B | 15.7 | B |
| Chelsea St SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 27.3 | C | 30.9 | C |
| E Paisano Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 21.6 | C | 17.7 | B |
| E Paisano Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 24.8 | C | 25.2 | C |
| Trowbridge Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 22.6 | C | 24.8 | C |
| Trowbridge Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 65.8 | E | 58.3 | E |
| Geronimo Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 19.0 | B | 26.3 | C |
| Geronimo Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 27.7 | C | 24.1 | c |
| REL Rd SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 6.4 | A | 6.2 | A |
| Airway Blvd SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 13.1 | B | 19.7 | B |
| Airway Blvd SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 19.3 | B | 20.7 | C |
| Hawkins Blvd SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 18.1 | B | 28.6 | c |
| Hawkins Blvd SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 20.9 | C | 21.0 | C |
| Viscount Blvd SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 21.8 | C | 21.2 | C |
| Viscount Blvd SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 20.8 | C | 26.1 | C |
| McRae Blvd SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 29.1 | C | 42.3 | D |
| McRae Blvd SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 36.0 | D | 44.2 | D |
| Sumac Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 28.8 | C | 29.2 | C |
| Sumac Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 25.1 | C | 28.2 | C |
| N Yarbrough Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 32.4 | C | 30.4 | C |
| N Yarbrough Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 48.8 | D | 76.0 | E |
| Lomaland Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 18.4 | B | 18.8 | B |
| Lomaland Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 29.4 | C | 30.9 | C |
| N Lee Trevino Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 20.4 | c | 37.0 | D |
| N Lee Trevino Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 26.9 | C | 23.6 | C |
| George Dieter Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 17.8 | B | 18.1 | B |
| George Dieter Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 23.2 | C | 27.5 | C |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |

1. VISSIM does not directly compute the HCM level of service.
2. The Delay for the link segments is the average of 3 simulation runs in VISSIM.
3. The Delay obtained from VISSIM is compared to the following tables to obtain LOS

Signalized Intersections - Exhibit 18-4 LOS Criteria (Page 18-6, HCM 2010)

### 6.2 No Build Operational Analysis

The 2042 No Build models were used as a comparison tool to measure the effectiveness of the build alternatives. The No Build models assumed committed projects in the analysis.
a) Segment 3 No Build Mainlane Level of Service Analysis

The Year 2042 No Build condition analysis for eastbound Segment 3 showed that the majority of segments operate at LOS E or worse. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with 34 segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 64 percent of the segments, while 36 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The majority of Segment 3 failed during this period. Table 44 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 44: Segment 3 EB No Build Mainlane LOS Analysis

| Segment Names | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Segment 2 -> US 54 Ent. | Basic | 3 | 5,521 | 85.7 | F | 5,670 | 83.7 | F |
| US 54 Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 2,398 | 94.8 | F | 2,194 | 55.3 | F |
| US 54 Ent. -> Chelsea Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 7,717 | 78.5 | F | 7,538 | 78.5 | F |
| Chelsea Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 490 | 12.0 | B | 761 | 20.1 | C |
| Chelsea Ext. ->Raynolds Ent. | Basic | 4 | 7,189 | 64.7 | F | 6,705 | 68.5 | F |
| Raynolds Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 565 | 28.5 | D | 589 | 53.6 | F |
| ```Raynolds Ent. -> Trowbridge Ext.``` | Merge | 5 | 7,710 | 71.2 | F | 7,195 | 78.1 | F |
| ```Raynolds Ent. -> Trowbridge Ext.``` | Weaving | 4 | 7,729 | 61.5 | F | 7,146 | 65.6 | F |
| Trowbridge Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 643 | 33.0 | D | 392 | 15.4 | B |
| ```Trowbridge Ext. -> Geronimo Ext.``` | Weaving | 4 | 7,069 | 34.9 | D | 6,619 | 61.4 | F |
| Geronimo Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,016 | 19.9 | B | 600 | 14.7 | B |
| ```Geronimo Ext. -> Trowbridge Ent.``` | Weaving | 4 | 6,071 | 29.7 | D | 5,866 | 66.2 | F |
| Trowbridge Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,170 | 68.1 | F | 721 | 64.4 | F |
| Trowbridge Ent. -> Geronimo Ent. | Merge | 5 | 7,237 | 64.3 | F | 6,453 | 87.4 | F |
| ```Trowbridge Ent. -> Geronimo Ent.``` | Basic | 4 | 7,226 | 38.0 | E | 6,271 | 76.0 | F |
| Geronimo Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 471 | 13.2 | B | 735 | 57.5 | F |
| Geronimo Ent. -> Airway Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 7,656 | 40.0 | E | 6,707 | 76.4 | F |
| Airway Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 801 | 71.0 | F | 642 | 14.2 | B |
| Airway Ext. -> Airway Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,195 | 29.4 | D | 5,218 | 81.2 | F |
| Hawkins Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,097 | 23.0 | C | 850 | 51.0 | F |


| Segment Names | Segment Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# of } \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Airway Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 601 | 17.4 | B | 479 | 102.5 | F |
| Airway Ent. -> Viscount Ext. | Merge | 5 | 6,221 | 28.0 | C | 5,019 | 94.5 | F |
| Airway Ent. -> Viscount Ext. | Basic | 4 | 6,257 | 32.8 | D | 5,015 | 89.6 | F |
| Viscount Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 596 | 17.3 | B | 542 | 80.8 | F |
| Viscount Ext. -> Hawkins Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,634 | 33.4 | D | 4,337 | 87.6 | F |
| Hawkins Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 731 | 47.6 | F | 399 | 150.1 | F |
| Hawkins Ent. -> McRae Ext. | Merge | 5 | 6,215 | 53.0 | F | 4,574 | 104.6 | F |
| Hawkins Ent. -> McRae Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,776 | 35.5 | E | 4,123 | 67.8 | F |
| McRae Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 727 | 47.3 | F | 760 | 111.9 | F |
| McRae Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 587 | 26.6 | C | 532 | 109.1 | F |
| McRae Ent. -> Yarbrough Ext. | Merge | 5 | 5,910 | 37.7 | E | 4,286 | 75.3 | F |
| McRae Ent. -> Yarbrough Ext. | Basic | 4 | 5,993 | 41.2 | E | 4,363 | 74.9 | F |
| Yarbrough Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 764 | 31.3 | D | 455 | 44.3 | F |
| Yarbrough Ext. -> Yarbrough Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,218 | 32.6 | D | 3,930 | 78.8 | F |
| Yarbrough Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 338 | 8.6 | A | 568 | 92.9 | F |
| Yarbrough Ent. -> Lomaland Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 5,448 | 40.7 | E | 4,419 | 107.3 | F |
| Lomaland Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 856 | 27.7 | C | 403 | 21.1 | C |
| Lomaland Ext. -> Lee Trevino Ent. | Basic | 4 | 3,651 | 33.1 | D | 3,451 | 46.9 | F |
| Lee Trevino Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,257 | 96.4 | F | 805 | 130.9 | F |
| Lee Trevino Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 464 | 11.4 | B | 822 | 21.2 | C |
| Lee Trevino Ent. -> Zaragoza Ext. | Merge | 5 | 3,480 | 13.0 | B | 3,831 | 15.7 | B |
| Lee Trevino Ent. -> Zaragoza Ext. | Basic | 4 | 3,612 | 16.2 | B | 3,974 | 17.5 | B |
| Zaragoza Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,065 | 25.3 | C | 943 | 18.8 | B |
| Zaragoza Ext. -> Zaragoza Ent. | Basic | 3 | 2,580 | 14.9 | B | 3,050 | 17.8 | B |
| Zaragoza Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 132 | 3.1 | A | 258 | 6.1 | A |
| Zaragoza Ent. -> 375 Ramp Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 2,723 | 9.2 | A | 3,316 | 11.3 | B |
| 375 Ramp Ext. | Ramp | 3 | 711 | 4.0 | A | 913 | 5.2 | A |
| 375 Ramp Ext. -> 375 FR Ext. | Basic | 4 | 2,018 | 8.5 | A | 2,407 | 10.2 | A |
| 375 FR Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 302 | 5.7 | A | 337 | 6.4 | A |
| 375 FR Ext. -> Exit to End | Basic | 4 | 1,720 | 7.2 | A | 2,069 | 8.7 | A |
| Segment 4 Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 203 | 3.5 | A | 234 | 4.0 | A |


| Segment Names | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Segment 4 Ext. -> 375 Ramp Ent. | Basic | 4 | 1,521 | 6.3 | A | 1,839 | 7.7 | A |
| 375 Ramp Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 730 | 9.1 | A | 1,362 | 17.9 | B |

The Year 2042 No Build condition analysis for westbound Segment 3 showed that the majority of segments operate at LOS E or worse. The study showed that the worst peak period was the AM peak, with 29 segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 53 percent of the segments, while 47 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The majority of Segment 3 failed during this time period. Table 45 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 45: Segment 3 WB No Build Mainlane LOS Analysis

| Segment Names | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Segment 4 -> 375 Ramp Ext. | Basic | 5 | 5,978 | 20.7 | C | 4,491 | 15.4 | B |
| Segment 4 -> 375 Ramp Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 5,963 | 21.0 | C | 4,484 | 16.1 | B |
| 375 Ramp Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 1,386 | 12.2 | B | 1,755 | 15.6 | B |
| 375 Ramp Ext. -> Segment 4 Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,567 | 23.0 | C | 2,721 | 11.7 | B |
| Segment 4 Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,016 | 98.3 | F | 859 | 18.0 | B |
| Segment 4 Ent. -> 375 Ramp Ent. | Weaving | 4 | 5,551 | 27.4 | C | 3,573 | 15.9 | B |
| 375 Ramp Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 565 | 10.5 | B | 370 | 6.8 | A |
| $\begin{aligned} & 375 \text { Ramp Ent. -> George Dieter } \\ & \text { Ext. } \end{aligned}$ | Basic | 4 | 4,964 | 25.0 | C | 3,197 | 13.8 | B |
| ```3 7 5 \text { Ramp Ent. -> George Dieter} Ext.``` | Basic | 3 | 1,279 | 8.5 | A | 1,903 | 12.4 | B |
| ```3 7 5 \text { Ramp Ent. -> George Dieter} Ext.``` | Weaving | 7 | 6,129 | 21.8 | C | 5,051 | 12.6 | B |
| George Dieter Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 913 | 17.5 | B | 1,189 | 23.4 | C |
| George Dieter Ext. -> 375 FR Ent. | Basic | 5 | 5,115 | 40.5 | E | 3,907 | 13.5 | B |
| 375 FR Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 649 | 34.8 | D | 743 | 17.9 | B |
| 375 FR Ent. -> George Dieter Ent. | Merge | 4 | 5,573 | 59.8 | F | 4,633 | 20.7 | C |
| 375 FR Ent. -> George Dieter Ent. | Basic | 3 | 5,504 | 61.1 | F | 4,634 | 27.8 | D |
| George Dieter Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 890 | 40.4 | E | 1,230 | 26.0 | C |
| George Dieter Ent. -> Pendale Ent. | Merge | 4 | 4,999 | 31.5 | D | 4,977 | 22.3 | C |
| Lee Trevino Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,769 | 55.0 | F | 1,228 | 24.7 | C |
| Pendale Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 557 | 19.6 | B | 741 | 25.1 | C |
| Pendale Ent. -> Lee Trevino Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,011 | 34.4 | D | 5,310 | 29.8 | D |
| Lee Trevino Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 824 | 83.8 | F | 1,075 | 65.6 | F |
| Lee Trevino Ent. -> Lomaland Ent. | Merge | 5 | 5,741 | 55.5 | F | 6,314 | 45.9 | F |


| Segment Names | Segment Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# of } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{gathered}$ | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Lee Trevino Ent. -> Lomaland Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,663 | 58.7 | F | 6,253 | 49.4 | F |
| Lomaland Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 563 | 113.7 | F | 834 | 83.3 | F |
| Lomaland Ent. -> Yarbrough Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 6,095 | 73.8 | F | 6,991 | 57.9 | F |
| Yarbrough Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 353 | 135.8 | F | 866 | 91.4 | F |
| Yarbrough Ext. -> Yarbrough Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,656 | 53.7 | F | 6,047 | 36.0 | E |
| Yarbrough Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 691 | 145.2 | F | 871 | 88.6 | F |
| Yarbrough Ent. -> McRae Ext. | Basic | 4 | 6,342 | 68.1 | F | 6,884 | 47.1 | F |
| McRae Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 738 | 99.6 | F | 694 | 38.1 | E |
| McRae Ext. -> McRae Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,638 | 26.8 | D | 6,201 | 36.6 | E |
| McRae Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,155 | 92.1 | F | 656 | 34.0 | D |
| McRae Ent. -> Hawkins Ext. | Basic | 4 | 6,808 | 33.1 | D | 6,832 | 39.3 | E |
| Hawkins Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 15 | 14.6 | B | 24 | 24.3 | C |
| Hawkins Ext. -> Viscount Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,016 | 53.2 | F | 3,899 | 16.9 | B |
| Viscount Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 404 | 10.9 | B | 216 | 5.7 | A |
| Viscount Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 393 | 9.6 | A | 269 | 8.3 | A |
| Viscount Ent. -> Airway Ext. | Basic | 5 | 6,887 | 28.9 | D | 6,175 | 43.7 | E |
| Airway Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 827 | 21.4 | C | 788 | 60.0 | F |
| Airway Ext. -> Hawkins Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,079 | 31.0 | D | 5,373 | 26.5 | D |
| Hawkins Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,046 | 51.2 | F | 1,262 | 84.4 | F |
| Hawkins Ent. -> Airway Ent. | Basic | 4 | 7,118 | 46.7 | F | 6,605 | 34.1 | D |
| Airway Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 948 | 24.6 | C | 923 | 31.3 | D |
| Airway Ent. -> Geronimo Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 8,021 | 54.0 | F | 7,483 | 37.0 | E |
| Geronimo Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 931 | 21.5 | C | 1,007 | 76.0 | F |
| Geronimo Ext. -> Geronimo Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,989 | 66.3 | F | 6,434 | 35.1 | E |
| Geronimo Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 756 | 47.4 | F | 948 | 89.8 | F |
| Geronimo Ent. -> Paisano Ext. | Basic | 4 | 7,687 | 69.7 | F | 7,390 | 60.1 | F |
| Paisano Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 636 | 36.3 | E | 432 | 10.0 | B |
| Paisano Ext. -> Trowbridge Ent. | Basic | 4 | 7,043 | 79.9 | F | 6,953 | 70.2 | F |
| Trowbridge Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 472 | 14.4 | B | 657 | 49.3 | F |
| Paisano Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 843 | 43.9 | F | 872 | 41.3 | E |
| Paisano Ent. -> Raynolds Ext. | Basic | 4 | 8,259 | 55.9 | F | 8,407 | 53.8 | F |
| Raynolds Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 498 | 10.8 | B | 362 | 7.4 | A |
| Raynolds Ext. -> Segment 2 | Basic | 4 | 7,837 | 36.0 | E | 8,103 | 37.4 | E |

## b) Segment 3 No Build Intersection Level of Service Analysis

The Year 2042 No Build condition analysis for the intersections along Segment 3 determined a significant decline in LOS. The PM peak hour has 17 intersections with poor LOS. These intersections are shown in Table 46 and are highlighted in red. The No Build analysis considers geometrical improvements from other committed projects.

| Intersection | Control Type | AM |  | PM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay(s/veh) | LOS | Delay(s/veh) | LOS |
| Raynolds St SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 54.4 | D | 19.2 | B |
| Raynolds St SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 49.5 | D | 50.5 | D |
| Chelsea St SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 19.8 | B | 19.2 | B |
| Chelsea St SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 48.9 | D | 50.8 | D |
| E Paisano Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 41.2 | D | 23.2 | C |
| E Paisano Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 24.2 | C | 33.6 | C |
| Trowbridge Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 131.5 | F | 107.1 | F |
| Trowbridge Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 163.7 | F | 107.2 | F |
| Geronimo Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 31.0 | C | 65.2 | E |
| Geronimo Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 39.0 | D | 66.6 | E |
| REL Rd SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 12.1 | B | 16.8 | B |
| Airway Blvd SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 60.7 | E | 95.2 | F |
| Airway Blvd SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 63.7 | E | 21.4 | C |
| Hawkins Blvd SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 20.3 | C | 37.9 | D |
| Hawkins Blvd SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 20.2 | C | 54.7 | D |
| Viscount Blvd SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 32.5 | C | 98.5 | F |
| Viscount Blvd SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 26.4 | C | 142.5 | F |
| McRae Blvd SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 118.0 | F | 151.9 | F |
| McRae Blvd SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 113.3 | F | 217.5 | F |
| Sumac Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 38.6 | D | 49.8 | D |
| Sumac Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 55.2 | E | 134.9 | F |
| N Yarbrough Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 379.9 | F | 166.6 | F |
| N Yarbrough Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 172.8 | F | 137.0 | F |
| Lomaland Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 64.7 | E | 57.3 | E |
| Lomaland Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 97.8 | F | 105.7 | F |
| N Lee Trevino Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 58.1 | E | 84.0 | F |
| N Lee Trevino Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 74.6 | E | 93.2 | F |
| George Dieter Dr SB \& WB Frontage Road | Signalized | 40.6 | D | 34.8 | C |
| George Dieter Dr SB \& EB Frontage Road | Signalized | 165.0 | F | 126.5 | F | Notes:

1. VISSIM does not directly compute the HCM level of service.
2. The Delay for the link segments is the average of 3 simulation runs in VISSIM.
3. The Delay obtained from VISSIM is compared to the following tables to obtain LOS

Signalized Intersections - Exhibit 18-4 LOS Criteria (Page 18-6, HCM 2010)

### 6.3 Recommended Alternative Analysis

The studied alternative for Segment 3 was Alternative 3. Alternative 3 includes changes in ramping, auxiliary lanes, and additional capacity in some areas (Ref 6). Full lane widths (12') and shoulder widths (10') are provided along with continuous frontage roads and desirable border width (20') for sidewalks and utilities. The inside most lane in each direction of travel is separated from general-purpose lanes by a two-foot buffer and serves as an adaptive lane. These adaptive lanes could be designated for special uses to benefit trucks or transit and remove these larger vehicles from mainlane traffic. Refer to Section 4 of the Feasibility Report for a detailed description of the Recommended Alternative.
a) Segment 3 Build VISSIM Mainlane Level of Service Analysis

By increasing capacity and improving the ramp configurations on Segment 2, the Year 2042 Build condition analysis for eastbound Segment 3 showed an increase of segments operating at LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with 10 segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 21 percent of the segments, while 79 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The proposed alternative provided the capacity needed to improve traffic flow for the major of the segment and improve the conditions for the majority of Segment 3 . Table 47 provides details regarding demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 47: Segment 3 EB 2042 Build Mainlane LOS

| Segment Names | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Segment 2 -> Raynolds Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,559 | 19.4 | C | 6,886 | 32.2 | D |
| Raynolds Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 2,362 | 20.3 | C | 2,314 | 21.8 | C |
| Raynolds Ent. -> Paisano Ent. | Merge | 6 | 6,920 | 19.6 | B | 9,139 | 31.6 | D |
| Raynolds Ent. -> Paisano Ent. | Basic | 6 | 6,869 | 19.6 | C | 8,970 | 38.3 | E |
| Paisano Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,246 | 29.4 | D | 1,000 | 30.2 | D |
| Paisano Ent. -> Robert Lee Ext. | Merge | 7 | 8,159 | 20.3 | C | 9,888 | 44.6 | F |
| Paisano Ent. -> Robert Lee Ext. | Basic | 6 | 8,189 | 24.2 | C | 9,781 | 52.6 | F |
| Paisano Ent. -> Robert Lee Ext. | Basic | 7 | 8,176 | 21.5 | C | 9,627 | 60.4 | F |
| Airway Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,047 | 22.7 | C | 1,245 | 27.5 | C |
| Airway Ext. -> Geronimo Ent. | Basic | 6 | 7,112 | 20.5 | C | 8,117 | 76.6 | F |
| Geronimo Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,100 | 24.6 | C | 1,266 | 47.9 | F |
| Geronimo Ent. -> Hawkins Ext. | Merge | 7 | 8,152 | 20.6 | C | 9,043 | 76.7 | F |
| Geronimo Ent. -> Hawkins Ext. | Basic | 6 | 8,082 | 23.8 | C | 8,936 | 61.8 | F |
| Hawkins Ext. | Ramp | 3 | 2,998 | 18.4 | B | 4,059 | 61.5 | F |
| Hawkins Ext. -> Airway Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,172 | 22.4 | C | 4,825 | 21.4 | C |
| Airway Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 451 | 8.8 | A | 749 | 14.8 | B |


| Segment Names | $\begin{gathered} \text { Segment } \\ \text { Type } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# of } \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Airway Ent. -> Hawkins Ent. | Merge | 5 | 5,604 | 19.7 | B | 5,562 | 19.6 | B |
| Airway Ent. -> Hawkins Ent. | Basic | 4 | 5,610 | 24.7 | C | 5,580 | 24.5 | C |
| Hawkins Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 797 | 17.7 | B | 807 | 17.9 | B |
| Hawkins Ent. -> Viscount Ent. | Merge | 5 | 6,392 | 22.7 | C | 6,374 | 22.7 | C |
| Hawkins Ent. -> Viscount Ent. | Basic | 4 | 6,395 | 28.7 | D | 6,389 | 28.7 | D |
| Viscount Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 265 | 5.7 | A | 433 | 9.5 | A |
| Viscount Ent. -> Yarbrough Ext. | Weaving | 5 | 6,623 | 24.2 | C | 6,821 | 24.0 | C |
| Viscount Ent. -> Yarbrough Ext. | Weaving | 6 | 6,517 | 22.6 | C | 6,779 | 20.3 | C |
| Yarbrough Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 933 | 20.5 | C | 765 | 18.7 | B |
| Yarbrough Ext. -> Lomaland Ext. | Basic | 5 | 5,492 | 30.2 | D | 6,037 | 22.2 | C |
| Lomaland Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 878 | 19.5 | B | 787 | 17.1 | B |
| Lomaland Ext. -> Yarbrough Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,472 | 30.0 | D | 5,258 | 23.5 | C |
| Yarbrough Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 820 | 53.0 | F | 1,264 | 27.4 | C |
| ```Yarbrough Ent. -> Lee Trevino Ext.``` | Basic | 6 | 5,073 | 63.1 | F | 6,491 | 18.9 | B |
| Lee Trevino Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 866 | 122.5 | F | 1,084 | 29.1 | D |
| Lee Trevino Ext. -> Pendale Ext. | Basic | 5 | 4,162 | 15.6 | B | 5,424 | 19.6 | C |
| Pendale Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 1,330 | 35.1 | E | 1,537 | 35.1 | E |
| Pendale Ext. -> Pendale Ent. | Basic | 4 | 2,815 | 11.9 | B | 3,890 | 16.7 | B |
| Pendale Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 587 | 13.2 | B | 1,290 | 29.9 | D |
| Pendale Ent. -> 375 Ramp Ext. | Merge | 5 | 3,406 | 11.6 | B | 5,170 | 18.0 | B |
| Pendale Ent. -> 375 Ramp Ext. | Basic | 4 | 3,409 | 14.6 | B | 5,172 | 23.0 | C |
| 375 Ramp Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 1,305 | 13.5 | B | 1,694 | 17.9 | B |
| 375 Ramp Ext. -> Zaragoza Ent. | Basic | 3 | 2,093 | 11.8 | B | 3,452 | 20.4 | C |
| 375 Ramp Ext. -> Zaragoza Ent. | Basic | 4 | 2,105 | 8.8 | A | 3,468 | 14.8 | B |
| Zaragoza Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 78 | 1.7 | A | 152 | 3.4 | A |
| Zaragoza Ent. -> End Ext. | Merge | 5 | 2,175 | 7.3 | A | 3,609 | 12.3 | B |
| Zaragoza Ent. -> End Ext. | Basic | 4 | 2,186 | 9.2 | A | 3,623 | 15.8 | B |
| Segment 4 Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 635 | 13.5 | B | 1,257 | 28.1 | D |
| End Ext. -> 375 Ramp Ent. | Basic | 3 | 1,547 | 8.6 | A | 2,354 | 13.3 | B |
| 375 Ramp Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 1,233 | 13.4 | B | 1,171 | 12.7 | B |
| 375 Ramp Ent. -> Segment 4 | Basic | 5 | 2,782 | 10.4 | A | 3,531 | 13.0 | B |

By increasing capacity and improving the ramp configurations on Segment 3, the Year 2042 Build condition analysis for westbound Segment 3 showed an improvement of LOS. The majority of segments improved in operating at LOS D or better. The study showed that the
worst peak period was the PM peak, with two segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for four percent of the segments, while 96 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The proposed alternative provided the capacity needed to improve traffic flow for the major of the segment and improve the conditions for the majority of Segment 3. Table 48 provides details regarding demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 48: Segment 3 WB 2042 Build Mainlane LOS

| Segment Names | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Segment 4 -> 375 Ramp Ext. | Basic | 4 | 2,963 | 12.5 | B | 2,424 | 10.2 | A |
| 375 Ramp Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 1,379 | 14.8 | B | 1,817 | 19.9 | B |
| 375 Ramp Ext. -> Segment 4 Ent. | Basic | 3 | 1,574 | 8.8 | A | 598 | 3.3 | A |
| Segment 4 Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 1,150 | 14.4 | B | 1,667 | 21.5 | C |
| Segment 4 Ent. -> George Dieter Ext. | Merge | 5 | 2,721 | 11.0 | B | 2,271 | 10.3 | B |
| Segment 4 Ent. -> George Dieter Ext. | Basic | 4 | 2,730 | 14.0 | B | 2,278 | 13.1 | B |
| Segment 4 Ent. -> George Dieter Ext. | Basic | 5 | 2,717 | 11.0 | B | 2,269 | 10.2 | B |
| George Dieter Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 371 | 7.9 | A | 635 | 14.0 | B |
| George Dieter Ext. -> 375 Ramp Ent. | Basic | 5 | 2,349 | 9.4 | A | 1,635 | 7.2 | A |
| George Dieter Ext. -> 375 Ramp Ent. | Basic | 4 | 2,351 | 11.7 | B | 1,637 | 9.0 | A |
| 375 Ramp Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 432 | 7.5 | A | 1,636 | 31.1 | D |
| ```375 Ramp Ent. -> Pendale Ext.``` | Merge | 5 | 2,768 | 10.9 | B | 3,252 | 13.4 | B |
| ```375 Ramp Ent. -> Pendale Ext.``` | Basic | 4 | 2,751 | 13.7 | B | 3,236 | 16.5 | B |
| Pendale Ext. | Ramp | 2 | 1,055 | 11.3 | B | 1,049 | 14.8 | B |
| Pendale Ext. -> Pendale Ent. | Basic | 3 | 1,694 | 11.2 | B | 2,171 | 14.6 | B |
| Pendale Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 1,495 | 14.7 | B | 2,028 | 20.5 | C |
| ```Pendale Ent. -> Lee Trevino Ent.``` | Merge | 5 | 3,180 | 11.9 | B | 4,189 | 16.2 | B |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pendale Ent. -> Lee Trevino } \\ & \text { Ent. } \end{aligned}$ | Basic | 4 | 3,174 | 14.7 | B | 4,175 | 22.7 | C |
| Lee Trevino Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,005 | 22.3 | C | 991 | 29.5 | D |
| Lee Trevino Ent. -> Yarbrough Ext. | Merge | 5 | 4,171 | 15.8 | B | 5,134 | 26.5 | C |
| Lee Trevino Ent. -> Yarbrough Ext. | Basic | 4 | 4,185 | 20.8 | C | 5,115 | 34.1 | D |


| Segment Names | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Lee Trevino Ent. -> Yarbrough Ext. | Basic | 5 | 4,158 | 18.5 | B | 5,046 | 35.5 | E |
| Yarbrough Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 721 | 25.8 | C | 1,038 | 57.0 | F |
| Yarbrough Ext. -> Lomaland Ent. | Basic | 4 | 3,435 | 15.8 | B | 3,988 | 18.9 | C |
| Lomaland Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 935 | 19.2 | B | 1,295 | 26.9 | C |
| Lomaland Ent. -> Yarbrough Ent. | Merge | 5 | 4,325 | 15.8 | B | 5,241 | 19.7 | B |
| Lomaland Ent. -> Yarbrough Ent. | Basic | 4 | 4,339 | 20.0 | C | 5,272 | 25.2 | C |
| Yarbrough Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 1,297 | 29.9 | D | 1,066 | 24.3 | C |
| ```Yarbrough Ent. -> Viscount``` Ext. | Merge | 5 | 5,640 | 20.5 | C | 6,347 | 23.6 | C |
| Yarbrough Ent. -> Viscount Ext. | Basic | 5 | 5,649 | 20.5 | C | 6,355 | 23.7 | C |
| ```Yarbrough Ent. -> Viscount Ext.``` | Basic | 6 | 5,643 | 17.1 | B | 6,351 | 19.7 | B |
| Viscount Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 302 | 6.4 | A | 311 | 6.6 | A |
| Viscount Ext. -> Hawkins Ext. | Basic | 5 | 5,343 | 19.4 | C | 6,047 | 22.8 | C |
| Viscount Ext. -> Hawkins Ext. | Basic | 6 | 5,345 | 16.3 | B | 6,050 | 19.8 | B |
| Hawkins Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 653 | 14.0 | B | 1,133 | 25.2 | C |
| Hawkins Ext. -> Airway Ext. | Basic | 5 | 4,682 | 16.9 | B | 4,912 | 18.1 | C |
| Airway Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 676 | 14.7 | B | 779 | 17.0 | B |
| Airway Ext. -> Hawkins Ent. | Basic | 4 | 3,989 | 18.0 | C | 4,128 | 18.9 | C |
| Hawkins Ent. | Ramp | 2 | 2,816 | 31.1 | D | 2,549 | 28.0 | D |
| ```Hawkins Ent. -> Geronimo Ext.``` | Merge | 6 | 6,791 | 20.2 | C | 6,672 | 20.0 | B |
| Hawkins Ent. -> Geronimo Ext. | Basic | 7 | 6,761 | 17.2 | B | 6,653 | 17.1 | B |
| Geronimo Ext. | Ramp | 1 | 689 | 15.9 | B | 752 | 17.4 | B |
| Geronimo Ext. -> Airway Ent. | Basic | 6 | 6,095 | 17.8 | B | 5,944 | 17.5 | B |
| Airway Ent. | Ramp | 1 | 615 | 13.0 | B | 674 | 14.3 | B |
| ```Airway Ent. -> Segment 2 Ext.``` | Merge | 7 | 6,669 | 16.7 | B | 6,586 | 16.6 | B |
| Airway Ent. -> Segment 2 Ext. | Basic | 6 | 6,686 | 20.2 | C | 6,611 | 20.3 | C |
| Segment 2 Ext. | Ramp | 3 | 2,863 | 17.5 | B | 4,359 | 28.5 | D |
| Segment 2 Ext. -> Segment 2 | Basic | 3 | 3,803 | 23.1 | C | 2,240 | 13.0 | B |

b) Segment 3 Build VISSIM Intersection Level of Service Analysis

The Year 2042 Build condition analysis for the intersections along Segment 3 shows a significant improvement in LOS over the No Build analysis. The study showed only four intersections with poor LOS in the AM peak hour and six intersections with poor LOS in the PM peak hour, which is a significant improvement over the No Build alternative. These intersections are shown in Table 49 and are highlighted in red.

Table 49: Segment 32042 Build Alternative Intersection LOS

| Intersection | Control Type | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Signalized | 12.9 | B | 19.3 |
| Paisano and WBFR | Signalized | 61.4 | E | 79.9 | E |
| Paisano and EBFR | Signalized | 39.5 | D | 24.9 | C |
| Trowbridge and EBFR | Signalized | 20.8 | C | 17.6 | B |
| Trowbridge and WBFR | Signalized | 19.0 | B | 24.3 | C |
| Geronimo and EBFR | Signalized | 16.0 | B | 38.8 | D |
| Geronimo and WBFR | Signalized | 5.2 | A | 11.9 | B |
| Airway and EBFR | Signalized | 4.5 | A | 5.9 | A |
| Airway and WBFR | Signalized | 86.5 | F | 79.7 | E |
| Airway and North intersection | Signalized | 47.6 | D | 65.7 | E |
| Viscount and EBFR | Signalized | 26.4 | C | 45.2 | D |
| Viscount and WBFR | Signalized | 39.1 | D | 78.0 | E |
| McRea and EBFR | Signalized | 51.7 | D | 28.8 | C |
| McRae and WBFR | Signalized | 14.7 | B | 18.6 | B |
| Sumac and EBFR | Signalized | 16.9 | B | 13.6 | B |
| Sumac and WBFR | Signalized | 16.7 | B | 36.9 | D |
| Yarbrough and EBFR | Signalized | 59.2 | E | 60.9 | E |
| Yarbrough and WBFR | Signalized | 26.0 | C | 24.5 | C |
| Lomaland and EBFR | Signalized | 20.5 | C | 21.9 | C |
| Lomaland and WBFR | Signalized | 85.7 | F | 56.6 | E |
| Lee Trevino and EBFR | Signalized | 41.8 | D | 158.9 | F |
| Lee Trevino and WBFR | Signalized | 39.5 | D | 52.4 | D |
| Zaragoza | Signalized | 30.5 | C | 35.7 | D |
| Hawkins |  |  |  |  |  |

### 6.4 Findings

Based on the analysis, there is an improvement in LOS between the No Build alternative and the Build alternative for the AM peak hour. Table 50 below provides a summary of the comparison between each alternative. The table shows that overall, the Build alternative cost to the user decreases from the No Build alternative while serving more vehicles.

Table 50: Segment 3 AM Peak Hour Measures of Effectiveness Comparison

| MOE | AM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing AM | No Build 2042 AM | Build 2042 AM |
| Total travel time (veh-hr) | 4098 | 8447 | 5167 |
| Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 825 | 4522 | 1453 |
| Calculated Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 744 | 3674 | 1296 |
| Average Delay time per vehicle (sec/veh) | 69 | 285 | 97 |
| Average speed (mph) | 42 | 24 | 35 |
| Number of vehicles served | 38687 | 46403 | 48326 |
| Travel Time (min/veh) | 6.36 | 10.92 | 6.42 |
| Annual Delay Hours | 619,000 | $3,391,000$ | $1,090,000$ |
| Annual Delay (\$) | $\$ 11,240,000$ | $\$ 61,580,000$ | $\$ 19,790,000$ |
| VMT | 170591.67 | 204005.20 | 181142.46 |

Annual delay dollars based on 250 Working days/ 3 hours of peak traffic in each AM \& PM peak / \$18.19 per hour based on TTI's 2015 Urban Mobility Scorecard

Based on the analysis, there is an improvement in LOS between the No Build alternative and the Build alternative for the PM peak hour. Table 51 below provides a summary of the comparison between each alternative. The table shows that overall, the Build alternative cost to the user decreases from the No Build alternative while serving more vehicles.

Table 51: Segment 3 PM Peak Hour Measures of Effectiveness Comparison

| MOE | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing PM | No Build 2042 PM | Build 2042 PM |
| Total travel time (veh-hr) | 4613 | 9644 | 6878 |
| Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 1078 | 5788 | 2584 |
| Calculated Total Delay time (veh-hr) | 961 | 4554 | 2217 |
| Average Delay time per vehicle (sec/veh) | 85 | 357 | 153 |
| Average speed (mph) | 40 | 21 | 30 |
| Number of vehicles served | 40895 | 45986 | 52229 |
| Travel Time (min/veh) | 6.77 | 12.58 | 7.90 |
| Annual Delay Hours | 809,000 | $4,341,000$ | $1,938,000$ |
| Annual Delay (\$) | $\$ 14,690,000$ | $\$ 78,830,000$ | $\$ 35,190,000$ |


| MOE | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing PM | No Build 2042 PM | Build 2042 PM |
| VMT | 183865.1257 | 198318.4562 | 209536.8468 |

Annual delay dollars based on 250 Working days/ 3 hours of peak traffic in each AM \& PM peak / \$18.19 per hour based on TTI's 2015 Urban Mobility Scorecard

## 7. Segment 4

### 7.1 Existing Conditions Analysis

Existing condition analysis provided the baseline analysis to obtain an understanding of the current operations. Segment 4 analysis used HCS and Synchro to determine the current deficiencies along the corridor.
a) Segment 4 Existing Mainlane Level of Service Analysis

The existing condition analysis for eastbound Segment 4 showed the majority of segments operating at LOS D or better. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with two segments operating at LOS E or worse. The segments were between Eastlake Boulevard and Horizon Boulevard. Table 52 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 52: Segment 4 EB Existing Mainlane LOS Analysis

| Segment Name | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Eastlake Ext. ->Eastlake Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,840 | 22.4 | C | 2,850 | 32.4 | D |
| Eastlake Ent. | Merge | 2 | 1,900 | 25.7 | C | 2,900 | 37.5 | F |
| Eastlake Ent.->Horizon Ext. | Basic | 2 | 1,900 | 23.1 | C | 2,900 | 33.2 | D |
| Horizon Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 1,900 | 27.2 | C | 2,900 | 45.0 | F |
| Horizon Ext. ->Horizon Ent. | Basic | 2 | 900 | 11.0 | A | 1,020 | 11.3 | B |
| Horizon Ent. | Merge | 2 | 1,130 | 15.0 | B | 1,300 | 15.7 | B |
| Horizon Ent.->Clint Cutoff Ext. | Basic | 2 | 1,130 | 11.0 | A | 1,300 | 11.5 | B |
| Clint Cutoff Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 1,130 | 17.1 | B | 1,300 | 17.8 | B |
| Clint Cutoff Ext.->Clint Cutoff Ent | Basic | 2 | 880 | 8.6 | A | 930 | 8.2 | A |
| Clint Cutoff Ent | Merge | 2 | 970 | 15.0 | B | 1,020 | 14.5 | B |
| Clint Cutoff Ent->Fabens Ext. | Basic | 2 | 970 | 9.4 | A | 1,020 | 9.0 | A |
| Fabens Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 970 | 13.3 | B | 1,020 | 12.8 | B |
| Fabens Ext. ->Fabens Ent. | Basic | 2 | 750 | 7.3 | A | 650 | 5.8 | A |
| Fabens Ent. | Merge | 2 | 810 | 11.0 | B | 730 | 9.3 | A |
| Fabens Ent.-> Turnillo Ext. | Basic | 2 | 810 | 7.9 | A | 730 | 6.5 | A |
| Turnillo Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 810 | 11.7 | B | 730 | 9.9 | A |
| Turnillo Ext. ->Turnillo Ent. | Basic | 2 | 750 | 7.3 | A | 680 | 6.0 | A |
| Turnillo Ent. | Merge | 2 | 780 | 11.6 | B | 710 | 10.1 | B |
| Turnillo Ent.->IH 10 South | Basic | 2 | 780 | 7.6 | A | 710 | 6.3 | A |

HCS analysis was done in HCS7 Facilities Module

The existing condition analysis for westbound Segment showed the majority of segments operating at LOS D or better. The study showed that both the AM and PM peak hours operated at LOS D or better with no segments operating worse than LOS D. Table 53 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 53: Segment 4 WB Existing Mainlane LOS Analysis

| Segment Name | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| IH 10 South->Turnillo Ext. | Basic | 2 | 530 | 4.9 | A | 750 | 6.5 | A |
| Turnillo Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 530 | 8.8 | A | 750 | 10.9 | B |
| Turnillo Ext. ->Turnillo Ent. | Basic | 2 | 500 | 4.6 | A | 720 | 6.3 | A |
| Turnillo Ent. | Merge | 2 | 550 | 9.9 | A | 750 | 11.6 | B |
| Turnillo Ent.->San Felipe Ext. | Basic | 2 | 550 | 5.1 | A | 750 | 6.5 | A |
| San Felipe Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 550 | 9.0 | A | 750 | 10.9 | B |
| San Felipe Ext. ->San Felipe Ent. | Basic | 2 | 490 | 4.6 | A | 690 | 6.0 | A |
| San Felipe Ent. | Merge | 2 | 790 | 10.8 | B | 920 | 11.7 | B |
| San Felipe Ent.->Darrington Ext. | Basic | 2 | 790 | 7.3 | A | 920 | 8.0 | A |
| Darrington Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 790 | 12.4 | B | 920 | 13.3 | B |
| Darrington Ext. ->Darrington Ent. | Basic | 2 | 740 | 6.9 | A | 850 | 7.4 | A |
| Darrington Ent. | Merge | 2 | 1,110 | 15.2 | B | 1,100 | 14.4 | B |
| Darrington Ent.->Horizon Ext. | Basic | 2 | 1,110 | 10.3 | A | 1,100 | 9.6 | A |
| Horizon Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 1,110 | 16.2 | B | 1,100 | 15.3 | B |
| Horizon Ext. ->Horizon Ent. | Basic | 2 | 920 | 8.6 | A | 860 | 7.5 | A |
| Horizon Ent. | Merge | 2 | 2,550 | 28.6 | D | 1,980 | 21.0 | C |
| Horizon Ent.->Eastlake Ext. | Basic | 2 | 2,550 | 26.0 | D | 1,980 | 17.5 | B |
| Eastlake Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 2,550 | 33.5 | D | 1,980 | 25.2 | C |
| Eastlake Ext. ->Eastlake Ent. | Basic | 2 | 2,470 | 24.9 | C | 1,890 | 16.6 | B |

HCS analysis was done in HCS7 Facilities Module
b) Intersection Level of Service Analysis

Segment 4 has a total of 10 intersections. In the AM Peak, there are six of the 10 intersections operating with an acceptable LOS. The other 4 intersections all operate with a LOS F, with the larges delay being 136.3 sec . The AM peak showed two interchanges operating with poor LOS. This is summarized on Table 54.

Table 54: Segment 4 - Existing Intersection LOS

| Intersections | Control Type | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| I-10 EB Frontage Road \& Eastlake | Signal Control | 66.0 | E | 54.0 | D |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& Eastlake | Signal Control | 135.3 | F | 34.1 | C |
| I-10 EB Frontage Road \& Horizon | Signal Control | 106.8 | F | 80.2 | F |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& Horizon | Signal Control | 136.3 | F | 84.5 | F |
| I-10 EB Frontage Road \& Darrington | Signal Control | 27.6 | C | 20.3 | C |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& Darrington | Signal Control | 12.3 | B | 9.2 | A |
| I-10 EB Frontage Road \& San Felipe/Fabens | AWSC | 11.3 | B | 12.7 | B |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& San Felipe/Fabens | AWSC | 9.7 | A | 10.0 | A |
| I-10 EB Frontage Road \& OT Smith | AWSC | 7.3 | A | 7.3 | A |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& OT Smith | AWSC | 7.4 | A | 7.2 | A |

### 7.2 No Build Operational Analysis

The 2042 No Build models were used as a comparison tool to measure the effectiveness of the build alternatives. The No Build models assumed committed projects in the analysis. Segment 4 No Build Mainlane Level of Service Analysis
a) Segment 4 - No Build Mainlane Level of Service Analysis

The Year 2042 No Build condition analysis for eastbound Segment 4 showed that the majority of segments still operating at LOS D or better. However, with the increase in vehicles, density increased overall. The study showed that the worst peak period was the PM peak, with 4 segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 21 percent of the segments, while 79 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The majority of Segment 4 that failed during this period is near Eastlake Blvd and Horizon Blvd. Table 55 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 55: Segment 4 EB 2042 No Build Mainlane LOS Analysis

| Segment Name | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Eastlake Ext. ->Eastlake Ent. | Basic | 2 | 2,730 | 30.4 | D | 4,220 | 57.9 | F |
| Eastlake Ent. | Merge | 2 | 2,820 | 35.7 | F | 4,290 | 42.8 | F |
| Eastlake Ent.->Horizon Ext. | Basic | 2 | 2,820 | 31.6 | D | 4,290 | 39.2 | E |
| Horizon Ext.->Horizon Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 2,820 | 35.4 | F | 4,290 | 45.0 | F |
| Horizon Ext. ->Horizon Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,340 | 14.7 | B | 1,510 | 16.7 | B |
| Horizon Ent. ->Horizon Ent. | Merge | 2 | 1,670 | 20.1 | C | 1,920 | 23.4 | C |
| Horizon Ent.->Clint Cutoff Ext. | Basic | 2 | 1,670 | 14.7 | B | 1,920 | 17.2 | B |
| Clint Cutoff Ext.->Clint Cutoff Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 1,670 | 21.9 | C | 1,920 | 24.9 | C |
| Clint Cutoff Ext.->Clint Cutoff Ent | Basic | 2 | 1,300 | 11.4 | B | 1,370 | 12.1 | B |
| Clint Cutoff Ent | Merge | 2 | 1,430 | 18.6 | B | 1,500 | 19.5 | B |
| Clint Cutoff Ent->Fabens Ext. | Basic | 2 | 1,430 | 12.6 | B | 1,500 | 13.3 | B |
| Fabens Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 1,430 | 17.3 | B | 1,500 | 18.3 | B |
| Fabens Ext. ->Fabens Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,100 | 9.7 | A | 950 | 8.4 | A |
| Fabens Ent. | Merge | 2 | 1,190 | 14.0 | B | 1,070 | 12.8 | B |
| Fabens Ent.-> Turnillo Ext. | Basic | 2 | 1,190 | 10.5 | A | 1,070 | 9.5 | A |
| Turnillo Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 1,190 | 15.1 | B | 1,070 | 13.8 | B |
| Turnillo Ext. ->Turnillo Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,100 | 9.7 | A | 1,000 | 8.9 | A |
| Turnillo Ent. | Merge | 2 | 1,150 | 14.5 | B | 1,050 | 13.6 | B |
| Turnillo Ent.->IH 10 East | Basic | 2 | 1,150 | 10.1 | A | 1,050 | 9.3 | A |

HCS analysis was done in HCS7 Facilities Module
No Build Analysis considers geometrical improvements from other committed projects shown in the table

The Year 2042 No Build condition analysis for westbound Segment 4 showed that the majority of segments still operating at LOS D or better. However, with the increase in vehicles, density increased overall. The study showed that the worst peak period was the AM peak, with 4 segments operating at LOS E or worse. This accounts for 21 percent of the segments, while 79 percent of the segments operate at LOS D or better. The majority of Segment 4 that failed during this time period is near Eastlake Blvd and Horizon Blvd. Table 56 provides the details of the demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 56: Segment 4 WB 2042 Build Mainlane LOS Analysis

| Segment Name | Segment Type | \# of Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| IH 10 East->Turnillo Ext. | Basic | 2 | 780 | 6.3 | A | 1,110 | 9.4 | A |
| Turnillo Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 780 | 10.5 | B | 1,110 | 14.5 | B |
| Turnillo Ext. ->Turnillo Ent. | Basic | 2 | 730 | 5.9 | A | 1,060 | 8.9 | A |
| Turnillo Ent. | Merge | 2 | 800 | 11.4 | B | 1,110 | 14.9 | B |
| Turnillo Ent.->San Felipe Ext. | Basic | 2 | 800 | 6.4 | A | 1,110 | 9.4 | A |
| San Felipe Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 800 | 10.7 | B | 1,110 | 14.5 | B |
| San Felipe Ext. ->San Felipe Ent. | Basic | 2 | 710 | 5.7 | A | 1,020 | 8.6 | A |
| San Felipe Ent. | Merge | 2 | 1,150 | 12.9 | B | 1,360 | 15.7 | B |
| San Felipe Ent.->Darrington Ext. | Basic | 2 | 1,150 | 9.2 | A | 1,360 | 11.5 | B |
| Darrington Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 1,150 | 14.8 | B | 1,360 | 17.7 | B |
| Darrington Ext. ->Darrington Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,080 | 8.7 | A | 1,260 | 10.6 | A |
| Darrington Ent. | Merge | 2 | 1,640 | 18.4 | B | 1,630 | 19.2 | B |
| Darrington Ent.->Horizon Ext. | Basic | 2 | 1,640 | 13.1 | B | 1,630 | 13.8 | B |
| Horizon Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 1,640 | 19.9 | B | 1,630 | 20.7 | C |
| Horizon Ext. ->Horizon Ent. | Basic | 2 | 1,360 | 10.9 | A | 1,270 | 10.7 | A |
| Horizon Ent. | Merge | 2 | 2,565 | 24.5 | C | 2,100 | 21.4 | C |
| Horizon Ent. | Merge | 2 | 3,770 | 41.3 | F | 2,930 | 30.2 | D |
| Horizon Ent.->Eastlake Ext. | Basic | 2 | 3,770 | 39.5 | E | 2,930 | 27.7 | D |
| Eastlake Ext. | Diverge | 2 | 3,770 | 41.9 | F | 2,930 | 34.8 | D |
| Eastlake Ext. ->Eastlake Ent. | Basic | 2 | 3,650 | 40.9 | E | 2,800 | 25.9 | C |

HCS analysis was done in HCS7 Facilities Module
No Build Analysis considers geometrical improvements from other committed projects shown in the table
b) Intersection Level of Service Analysis

The Year 2042 No Build condition analysis for the intersections along Segment 4 determined a significant reduction in operating conditions. The study showed that both AM, and PM peak hours have four intersections that operate at a pool LOS. These intersections are shown in Table 57 and are highlighted in red. The No Build analysis considers geometrical improvements from other committed projects.

Table 57: Segment 4 - 2042 No Build Intersection LOS

| Intersections | Control Type | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| I-10 EB Frontage Road \& Eastlake | Signal Control | 66.7 | E | 229.4 | F |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& Eastlake | Signal Control | 371.4 | F | 161.7 | F |
| I-10 EB Frontage Road \& Horizon | Signal Control | 193.0 | F | 245.0 | F |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& Horizon | Signal Control | 328.7 | F | 210.8 | F |
| I-10 EB Frontage Road \& Darrington | Signal Control | 52.8 | D | 36.9 | D |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& Darrington | Signal Control | 25.7 | C | 11.3 | B |
| I-10 EB Frontage Road \& San Felipe/Fabens | AWSC | 21.4 | C | 34.1 | D |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& San Felipe/Fabens | AWSC | 14.2 | B | 14.1 | B |
| l-10 EB Frontage Road \& OT Smith | AWSC | 7.6 | A | 7.5 | A |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& OT Smith | AWSC | 7.7 | A | 7.5 | A |

### 7.3 Recommended Alternative Analysis

The studied alternative for Segment 4 was Alternative 2 (Ref 6). Alternative 2 provides 15' wide inside shoulders, which improve safety, allow for more effective incident management, and may be used as a peak period or special purpose lanes in the future. This alternative also includes changes in ramping, auxiliary lanes, and additional capacity in some areas. Refer to Section 4 of the Feasibility Report for a detailed description of the Recommended Alternative.
a) Mainlane Level of Service Analysis

The Year 2042 Build condition analysis for eastbound Segment 4 showed that all segments improved and operate at LOS D or better. The proposed alternative provided the capacity needed to improve traffic flow for all the segments and improve conditions near Eastlake and Horizon Blvd. Table 58 provides details regarding demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 58: Segment 4 EB 2042 Build Mainlane LOS

| Segment Name | Segment Type | \# of <br> Lanes | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| Loop 375 DC ONR -> Frontage RD ONR | Basic | 5 | 2570 | 11.3 | B | 3890 | 17.1 | B |
| Frontage RD ONR | Merge | 5 | 2730 | 10.6 | B | 4220 | 16.5 | B |
| Frontage RD ONR -> Horizon OFR | Basic | 5 | 2730 | 12 | B | 4220 | 18.6 | C |
| Horizon OFR | Diverge | 5 | 273 | 12 | B | 4220 | 18.6 | C |
| Horizon OFR -> Eastlake ONR | Basic | 4 | 1250 | 6.9 | A | 1440 | 7.9 | A |
| Eastlake ONR | Merge | 4 | 1340 | 7.6 | A | 1510 | 8.6 | A |
| Eastlake ONR -> Darrington OFR | Overlap | 4 | 1340 | 57.9 | A | 1510 | 57.8 | A |
| Darrington OFR | Diverge | 4 | 1340 | 5.9 | A | 1510 | 6.6 | A |
| Horizon OFR -> Eastlake ONR | Basic | 3 | 970 | 5.7 | A | 960 | 5.6 | A |
| Horizon ONR | Merge | 3 | 1300 | 9.7 | A | 1370 | 10.4 | B |
| Horizon ONR -> Darrington ONR | Basic | 3 | 1300 | 7.6 | A | 1370 | 8 | A |
| Darrington ONR | Merge | 4 | 1430 | 6.3 | A | 1500 | 6.6 | A |
| Darrington ONR -> San Felipe OFR | Basic | 4 | 1430 | 6.3 | A | 1500 | 6.6 | A |
| San Felipe OFR | Diverge | 4 | 1430 | 6.3 | A | 1500 | 6.6 | A |
| San Felipe OFR -> San Felipe ONR | Basic | 3 | 1100 | 6.5 | A | 950 | 5.6 | A |
| San Felipe ONR | Merge | 4 | 1190 | 5.2 | A | 1070 | 4.7 | A |
| San Felipe ONR -> OT Smith OFR | Basic | 4 | 1190 | 5.2 | A | 1070 | 4.7 | A |
| OT Smith OFR | Diverge | 4 | 1190 | 5.2 | A | 1070 | 4.7 | A |
| OT Smith OFR -> OT Smith ONR | Basic | 3 | 1100 | 6.5 | A | 1000 | 5.9 | A |
| OT Smith ONR | Merge | 3 | 1150 | 8.1 | A | 1050 | 7.5 | A |
| I-10 EB | Basic | 3 | 1150 | 6.7 | A | 1050 | 6.2 | A |

The Year 2042 Build condition analysis for eastbound Segment 4 showed that all segments improved and operate at LOS D or better. The proposed alternative provided the capacity needed to improve traffic flow for all the segments and improve conditions near Eastlake and Horizon Blvd. Table 59 provides details regarding demand, density, and letter LOS.

Table 59: Segment 4 WB 2042 Build Mainlane LOS

| Segment Name | Segment Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# of } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{gathered}$ | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Demand | Density | LOS | Demand | Density | LOS |
| I-10 WB -> OT Smith OFR | Basic | 3 | 780 | 4.2 | A | 780 | 3.7 | A |
| OT Smith OFR | Diverge | 3 | 780 | 9.4 | A | 780 | 4 | A |
| OT Smith OFR -> OT Smith ONR | Basic | 3 | 730 | 3.9 | A | 730 | 3.5 | A |
| OT Smith ONR | Merge | 4 | 800 | 3.2 | A | 800 | 2.8 | A |
| OT Smith ONR -> San Felipe OFR | Basic | 4 | 800 | 3.2 | A | 800 | 2.8 | A |
| San Felipe OFR | Diverge | 4 | 800 | 3.2 | A | 800 | 2.8 | A |
| San Felipe OFR -> San Felipe ONR | Basic | 3 | 710 | 3.8 | A | 710 | 3.4 | A |
| San Felipe ONR | Merge | 4 | 1150 | 4.6 | A | 1150 | 4.1 | A |
| San Felipe ONR -> Darrington OFR | Basic | 4 | 1150 | 4.6 | A | 1150 | 4.1 | A |
| Darrington OFR | Diverge | 4 | 1150 | 4.6 | A | 1150 | 4.1 | A |
| Darrington OFR -> New Connection OFR | Basic | 3 | 1080 | 5.8 | A | 1080 | 5.1 | A |
| New Connection OFR | Diverge | 3 | 1080 | 11.2 | B | 1080 | 10.3 | B |
| New Connection OFR -> New Connection ONR | Basic | 3 | 800 | 4.3 | A | 800 | 3.8 | A |
| New Connection ONR | Merge | 4 | 1360 | 5.4 | A | 1360 | 4.8 | A |
| New Connection ONR -> Eastlake OFR | Basic | 4 | 1360 | 5.5 | A | 1360 | 4.8 | A |
| Eastlake OFR | Diverge | 4 | 1360 | 6.8 | A | 1360 | 6.1 | A |
| Eastlake OFR -> Horizon ONR | Basic | 4 | 1240 | 6.2 | A | 1240 | 5.5 | A |
| Horizon ONR | Merge | 5 | 3500 | 14 | B | 3500 | 12.4 | B |
| Horizon ONR -> Add Lane | Basic | 5 | 3500 | 14 | B | 3500 | 12.4 | B |
| Joe Battle OFR | Diverge | 5 | 3500 | 20 | B | 3500 | 19.4 | B |
| $\text { Joe Battle OFR -> Loop } 375 \text { DC }$ OFR | Basic | 5 | 2920 | 11.7 | B | 2920 | 10.4 | A |

b) Intersection Level of Service Analysis

Interchanges that explicitly designed for high-left turning volume include the continuous flow intersection (CFI), the single point urban interchange (SPUI), and the diverging diamond interchange (DDI). The main differences between these interchanges and a traditional diamond interchange include a reduced number of signal phases (CFI, DDI, and SPUI) and increased storage bays (CFI). These interchanges were analyzed with volumes from the Eastlake Blvd and Horizon Blvd interchanges and operated effectively with the provision of two free flowing right turn lanes for the southbound to westbound movement. Table 60 summarizes the results.

A DDI is proposed at both Eastlake Blvd and Horizon Blvd. Two free flowing right turns lanes are provided for the southbound to westbound movements at these interchanges to accommodate high right turn volumes. Impacts and access to adjacent properties will need to be evaluated during future phases of design.

Table 60: Segment 4 - 2042 Build Intersection LOS Analysis

| Segment 4 Intersections | Alternative Improvements | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay (Sec/veh) | LOS | Delay (Sec/veh | LOS |
| I-10 EB Frontage Road \& Eastlake | Changed to DDI | B | 19.7 | D | 46.6 |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& Eastlake |  | B | 15.4 | D | 35.5 |
| I-10 EB Frontage Road \& Horizon | Changed to DDI | C | 21.6 | D | 41.3 |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& Horizon |  | C | 21.2 | D | 38.5 |
| I-10 EB Frontage Road \& Darrington |  | D | 51.0 | C | 33.1 |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& Darrington |  | C | 33.2 | B | 11.6 |
| l-10 EB Frontage Road \& San Felipe/Fabens |  | B | 13.1 | B | 11.6 |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& San Felipe/Fabens | Added Turn Bay | B | 10.9 | B | 12.9 |
| I-10 EB Frontage Road \& OT Smith |  | A | 7.7 | A | 7.5 |
| I-10 WB Frontage Road \& OT Smith |  | A | 7.7 | A | 7.5 |

### 7.4 Findings

a) Segment 4 Build Mainlane Level of Service Analysis Summary

Based on the analysis, there is a significant improvement in LOS between the No Build alternative and the Build alternative. Figure 12 below provides a summary of the comparison between each alternative. The figure shows a reduction of the number of segments in the LOS E \& F column between the No Build and Build alternatives for both AM and PM peak hours.


Figure 12: Segment 4 Mainlane Level of Service Summary
b) Segment 4 Intersection Level of Service Analysis Summary

Based on the analysis, there is a significant improvement between the No Build alternative and the Build alternative.

3 below provides a summary of the comparison between each alternative. The figure shows a reduction of the number of segments in the LOS E\&F column between the No Build and Build alternatives for both AM and PM peak hours.


Figure 13: Segment 4 Mainlane Level of Service Summary

## 8. Summary

The primary objectives of the study were to address the following criteria:

1. Mobility \& Circulation: Facilitate movement through and within the corridor
2. Design: Comply with accepted design standards to provide a safer facility
3. Technology: Leverage advancing technologies to address corridor issues

This analysis assisted the roadway planners and designers in helping determine the benefits of the proposed alternatives.

### 8.1 Results and Analysis

Segment 1 alternative comparison clearly shows that the LOS improves in both directions of travel and both peak hours in the Build alternative when compared with the No Build alternative, as shown in Table 61. The PM peak hour showed the most improvement, with the eastbound percent of segments at LOS E or worse going from 33 percent to 11 percent and the westbound percent of segments at LOS E or worse going from 32 percent to 18 percent.

Table 61: Segment 1 Percent Passing Comparison - From the HCS Analysis

| Direction | Time | Existing |  | 2042 No Build |  | 2042 Build |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% LOS D or <br> better | \% LOS E or worse | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% LOS D or } \\ & \text { better } \end{aligned}$ | \% LOS E or worse | \% LOS D or better | \% LOS E or worse |
| EB | AM | 87\% | 13\% | 80\% | 20\% | 93\% | 7\% |
|  | PM | 95\% | 5\% | 67\% | 33\% | 89\% | 11\% |
| WB | AM | 91\% | 9\% | 82\% | 18\% | 94\% | 6\% |
|  | PM | 82\% | 18\% | 68\% | 32\% | 82\% | 18\% |

Segment 2 alternative comparison clearly shows that LOS improves in both the directions of travel and in both peak hours in the Build alternative when compared with the No Build alternative, as shown in Table 62. The PM peak hour showed the most improvement, with the eastbound percent of segments at LOS E or worse going from 76 percent to six percent and the westbound percent of segments at LOS E or worse going from 53 percent to 10 percent LOS E or worse. The eastbound AM peak hour also improved significantly, with the number segments at LOS E or worse, reducing from 52 percent to nine percent.

Table 62: Segment 2 Percent Passing Comparison - From the HCS Analysis

| Direction |  | Existing |  | 2042 No Build |  | 2042 Build |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% LOS D or <br> better | \% LOS E or <br> worse | \% LOS D <br> or better | \% LOS E or <br> worse | \% LOS D <br> or better | \% LOS E or <br> worse |
| EB | AM | $88 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
|  | PM | $85 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $6 \%$ |

Segment 2 No Build and Build 2042 alternatives relative delay and speed were compared against each other for four 15-minute intervals to get a sense of how peak hour spreading increased for the No Build alternative and how the recommended Build alternative improved congestion on the corridor. Figure 14 and Figure 15 shows the comparison.


Segment 2 AM Peak Hour 3rd Quarter


Figure 14: Segment 2 No Build and Build 2042 AM Delay and Speed Comparison

Segment 2 PM Peak Hour 1st Quarter
Segment 2 PM Peak Hour 2nd Quarter


Segment 2 PM Peak Hour 4th Quarter
Segment 2 PM Peak Hour 3rd Quarter


Figure 15: Segment 2 No Build and Build 2042 PM Delay and Speed Comparison

Segment 3 alternative comparison clearly shows that LOS improves in both the directions of travel and in both peak hours in the Build alternative when compared with the No Build alternative, as shown in Table 63. Both the AM and PM peak hours showed significant improvements over the No Build. The most considerable improvement was in the AM peak hour in the westbound direction, with the number of segments at LOS E or worse, reducing from 53 percent to zero percent.

Table 63: Segment 3 Percent Passing Comparison

| Direction | Time | Existing |  | 2042 No Build |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% LOS D or <br> better | \% LOS E or <br> worse | \% LOS E or <br> worse | \% LOS D or <br> better | \% LOS E or <br> worse |  |
| EB | AM | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
|  | PM | $87 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
|  | AM | $93 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
|  | PM | $98 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

Segment 3 No Build and Build 2042 alternatives relative delay and speed were compared against each other for four 15-minute intervals to get a sense of how peak hour spreading increased for the No Build alternative and how the recommended Build alternative improved congestion on the corridor.

### 8.2 Conclusion

Based on available data from TxDOT, cities in the El Paso Metropolitan area, the EI Paso MPO, and supplemental data provided by GRV, the traffic analysis concluded that if improvements are not implemented on IH 10, delays and user costs will significantly increase over the next 20 years. Potential negative impacts on the economy (from extensive delays and increased incidences due to substandard design) are mitigated through the implementation of the recommended alternative designs.
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# Interactive Highway Safety Design Model 

## Crash Prediction Evaluation Report

## Disclaimer

The Interactive Highway Design Model (IHSDM) software is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for its content or use thereof. This document does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade and manufacturers' names may appear in this software and documentation only because they are considered essential to the objective of the software.

## Limited Warranty and Limitations of Remedies

This software product is provided "as-is," without warranty of any kind-either expressed or implied (but not limited to the implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose). The FHWA do not warrant that the functions contained in the software will meet the end-user's requirements or that the operation of the software will be uninterrupted and error-free.

Under no circumstances will the FHWA be liable to the end-user for any damages or claimed lost profits, lost savings, or other incidental or consequential damages rising out of the use or inability to use the software (even if these organizations have been advised of the possibility of such damages), or for any claim by any other party.

## Notice

The use of the IHSDM software is being done strictly on a voluntary basis. In exchange for provision of IHSDM, the user agrees that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), U.S. Department of Transportation and any other agency of the Federal Government shall not be responsible for any errors, damage or other liability that may result from any and all use of the software, including installation and testing of the software. The user further agrees to hold the FHWA and the Federal Government harmless from any resulting liability. The user agrees that this hold harmless provision shall flow to any person to whom or any entity to which the user provides the IHSDM software. It is the user's full responsibility to inform any person to whom or any entity to which it provides the IHSDM software of this hold harmless provision.
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## Report Overview

Report Generated: Sep 17, 2019 10:34 AM
Report Template: System: Multi-Page, 508 Compliant [System] (mlcpm4, Jun 18, 2019 9:17 AM)

Evaluation Date: Thu Feb 21 16:31:31 CST 2019
IHSDM Version: v14.0.0 (Sep 26, 2018)
Crash Prediction Module: v9.0.0 (Sep 26, 2018)

User Name: chmeyer
Organization Name:
Phone:
E-Mail:

Project Title: Reimagine I-10 Existing
Project Comment: Created Thu Jul 05 15:19:00 CDT 2018
Project Unit System: U.S. Customary

Highway Title: Alignment I10P
Highway Comment: Imported from I10-P.xml
Highway Version: 1

Evaluation Title: Evaluation AADT Fix
Evaluation Comment: Created Thu Feb 21 16:09:18 CST 2019

Minimum Location: 1000+00.000
Maximum Location: 4035+90.691
Policy for Superelevation: AASHTO 2011 U.S. Customary
Calibration: HSM Configuration
Crash Distribution: HSM Configuration
Model/CMF: HSM Configuration
Empirical-Bayes Analysis: None
First Year of Analysis: 2022
Last Year of Analysis: 2042

## Section Types

## Section 1 Evaluation

Section: Section 1
Evaluation Start Location: 1000+00.000
Evaluation End Location: 4035+90.691
Functional Class: Freeway
Type of Alignment: Divided, Multilane
Model Category: Freeway Segment
Calibration Factor: FI_EN=1.0; FI_EX=1.0; FI_MV=1.0; FI_SV=1.0; PDO_EN=1.0; PDO_EX=1.0; PDO_MV=1.0;
PDO_SV=1.0;

Crash Prediction Summary, Section 1 (Divided, Multilane; Urban; Freeway)
Project: Reimagine I-10 Existing, Evaluation: Evaluation AADT Fix Highway: Alignment I10P


Figure 1. Crash Prediction Summary (Section 1)

Table 1. Evaluation Freeway - Homogeneous Segments (Section 1)

| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Start Location } \\ \text { (Sta. ft) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \begin{array}{c} \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 4 F | Urban | 1000+00.000 | 1001+07.510 | 107.51 | 0.0204 | 2022: 28,450; 2023: 28,937; 2024: 29,425; 2025: 29,912; 2026: 30,400; 2027: 30,887; 2028: 31,375; 2029: 31,862; 2030: 32,350; 2031: 32,837; 2032: 33,325; 2033: 33,812; 2034: 34,300; 2035: 34,787; 2036: 35,275; 2037: 35,762; 2038: 36,250; 2039: 36,737; 2040: 37,225; 2041: 37,712; 2042: 38,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 3 | 4 F | Urban | 1001+07.510 | 1001+30.470 | 22.96 | 0.0043 | 2022: 25,800; 2023: 26,242; 2024: 26,685; 2025: 27,127; 2026: 27,570; 2027: 28,012; 2028: 28,455; 2029: 28,897; 2030: 29,340; 2031: 29,782; 2032: 30,225; 2033: 30,667; 2034: 31,110; 2035: 31,552; 2036: 31,995; 2037: 32,437; 2038: 32,880; 2039: 33,322; 2040: 33,765; 2041: 34,207; 2042: 34,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 5 | 4 F | Urban | 1001+30.470 | 1018+93.610 | 1,763.14 | 0.3339 | 2022: 23,750; 2023: 24,157; 2024: 24,565; 2025: 24.972; 2026: 25,380; 2027: 25,787; 2028: 26, 195; 2029: 26,602; 2030: 27,010; 2031: 27,417; 2032: 27,825; 2033: 28,232; 2034: 28,640; 2035: 29,047; 2036: 29,455; 2037: 29,862; 2038: 30,270; 2039: 30,677; 2040: 31,085; 2041: 31,492; 2042: 31,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 6 | 4 F | Urban | 1018+93.610 | 1035+88.900 | 1,695.29 | 0.3211 | 2022: 28,750; 2023: 29,242; 2024: 29,735; 2025: 30,227; 2026: 30,720; 2027: 31,212; 2028: 31,705; 2029: 32,197; 2030: 32,690; 2031: 33,182; 2032: 33,675; 2033: 34,167; 2034: 34,660; 2035: 35,152; 2036: 35,645; 2037: 36,137; 2038: 36,630; 2039: 37,122; 2040: 37,615; 2041: 38,107; 2042: 38,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 7 | 4 F | Urban | 1035+88.900 | 1081+93.610 | 4,604.71 | 0.8721 | 2022: 28,400; 2023: 28,887; 2024: 29,375; 2025: 29,862; 2026: 30,350; 2027: 30,837; 2028: 31,325; 2029: 31,812; 2030: 32,300; 2031: 32,787; 2032: 33,275; 2033: 33,762; 2034: 34,250; 2035: 34,737; 2036: 35,225; 2037: 35,712; 2038: 36,200; 2039:36,687; 2040: 37,175; 2041: 37,662; 2042: 38,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 8 | 4 F | Urban | 1081+93.610 | 1084+46.040 | 252.43 | 0.0478 | 2022: 28,400; 2023: 28,887; 2024: 29,375; 2025: 29,862; 2026: 30,350; 2027: 30,837; 2028: 31,325; 2029: 31,812; 2030: 32,300; 2031: 32,787; 2032: 33,275; 2033: 33,762; 2034: 34,250; 2035: 34,737; 2036: 35,225; 2037: 35,712; 2038: 36,200; 2039: 36,687; 2040: 37,175; 2041: 37,662; 2042: 38,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 9 | 4 F | Urban | 1084+46.040 | $1108+25.790$ | 2,379.75 | 0.4507 | 2022: 32,800; 2023: 33,365; 2024: 33,930; 2025: 34,495; 2026: 35,060; 2027: 35,625; 2028: 36,190; 2029: 36,755; 2030: 37,320; 2031: 37,$885 ; 2032: 38,450 ; 2033: 39,015 ; 2034: 39,580 ; 2035: 40,145 ; 2036: 40,710 ; 2037: 41,275 ; 2038: 41,840 ; 2039: 42,405$; 2040: 42,970; 2041: 43,535; 2042: 44,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 11 | 4 F | Urban | 1108+25.790 | 1141+21.180 | 3,295.39 | 0.6241 | 2022: 34,050; 2023: 34,635; 2024: 35,220; 2025: 35,805; 2026: 36,390; 2027: 36,975; 2028: 37,560; 2029: 38,145; 2030: 38,730; 2031: 39,315; 2032: 39,900; 2033: 40,485; 2034: 41,070; 2035: 41,655; 2036: 42,240; 2037: 42,825; 2038: 43,410; 2039: 43,995; 2040: 44,580; 2041: 45,165; 2042: 45,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 15 | 4 F | Urban | 1141+21.180 | 1142+97.170 | 175.99 | 0.0333 | 2022: 32,350; 2023: 32,907; 2024: 33,465; 2025: 34,022; 2026: 34,580; 2027: 35,137; 2028: 35,695; 2029: 36,252; 2030: 36,810; 2031: 37,367; 2032: 37,925; 2033: 38,482; 2034: 39,040; 2035: 39,597; 2036: 40,155; 2037: 40,712; 2038: 41,270; 2039: 41,827; 2040: 42,385; 2041: 42,942; 2042: 43,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 17 | 4 F | Urban | 1142+97.170 | 1171+25.410 | 2,828.24 | 0.5356 | 2022: 30,850; 2023: 31,380; 2024: 31,910; 2025: 32,440; 2026: 32.970; 2027: 33,500; 2028: 34,030; 2029: 34.560; 2030: 35,090; 2031: 35,620; 2032: 36,150; 2033: 36,680; 2034: 37,210; 2035: 37,740; 2036: 38,270; 2037: 38,800; 2038: 39,330; 2039: 39,860; 2040: 40,390; 2041: 40,920; 2042: 41,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 18 | 4 F | Urban | 1171+25.410 | 1181+76.080 | 1,050.67 | 0.1990 | 2022: 35,$250 ; 2023: 35,855$; 2024: 36,460; 2025: 37,065; 2026: 37,670; 2027: 38,275; 2028: 38,880; 2029: 39,485; 2030: 40,090; 2031: 40,695; 2032: 41,300; 2033: 41,905; 2034: 42,510; 2035: 43,115; 2036: 43,720; 2037: 44,325; 2038: 44,930; 2039: 45,535; 2040: 46, 140; 2041: 46,745; 2042: 47,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 20 | 4 F | Urban | 1181+76.080 | 1310+09.960 | 12,833.88 | 2.4307 | 2022: 39,650; 2023: 40,330; 2024: 41,010; 2025: 41,690; 2026: 42,370; 2027: 43,050; 2028: 43,730; 2029: 44,410; 2030: 45,090; 2031: 45,770; 2032: 46,450; 2033: 47,130; 2034: 47,810; 2035: 48,490; 2036: 49,170; 2037: 49,850; 2038: 50,530; 2039: 51,210; 2040: 51,890; 2041: 52,570; 2042: 53,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 24 | 4 F | Urban | 1310+09.960 | $1311+36.670$ | 126.71 | 0.0240 | 2022: 36,450; 2023: 37,075; 2024: 37,700; 2025: 38.325; 2026: 38.950; 2027: 39,575; 2028: 40,200; 2029: 40,825; 2030: 41,450; 2031: 42,075; 2032: 42,700; 2033: 43,325; 2034: 43,950; 2035: 44,575; 2036: 45,200; 2037: 45,825; 2038: 46,450; 2039: 47,075; 2040: 47,700; 2041: 48,325; 2042: 48,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 26 | 4 F | Urban | 1311+36.670 | 1353+89.440 | 4,252.77 | 0.8054 | 2022: 31,500; 2023: 32,040; 2024: 32,580; 2025: 33,120; 2026: 33,660; 2027: 34,200; 2028: 34,740; 2029: 35,280; 2030: 35,820; 2031: 36,360; 2032: 36,900; 2033: 37,440; 2034: 37,980; 2035: 38,520; 2036: 39,060; 2037: 39,600; 2038: 40,140; 2039: 40,680; 2040: 41,220; 2041: 41,760; 2042: 42,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 27 | 4 F | Urban | 1353+89.440 | $1355+18.280$ | 128.84 | 0.0244 | 2022: 33,100; 2023: 33,670; 2024: 34,240; 2025: 34,810; 2026: 35,380; 2027: 35,950; 2028: 36,520; 2029: 37,090; 2030: 37,660; 2031: 38,$230 ; 2032: 38,800 ; 2033: 39,370 ; 2034: 39,940 ; 2035: 40,510 ; 2036: 41,080 ; 2037: 41,650 ; 2038: 42,220 ; 2039: 42,790 ;$ 2040: 43,360; 2041: 43,930; 2042: 44,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 29 | 4 F | Urban | $1355+18.280$ | 1365+82.620 | 1,064.34 | 0.2016 | 2022: 37,950; 2023: 38,605; 2024: 39,260; 2025: 39,915; 2026: 40,570; 2027: 41,225; 2028: 41,880; 2029: 42,535; 2030: 43,190; 2031: 43,845; 2032: 44,500; 2033: 45,155; 2034: 45,810; 2035: 46,465; 2036: 47,120; 2037: 47,775; 2038: 48,430; 2039: 49,085; 2040: 49,740; 2041: 50,395; 2042: 51,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 32 | 4 F | Urban | $1365+82.620$ | $1366+63.080$ | 80.46 | 0.0152 | 2022: 43,450; 2023: 44,200; 2024: 44,950; 2025: 45,700; 2026: 46,450; 2027: 47,200; 2028: 47,950; 2029: 48,700; 2030: 49,450; 2031: 50,200; 2032: 50,950; 2033: 51,700; 2034: 52,450; 2035: 53,200; 2036: 53,950; 2037: 54,700; 2038: 55,450; 2039: 56,200; 2040: 56,950; 2041: 57,700; 2042: 58,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 34 | 4 F | Urban | 1366+63.080 | 1387+72.400 | 2,109.32 | 0.3995 | 2022: 45,100; 2023: 45,877; 2024: 46,655; 2025: 47,432; 2026: 48,210; 2027: 48,987; 2028: 49,765; 2029: 50,542; 2030: 51,320; 2031: 52,097; 2032: 52,875; 2033: 53,652; 2034: 54,430; 2035: 55,207; 2036: 55,985; 2037: 56,762; 2038: 57,540; 2039: 58,317; 2040: 59,095; 2041: 59,872; 2042: 60,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 38 | 4 F | Urban | 1387+72.400 | $1401+83.800$ | 1,411.40 | 0.2673 | 2022: 41,250; 2023: 41,960; 2024: 42,670; 2025: 43.380; 2026: 44,090; 2027: 44,800; 2028: 45.510; 2029: 46,220; 2030: 46,930; 2031: 47,640; 2032: 48,350; 2033: 49,060; 2034: 49,770; 2035: 50,480; 2036: 51,190; 2037: 51,900; 2038: 52,610; 2039: 53,320; 2040: 54,030; 2041: 54,740; 2042: 55,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Start Location } \\ (\text { Sta. } \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40 | 4 F | Urban | 1401+83.800 | 1448+14.880 | 4,631.08 | 0.8771 | 2022: 40,500; 2023: 41,197; 2024: 41,895; 2025: 42,592; 2026: 43,290; 2027: 43,987; 2028: 44,685; 2029: 45,382; 2030: 46,080; 2031: 46,777; 2032: 47,475; 2033: 48,172; 2034: 48,870; 2035: 49,567; 2036: 50,265; 2037: 50,962; 2038: 51,660; 2039: 52,357; 2040: 53,055; 2041: 53,752; 2042: 54,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 41 | 5 F | Urban | $1448+14.880$ | $1448+51.680$ | 36.80 | 0.0070 | 2022: 51,850; 2023: 52,742; 2024: 53,635; 2025: 54,527; 2026: 55,420; 2027: 56,312; 2028: 57,205; 2029: 58,097; 2030: 58,990; 2031: 59,882; 2032: 60,775; 2033: 61,667; 2034: 62,560; 2035: 63,452; 2036: 64,345; 2037: 65,237; 2038: 66,130; 2039: 67,022; 2040: 67,915; 2041: 68,807; 2042: 69,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 45 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | $1448+51.680$ | $1461+68.620$ | 1,316.94 | 0.2494 | 2022: 64,300; 2023: 65,407; 2024: 66,515; 2025: 67,622; 2026: 68,730; 2027: 69,837; 2028: 70,945; 2029: 72,052; 2030: 73,160; 2031: 74,267; 2032: 75,375; 2033: 76,482; 2034: 77,590; 2035: 78,697; 2036: 79,805; 2037: 80,912; 2038: 82,020; 2039: 83,127; 2040: 84,235; 2041: 85,342; 2042: 86,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 50 | ${ }^{5 \mathrm{~F}}$ | Urban | 1461+68.620 | 1463+36.890 | 168.27 | 0.0319 | 2022: 59,750; 2023: 60,777; 2024: 61,805; 2025: 62,832; 2026: 63.860; 2027: 64,887; 2028: 65,915; 2029: 66,942; 2030: 67.970; 2031: 68,997; 2032: 70,025; 2033: 71,052; 2034: 72,080; 2035: 73,107; 2036: 74,135; 2037: 75,162; 2038: 76,190; 2039: 77,217; 2040: 78,245; 2041: 79,272; 2042: 80,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 54 | 4 F | Urban | 1463+36.890 | 1532+41.010 | 6,904.12 | 1.3076 | 2022: 54,750; 2023: 55,690; 2024: 56,630; 2025: 57,570; 2026: 58,510; 2027: 59,450; 2028: 60,390; 2029: 61,330; 2030: 62,270; 2031: 63,210; 2032: 64,150; 2033: 65,090; 2034: 66,030; 2035: 66,970; 2036: 67,910; 2037: 68,850; 2038: 69,790; 2039: 70,730; 2040: 71,670; 2041: 72,610; 2042: 73,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 55 | 4 F | Urban | 1532+41.010 | 1542+72.380 | 1,031.37 | 0.1953 | 2022: 64,950; 2023: 66,065; 2024: 67,180; 2025: 68,295; 2026: 69,410; 2027: 70,525; 2028: 71,640; 2029: 72,755; 2030: 73,870; 2031: 74,985; 2032: 76,100; 2033: 77,215; 2034: 78,330; 2035: 79,445; 2036: 80,560; 2037: 81,675; 2038: 82,790; 2039: 83,905; 2040: 85,020; 2041: 86,135; 2042: 87,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 57 | 4 F | Urban | 1542+72.380 | 1571+03.740 | 2,831.36 | 0.5362 | 2022: 74,850; 2023: 76,137; 2024: 77,425; 2025: 78,712; 2026: 80,000; 2027: 81,287; 2028: 82,575; 2029: 83,862; 2030: 85,150; 2031: 86,$437 ; 2032: 87,725 ; 2033: 89,012 ; 2034: 90,300 ; 2035: 91,587 ; 2036: 92,875 ; 2037: 94,162 ; 2038: 95,450 ; 2039: 96,737$; 2040: 98,025; 2041: 99,312; 2042: 100,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 61 | 4 F | Urban | 1571+03.740 | 1571+65.940 | 62.20 | 0.0118 | 2022: 68,050; 2023: 69,220; 2024: 70,390; 2025: 71,560; 2026: 72,730; 2027: 73,900; 2028: 75,070; 2029: 76,240; 2030: 77,410; 2031: 78,580; 2032: 79,750; 2033: 80,920; 2034: 82,090; 2035: 83,260; 2036: 84,430; 2037: 85,600; 2038: 86,770; 2039: 87,940; 2040: 89,110; 2041: 90,280; 2042: 91,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 63 | 4 F | Urban | 1571+65.940 | 1616+96.040 | 4,530.10 | 0.8580 | 2022: 61,500; 2023: 62,557; 2024: 63,615; 2025: 64,672; 2026: 65,730; 2027: 66,787; 2028: 67,845; 2029: 68,902; 2030: 69,960; 2031: 71,017; 2032: 72,075; 2033: 73,132; 2034: 74,190; 2035: 75,247; 2036: 76,305; 2037: 77,.362; 2038: 78,420; 2039: 79,477; 2040: 80,535; 2041: 81,592; 2042: 82,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 64 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 1616+96.040 | 1620+37.170 | 341.13 | 0.0646 | 2022: 70,500; 2023: 71,715; 2024: 72,930; 2025: 74,145; 2026: 75,360; 2027: 76,575; 2028: 77,790; 2029: 79,005; 2030: 80,220; 2031: 81,435; 2032: 82,650; 2033: 83,865; 2034: 85,080; 2035: 86,295; 2036: 87,510; 2037: 88,725; 2038: 89,940; 2039: 91,155; 2040: 92,370; 2041: 93,585; 2042: 94,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 65 | 8 F | Urban | 1620+37.170 | 1641+82.890 | 2,145.72 | 0.4064 | 2022: 82,100; 2023: 83,512; 2024: 84,925; 2025: 86,337; 2026: 87,750; 2027: 89,162; 2028: 90,575; 2029: 91,987; 2030: 93,400; 2031: 94,812; 2032: 96,225; 2033: 97,637; 2034: 99,050; 2035: 100,462; 2036: 101,875; 2037: 103,287; 2038: 104,700; 2039: 106,112; 2040: 107,525; 2041: 108,937; 2042: 110,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 66 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | $1641+82.890$ | 1752+45.780 | 11,062.89 | 2.0952 | 2022: 51,600; 2023: 52,485; 2024: 53,370; 2025: 54,255; 2026: 55,140; 2027: 56,025; 2028: 56,910; 2029: 57,795; 2030: 58,680; 2031: 59,565; 2032: 60,450; 2033: 61,335; 2034: 62,220; 2035: 63,105; 2036: 63,990; 2037: 64,875; 2038: 65,760; 2039: 66,645; 2040: 67,530; 2041: 68,415; 2042: 69,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 67 | 7 F | Urban | 1752+45.780 | 1774+96.080 | 2,250.30 | 0.4262 | 2022: 73,800; 2023: 75,067; 2024: 76,335; 2025: 77,602; 2026: 78,870; 2027: 80,137; 2028: 81,405; 2029: 82,672; 2030: 83,940; 2031: 85,207; 2032: 86,475; 2033: 87,742; 2034: 89,010; 2035: 90,277; 2036: 91,545; 2037: 92,812; 2038: 94,080; 2039: 95,347; 2040: 96,615; 2041: 97,882; 2042: 99,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 68 | 9 F | Urban | 1774+96.080 | 1802+00.210 | 2,704.13 | 0.5121 | 2022: 101,350; 2023: 103,092; 2024: 104,835; 2025: 106,577; 2026: 108,320; 2027: 110,062; 2028: 111,805; 2029: 113,547; 2030: 115,290; 2031: 117,032; 2032: 118,775; 2033: 120,517; 2034: 122,260; 2035: 124,002; 2036: 125,745; 2037: 127,487; 2038: 129,230; 2039: 130,972; 2040: 132,715; 2041: 134,457; 2042: 136,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 70 | 9 F | Urban | 1802+00.210 | 1802+34.860 | 34.65 | 0.0066 | 2022: 97,500; 2023: 99.177; 2024: 100,855; 2025: 102,532; 2026: 104,210; 2027: 105.887; 2028: 107.565; 2029: 109,242; 2030; 110,920; 2031: 112,597; 2032: 114,275; 2033: 115,952; 2034: 117,630; 2035: 119,307; 2036: 120,985; 2037: 122,662; 2038: 124,340; 2039: 126,017; 2040: 127,695; 2041: 129,372; 2042: 131,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 71 | 8 F | Urban | 1802+34.860 | 1858+89.680 | 5,654.82 | 1.0710 | 2022: 94,950; 2023: 96,585; 2024: 98,220; 2025: 99,855; 2026: 101,490; 2027: 103,125; 2028: 104,760; 2029: 106,395; 2030: 108,030; 2031: 109,665; 2032: 111,300; 2033: 112,935; 2034: 114,570; 2035: 116,205; 2036: 117,840; 2037: 119,475; 2038: 121,110; 2039: 122,745; 2040: 124,380; 2041: 126,015; 2042: 127,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 72 | 8 F | Urban | 1858+89.680 | 1862+31.360 | 341.68 | 0.0647 | 2022: 106,850; 2023: 108,687; 2024: 110,525; 2025: 112,362; 2026: 114,200; 2027: 116,037; 2028: 117,875; 2029: 119,712; 2030: 121,550; 2031: 123,387; 2032: 125,225; 2033: 127,062; 2034: 128,900; 2035: 130,737; 2036: 132,575; 2037: 134,412; 2038: 136,250; 2039: 138,087; 2040: 139,925; 2041: 141,762; 2042: 143,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 74 | 8 F | Urban | 1862+31.360 | 1937+57.720 | 7,526.36 | 1.4255 | 2022: 118,200; 2023: 120,230; 2024: 122,260; 2025: 124,290; 2026: 126,320; 2027: 128,350; 2028: 130,380; 2029: 132,410; 2030: 134,440; 2031: 136,470; 2032: 138,500; 2033: 140,530; 2034: 142,560; 2035: 144,590; 2036: 146,620; 2037: 148,650; 2038: 150,680; 2039: 152,$710 ; 2040: 154,740 ; 2041: 156,770 ; 2042: 158,800$ | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 77 | 8 F | Urban | 1937+57.720 | 1945+10.160 | 752.44 | 0.1425 | 2022: 114,600; 2023: 116,570; 2024: 118,540; 2025: 120,510; 2026: 122,480; 2027: 124,450; 2028: 126,420; 2029: 128,390; 2030: 130,360; 2031: 132,330; 2032: 134,300; 2033: 136,270; 2034: 138,240; 2035: 140,210; 2036: 142,180; 2037: 144,150; 2038: 146,120; 2039: 148,090; 2040: 150,060; 2041: 152,030; 2042: 154,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 79 | ${ }^{8 F}$ | Urban | 1945+10.160 | 1962+27.940 | 1,717.78 | 0.3253 | 2022: 108,750; 2023: 110,622; 2024: 112,495; 2025: 114,367; 2026: 116,240; 2027: 118,112; 2028: 119,985; 2029: 121,857; 2030: 123,730; 2031: 125,602; 2032: 127,475; 2033: 129,347; 2034: 131,220; 2035: 133,092; 2036: 134,965; 2037: 136,837; 2038: 138,710; 2039: 140,582; 2040: 142,455; 2041: 144,327; 2042: 146,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Start Location } \\ (\text { Sta. } \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80 | 8 F | Urban | 1962+27.940 | 1969+25.480 | 697.54 | 0.1321 | 2022: 112,750; 2023: 114,690; 2024: 116,630; 2025: 118,570; 2026: 120,510; 2027: 122,450; 2028: 124,390; 2029: 126,330; 2030: 128,270; 2031: 130,210; 2032: 132,150; 2033: 134,090; 2034: 136,030; 2035: 137,970; 2036: 139,910; 2037: 141,850; 2038: 143,790; 2039: 145,730; 2040: 147,670; 2041: 149,610; 2042: 151,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 82 | 8 F | Urban | 1969+25.480 | 1983+70.120 | 1,444.64 | 0.2736 | 2022: 122,250; 2023: 124,352; 2024: 126,455; 2025: 128,557; 2026: 130,660; 2027: 132,762; 2028: 134,865; 2029: 136,967; 2030: 139,070; 2031: 141,172; 2032: 143,275; 2033: 145,377; 2034: 147,480; 2035: 149,582; 2036: 151,685; 2037: 153,787; 2038: 155,890; 2039: 157,992; 2040: 160,095; 2041: 162,197; 2042: 164,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 85 | ${ }^{8 F}$ | Urban | 1983+70.120 | 1992+04.960 | 834.84 | 0.1581 | 2022: 121,150; 2023: 123,232; 2024: 125,315; 2025: 127,397; 2026: 129,480; 2027: 131,562; 2028: 133,645; 2029: 135,727; 2030: 137,810; 2031: 139,892; 2032: 141,975; 2033: 144,057; 2034: 146,140; 2035: 148,222; 2036: 150,305; 2037: 152,.387; 2038: 154,470; 2039: 156,552; 2040: 158,635; 2041: 160,717; 2042: 162,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 86 | 8 F | Urban | 1992+04.960 | 1993+20.390 | 115.43 | 0.0219 | 2022: 123,950; 2023: 126,080; 2024: 128,210; 2025: 130,340; 2026: 132,470; 2027: 134,600; 2028: 136,730; 2029: 138,860; 2030: 140,990; 2031: 143,120; 2032: 145,250; 2033: 147,380; 2034: 149,510; 2035: 151,640; 2036: 153,770; 2037: 155,900; 2038: 158,030; 2039: 160,160; 2040: 162,$290 ; 2041: 164,420 ; 2042: 166,550$ | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 88 | 8 F | Urban | 1993+20.390 | 2006+55.130 | 1,334.74 | 0.2528 | 2022: 130,350; 2023: 132,590; 2024: 134,830; 2025: 137,070; 2026: 139,310; 2027: 141,550; 2028: 143,790; 2029: 146,030; 2030: 148,270; 2031: 150,510; 2032: 152,750; 2033: 154,990; 2034: 157,230; 2035: 159,470; 2036: 161,710; 2037: 163,950; 2038: 166,190; 2039: 168,430; 2040: 170,670; 2041: 172,910; 2042: 175,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 92 | 7 F | Urban | 2006+55.130 | 2006+91.220 | 36.09 | 0.0068 | 2022: 121,900; 2023: 123,997; 2024: 126,095; 2025: 128,192; 2026: 130,290; 2027: 132,387; 2028: 134,485; 2029: 136,582; 2030: 138,680; 2031: 140,777; 2032: 142,875; 2033: 144,972; 2034: 147,070; 2035: 149,167; 2036: 151,265; 2037: 153,362; 2038: 155,460; 2039: 157,557; 2040: 159,655; 2041: 161,752; 2042: 163,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 94 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2006+91.220 | 2045+17.910 | 3,826.69 | 0.7248 | 2022: 112,900; 2023: 114,842; 2024: 116,785; 2025: 118,727; 2026: 120,670; 2027: 122,612; 2028: 124,555; 2029: 126,497; 2030: 128,440; 2031: 130,382; 2032: 132,325; 2033: 134,267; 2034: 136,210; 2035: 138,152; 2036: 140,095; 2037: 142,037; 2038: 143,980; 2039: 145,922; 2040: 147,865; 2041: 149,807; 2042: 151,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 95 | 7 F | Urban | 2045+17.910 | 2046+03.220 | 85.31 | 0.0162 | 2022: 120,650; 2023: 122,722; 2024: 124,795; 2025: 126,867; 2026: 128,940; 2027: 131,012; 2028: 133,085; 2029: 135,157; 2030: 137,230; 2031: 139,302; 2032: 141,375; 2033: 143,447; 2034: 145,520; 2035: 147,592; 2036: 149,665; 2037: 151,737; 2038: 153,810; 2039: 155,882; 2040: 157,955; 2041: 160,027; 2042: 162,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 97 | 8 F | Urban | 2046+03.220 | 2049+38.400 | 335.18 | 0.0635 | 2022: 133,950; 2023: 136,252; 2024: 138,555; 2025: 140,857; 2026: 143,160; 2027: 145,462; 2028: 147,765; 2029: 150,067; 2030: 152,370; 2031: 154,672; 2032: 156,975; 2033: 159,277; 2034: 161,580; 2035: 163,882; 2036: 166, 185; 2037: 168,487; 2038: 170,790; 2039: 173,092; 2040: 175,395; 2041: 177,697; 2042: 180,000 <br> 2038: 170,79, 203.: 173,092, 2070: 175,355, 2041: 177,697, 2042: 180,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 99 | 9 F | Urban | 2049+38.400 | 2051+11.970 | 173.57 | 0.0329 | 2022: 148,750; 2023: 151,310; 2024: 153,870; 2025: 156,430; 2026: 158,990; 2027: 161,550; 2028: 164,110; 2029: 166,670; 2030: 169,230; 2031: 171,790; 2032: 174,350; 2033: 176,910; 2034: 179,470; 2035: 182,030; 2036: 184,590; 2037: 187,150; 2038: 189,710; 2039: 192,270; 2040: 194,830; 2041: 197,390; 2042: 199,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 101 | 10F | Urban | 2051+11.970 | 2067+62.740 | 1,650.77 | 0.3126 | 2022: 158,450; 2023: 161,175; 2024: 163,900; 2025: 166,625; 2026: 169,350; 2027: 172,075; 2028: 174,800; 2029: 177,525; 2030: 180,250; 2031: 182,975; 2032: 185,700; 2033: 188,425; 2034: 191,150; 2035: 193,875; 2036: 196,600; 2037: 199,325; 2038: 202,050; 2039: 204,775; 2040: 207,500; 2041: 210,225; 2042: 212,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 104 | 10F | Urban | 2067+62.740 | 2072+80.530 | 517.79 | 0.0981 | 2022: 155,400; 2023: 158,070; 2024: 160,740; 2025: 163,410; 2026: 166,080; 2027: 168,750; 2028: 171,420; 2029: 174,090; 2030: 176,760; 2031: 179,430; 2032: 182,100; 2033: 184,770; 2034: 187,440; 2035: 190,110; 2036: 192,780; 2037: 195,450; 2038: 198,120; 2039: 200,790; 2040: 203,460; 2041: 206,130; 2042: 208,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 106 | 10F | Urban | 2072+80.530 | 2096+65.070 | 2,384.54 | 0.4516 | 2022: 152,400; 2023: 155,020; 2024: 157,640; 2025: 160,260; 2026: 162,880; 2027: 165,500; 2028: 168,120; 2029: 170,740; 2030: 173,360; 2031: 175,980; 2032: 178,600; 2033: 181,220; 2034: 183,840; 2035: 186,460; 2036: 189,080; 2037: 191,700; 2038: 194,320; 2039: 196,940; 2040: 199,560; 2041: 202, 180; 2042: 204,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 108 | 10F | Urban | 2096+65.070 | 2108+05.270 | 1,140.20 | 0.2160 | 2022: 162,300; 2023: 165,090; 2024: 167,880; 2025: 170,670; 2026: 173,460; 2027: 176,250; 2028: 179,040; 2029: 181,830; 2030: 184,620; 2031: 187,410; 2032: 190,200; 2033: 192,990; 2034: 195,780; 2035: 198,570; 2036: 201,360; 2037: 204,150; 2038: 206,940; 2039: 209,730; 2040: 212,520; 2041: 215,310; 2042: 218,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 112 | 10F | Urban | 2108+05.270 | 2112+02.880 | 397.61 | 0.0753 | 2022: 158.150; 2023: 160,870; 2024: 163.590; 2025: 166.310; 2026: 169.030; 2027: 171.750; 2028: 174.470; 2029: 177, 190; 2030: 179,910; 2031: 182,630; 2032: 185,350; 2033: 188,070; 2034: 190,790; 2035: 193,510; 2036: 196,230; 2037: 198,950; 2038: 201.670; 2039: 204.390; 2040: 207.110; 2041: 209.830; 2042: 212.550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 115 | 10F | Urban | 2112+02.880 | 2132+94.000 | 2,091.12 | 0.3961 | 2022: 152,800; 2023: 155,427; 2024: 158,055; 2025: 160,682; 2026: 163,310; 2027: 165,937; 2028: 168,565; 2029: 171,192; 2030: 173,820; 2031: 176,447; 2032: 179,075; 2033: 181,702; 2034: 184,330; 2035: 186,957; 2036: 189,585; 2037: 192,212; 2038: 194,840; 2039: 197,467; 2040: 200,095; 2041: 202,722; 2042: 205,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 118 | 10F | Urban | 2132+94.000 | 2141+38.040 | 844.04 | 0.1599 | 2022: 163,000; 2023: 165,802; 2024: 168,605; 2025: 171,407; 2026: 174,210; 2027: 177,012; 2028: 179,815; 2029: 182,617; 2030: 185,420; 2031: 188,222; 2032: 191,025; 2033: 193,827; 2034: 196,630; 2035: 199,432; 2036: 202,235; 2037: 205,037; 2038: 207,840; 2039: 210,642; 2040: 213,445; 2041: 216,247; 2042: 219,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 121 | 10F | Urban | 2141+38.040 | 2142+01.770 | 63.73 | 0.0121 | 2022: 160,600; 2023: 163,360; 2024: 166,120; 2025: 168,880; 2026: 171,640; 2027: 174,400; 2028: 177,160; 2029: 179,920; 2030: 182,680; 2031: 185,440; 2032: 188,200; 2033: 190,960; 2034: 193,720; 2035: 196,480; 2036: 199,240; 2037: 202,000; 2038: 204,760; 2039: 207,520; 2040: 210,280; 2041: 213,040; 2042: 215,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 123 | 10F | Urban | 2142+01.770 | $2156+10.790$ | 1,409.02 | 0.2669 | 2022: 156,300; 2023: 158,987; 2024: 161,675; 2025: 164,362; 2026: 167,050; 2027: 169,737; 2028: 172,425; 2029: 175,112; 2030: 177,800; 2031: 180,487; 2032: 183,175; 2033: 185,862; 2034: 188,550; 2035: 191,237; 2036: 193,925; 2037: 196,612; 2038: 199,300; 2039: 201,987; 2040: 204,675; 2041: 207,362; 2042: 210,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 124 | 8 F | Urban | $2156+10.790$ | 2159+38.930 | 328.14 | 0.0621 | 2022: 136,700; 2023: 139,050; 2024: 141,400; 2025: 143,750; 2026: 146,100; 2027: 148.450; 2028: 150.800; 2029: 153.150; 2030: 155,500; 2031: 157,850; 2032: 160,200; 2033: 162,550; 2034: 164,900; 2035: 167,250; 2036: 169,600; 2037: 171,950; 2038: 174,300; 2039: 176,650; 2040: 179,000; 2041: 181,350; 2042: 183,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | Start Location (Sta.ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Type | Effective Median Width (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 125 | 8 F | Urban | 2159+38.930 | 2171+54.400 | 1,215.47 | 0.2302 | 2022: 142.500; 2023: 144,952; 2024: 147,405; 2025: 149.,857; 2026: 152,310; 2027: 154,762; 2028: 157, 215; 2029: 159,.667; 2030: 162,120; 2031: 164,572; ; 2032: 167,025; 2033: 169,477; 2034: 171,930; 2035: 174,382; 2036: 176,835; 2037: 179,287; 2038: 181,740; 2039: 184,192; 2040: 186,645; 2041: 189,097; 2042: 191,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 127 | 7 F | Urban | 2171+54.400 | $2183+64.830$ | 1,210.43 | 0.2293 | 2022: 123,850; 2023: 125,980; 2024: 128,110; 2025: 130,240; 2026: 132,370; 2027: 134,500; 2028: 136,630; 2029: 138,760; 2030: 140,890; 2031: 143,020; 2032: 145,150; 2033: 147,280; 2034: 149,410; 2035: 151,540; 2036: 153,670; 2037: 155,800; 2038: 157,930; 2039: 160,060; 2040: 162,190; 2041: 164,320; 2042: 166,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 130 | ${ }^{8 F}$ | Urban | $2183+64.830$ | $2187+07.690$ | 342.86 | 0.0649 | 2022: 130,200; 2023: 132,440; 2024: 134,680; 2025: 136,920; 2026: 139,160; 2027: 141,400; 2028: 143,640; 2029: 145,880; 2030: 148,120; 2031: 150,360; 2032: 152,600; 2033: 154,840; 2034: 157,080; 2035: 159,320; 2036: 161,560; 2037: 163,800; 2038: 166,040; 2039: 168,280; 2040: 170,520; 2041: 172,760; 2042: 175,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 134 | 9 F | Urban | 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | 1,058.75 | 0.2005 | 2022: 135,250; 2023: 137,577; 2024: 139,905; 2025: 142,232; 2026: 144,560; 2027: 146,887; 2028: 149,215; 2029: 151,542; 2030: 153,870; 2031: 156,197; 2032: 158,525; 2033: 160,852; 2034: 163,180; 2035: 165,507; 2036: 167,835; 2037: 170,162; 2038: 172,490; 2039: 174,817; 2040: 177,145; 2041: 179,472; 2042: 181,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 139 | 8 F | Urban | 2197+66.440 | $2198+41.760$ | 75.32 | 0.0143 | 2022: 129,650; 2023: 131,880; 2024: 134,110; 2025: 136,340; 2026: 138,570; 2027: 140,800; 2028: 143,030; 2029: 145,260; 2030: 147,490; 2031: 149,720; 2032: 151,950; 2033: 154,180; 2034: 156,410; 2035: 158,640; 2036: 160,870; 2037: 163,100; 2038: 165,330; 2039: 167,560; 2040: 169,790; 2041: 172,020; 2042: 174,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 144 | 7 F | Urban | $2198+41.760$ | $2201+64.630$ | 322.87 | 0.0612 | 2022: 128,850; 2023: 131,065; 2024: 133,280; 2025: 135,495; 2026: 137,710; 2027: 139,925; 2028: 142,140; 2029: 144,355; 2030: 146,570; 2031: 148,785; 2032: 151,000; 2033: 153,215; 2034: 155,430; 2035: 157,645; 2036: 159,860; 2037: 162,075; 2038: 164,290; 2039: 166,505; 2040: 168,720; 2041: 170,935; 2042: 173,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 147 | 7 F | Urban | 2201+64.630 | $2216+63.010$ | 1,498.38 | 0.2838 | 2022: 123,700; 2023: 125,827; 2024: 127,955; 2025: 130,082; 2026: 132,210; 2027: 134,337; 2028: 136,465; 2029: 138,592; 2030: 140,720; 2031: 142,847; 2032: 144,975; 2033: 147,102; 2034: 149,230; 2035: 151,357; 2036: 153,485; 2037: 155,612; 2038: 157,740; 2039: 159,867; 2040: 161,995; 2041: 164,122; 2042: 166,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 148 | 7 F | Urban | 2216+63.010 | $2221+59.740$ | 496.73 | 0.0941 | 2022: 142,150; 2023: 144,595; 2024: 147,040; 2025: 149,485; 2026: 151,930; 2027: 154,375; 2028: 156,820; 2029: 159,265; 2030: 161,710; 2031: 164,155; 2032: 166,600; 2033: 169,045; 2034: 171,490; 2035: 173,935; 2036: 176,380; 2037: 178,825; 2038: 181,270; 2039: 183,715; 2040: 186,160; 2041: 188,605; 2042: 191,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 150 | 9 F | Urban | 2221+59.740 | 2230+01.910 | 842.17 | 0.1595 | 2022: 161,650; 2023: 164,430; 2024: 167,210; 2025: 169,990; 2026: 172,770; 2027: 175,550; 2028: 178,330; 2029: 181,110; 2030: 183,890; 2031: 186,670; 2032: 189,450; 2033: 192,230; 2034: 195,010; 2035: 197,790; 2036: 200,570; 2037: 203,350; 2038: 206,130; 2039: 208,910; 2040: 211,690; 2041: 214,470; 2042: 217,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 153 | 8 F | Urban | 2230+01.910 | 2234+63.570 | 461.66 | 0.0874 | 2022: 155,100; 2023: 157,767; 2024: 160,435; 2025: 163,102; 2026: 165,770; 2027: 168,437; 2028: 171,105; 2029: 173,772; 2030: 176,440; 2031: 179,107; 2032: 181,775; 2033: 184,442; 2034: 187,110; 2035: 189,777; 2036: 192,445; 2037: 195,112; 2038: 197,780; 2039: 200,447; 2040: 203,115; 2041: 205,782; 2042: 208,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 155 | 8 F | Urban | 2234+63.570 | 2240+93.000 | 629.43 | 0.1192 | 2022: 159,550; 2023: 162,292; 2024: 165,035; 2025: 167,777; 2026: 170,520; 2027: 173,262; 2028: 176,005; 2029: 178,747; 2030: 181,490; 2031: 184,232; 2032: 186,975; 2033: 189,717; 2034: 192,460; 2035: 195,202; 2036: 197,945; 2037: 200,687; 2038: 203,430; 2039: 206, 172; 2040: 208,915; 2041: 211,657; 2042: 214,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 157 | 8 F | Urban | 2240+93.000 | 2245+71.310 | 478.31 | 0.0906 | 2022: 164,350; 2023: 167,175; 2024: 170,000; 2025: 172,825; 2026: 175,650; 2027: 178,475; 2028: 181,300; 2029: 184,125; 2030: 186,950; 2031: 189,775; 2032: 192,600; 2033: 195,425; 2034: 198,250; 2035: 201,075; 2036: 203,900; 2037: 206,725; 2038: 209,550; 2039: 212,375; 2040: 215,200; 2041: 218,025; 2042: 220,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 160 | 8 F | Urban | 2245+71.310 | $2258+50.450$ | 1,279.14 | 0.2423 | 2022: 157.,50; 2023: 160,260; 2024: 162.970; 2025: 165.680; 2026: 168.390; 2027: 171,100; 2028: 173,810; 2029: 176,520; 2030: 179,230; 2031: 181,940; 2032: 184,650; 2033: 187,360; 2034: 190,070; 2035: 192,780; 2036: 195,490; 2037: 198,200; 2038: 200,910; 2039: 203,620; 2040: 206, 330; 2041: 209,040; 2042: 211,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 163 | ${ }^{8 F}$ | Urban | $2258+50.450$ | 2258+79.500 | 29.05 | 0.0055 | 2022: 152,000; 2023: 154,615; 2024: 157,230; 2025: 159,845; 2026: 162,460; 2027: 165,075; 2028: 167,690; 2029: 170,305; 2030: 172,920; 2031: 175,535; 2032: 178,150; 2033: 180,765; 2034: 183,380; 2035: 185,995; 2036: 188,610; 2037: 191,225; 2038: 193,840; 2039: 196,455; 2040: 199,070; 2041: 201,685; 2042: 204,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 165 | 8 F | Urban | 2258+79.500 | $2268+46.280$ | 966.78 | 0.1831 | 2022: 146,250; 2023: 148,767; 2024: 151,285; 2025: 153,802; 2026: 156,320; 2027: 158,837; 2028: 161,355; 2029: 163,872; 2030: 166,390; 2031: 168,907; 2032: 171,425; 2033: 173,942; 2034: 176,460; 2035: 178,977; 2036: 181,495; 2037: 184,012; 2038: 186,530; 2039: 189,047; 2040: 191,565; 2041: 194,082; 2042: 196,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 166 | 8 F | Urban | $2268+46.280$ | 2274+72.630 | 626.35 | 0.1186 | 2022: 151,650; 2023: 154,260; 2024: 156,870; 2025: 159,480; 2026: 162,090; 2027: 164,700; 2028: 167,310; 2029: 169,920; 2030: 172,530; 2031: 175,140; 2032: 177,750; 2033: 180,360; 2034: 182,970; 2035: 185,580; 2036: 188,190; 2037: 190,800; 2038: 193,410; 2039: 196,020; 2040: 198,630; 2041: 201,240; 2042: 203,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 169 | 8 F | Urban | 2274+72.630 | 2284+00.230 | 927.60 | 0.1757 | 2022: 142,750; 2023: 145,205; 2024: 147,660; 2025: 150,115; 2026: 152,570; 2027: 155,025; 2028: 157,480; 2029: 159,935; 2030: 162,390; 2031: 164,845; 2032: 167,300; 2033: 169,755; 2034: 172,210; 2035: 174,665; 2036: 177,120; 2037: 179,575; 2038: 182,030; 2039: 184,485; 2040: 186,940; 2041: 189,395; 2042: 191,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 171 | 8 F | Urban | $2284+00.230$ | 2289+18.000 | 517.77 | 0.0981 | 2022: 134,700; 2023: 137,017; 2024: 139,335; 2025: 141,652; 2026: 143,970; 2027: 146,287; 2028: 148,605; 2029: 150,922; 2030: 153,240; 2031: 155,557; 2032: 157,875; 2033: 160,192; 2034: 162,510; 2035: 164,827; 2036: 167,145; 2037: 169,462; 2038: 171,780; 2039: 174,097; 2040: 176,415; 2041: 178,732; 2042: 181,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 172 | ${ }^{8 F}$ | Urban | 2289+18.000 | 2319+47.290 | 3,029.29 | 0.5737 | 2022: 144,400; 2023: 146,885; 2024: 149,370; 2025: 151,855; 2026: 154,340; 2027: 156,825; 2028: 159,310; 2029: 161,795; 2030: 164,280; 2031: 166,765; 2032: 169,250; 2033: 171,735; 2034: 174,220; 2035: 176,705; 2036: 179,190; 2037: 181,675; 2038: 184,160; 2039: 186,645; 2040: 189,130; 2041: 191,615; 2042: 194,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 174 | 9 F | Urban | 2319+47.290 | 2324+20.370 | 473.08 | 0.0896 | 2022: 154,750; 2023: 157,410; 2024: 160,070; 2025: 162,730; 2026: 165,390; 2027: 168,050; 2028: 170,710; 2029: 173,370; 2030: 176,030; 2031: 178,690; 2032: 181,350; 2033: 184,010; 2034: 186,670; 2035: 189,330; 2036: 191,990; 2037: 194,650; 2038: 197,310; 2039: 199,970; 2040: 202,630; 2041: 205,290; 2042: 207,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Start Location } \\ (\text { Sta. } \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 175 | 10F | Urban | 2324+20.370 | 2342+71.190 | 1,850.82 | 0.3505 | 2022: 160,600; 2023: 163,360; 2024: 166,120; 2025: 168,880; 2026: 171,640; 2027: 174,400; 2028: 177,160; 2029: 179,920; 2030: 182,680; 2031: 185,440; 2032: 188,200; 2033: 190,960; 2034: 193,720; 2035: 196,480; 2036: 199,240; 2037: 202,000; 2038: 204,760; 2039: 207,520; 2040: 210,280; 2041: 213,040; 2042: 215,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 176 | 9 F | Urban | 2342+71.190 | $2343+28.110$ | 56.92 | 0.0108 | 2022: 152,500; 2023: 155,122; 2024: 157,745; 2025: 160,367; 2026: 162,990; 2027: 165,612; 2028: 168,235; 2029: 170,857; 2030: 173,480; 2031: 176,102; 2032: 178,725; 2033: 181,347; 2034: 183,970; 2035: 186,592; 2036: 189,215; 2037: 191,837; 2038: 194,460; 2039: 197,082; 2040: 199,705; 2041: 202,327; 2042: 204,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 177 | ${ }^{8 F}$ | Urban | $2343+28.110$ | 2365+64.260 | 2,236.15 | 0.4235 | 2022: 143,450; 2023: 145,917; 2024: 148,385; 2025: 150,852; 2026: 153,320; 2027: 155,787; 2028: 158,255; 2029: 160,722; 2030: 163,190; 2031: 165,657; 2032: 168,125; 2033: 170,592; 2034: 173,060; 2035: 175,527; 2036: 177,995; 2037: 180,462; 2038: 182,930; 2039: 185,397; 2040: 187,865; 2041: 190,332; 2042: 192,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 180 | 8 F | Urban | 2365+64.260 | $2366+17.960$ | 53.70 | 0.0102 | 2022: 131,400; 2023: 133,660; 2024: 135,920; 2025: 138,180; 2026: 140,440; 2027: 142,700; 2028: 144,960; 2029: 147,220; 2030: 149,480; 2031: 151,740; 2032: 154,000; 2033: 156,260; 2034: 158,520; 2035: 160,780; 2036: 163,040; 2037: 165,300; 2038: 167,560; 2039: 169,820; 2040: 172,080; 2041: 174,340; 2042: 176,600 2038: $16,500,203: 1,8,82,202: 12,000,2031: 17,310,202: 17,60$ | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 182 | 8 F | Urban | $2366+17.960$ | 2401+60.950 | 3,542.99 | 0.6710 | 2022: 120,000; 2023: 122,065; 2024: 124,130; 2025: 126,195; 2026: 128,260; 2027: 130,325; 2028: 132,390; 2029: 134,455; 2030: 136,520; 2031: 138,585; 2032: 140,650; 2033: 142,715; 2034: 144,780; 2035: 146,845; 2036: 148,910; 2037: 150,975; 2038: 153,040; 2039: 155,105; 2040: 157,170; 2041: 159,235; 2042: 161,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 184 | 8 F | Urban | 2401+60.950 | 2402+12.440 | 51.49 | 0.0097 | 2022: 126,150; 2023: 128,322; 2024: 130,495; 2025: 132,667; 2026: 134,840; 2027: 137,012; 2028: 139,185; 2029: 141,357; 2030: 143,530; 2031: 145,702; 2032: 147,875; 2033: 150,047; 2034: 152,220; 2035: 154,392; 2036: 156,565; 2037: 158,737; 2038: 160,910; 2039: 163,082; 2040: 165,255; 2041: 167,427; 2042: 169,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 186 | 9 F | Urban | 2402+12.440 | 2414+12.230 | 1,199.79 | 0.2272 | 2022: 134,550; 2023: 136,865; 2024: 139,180; 2025: 141,495; 2026: 143,810; 2027: 146,125; 2028: 148,440; 2029: 150,755; 2030: 153,070; 2031: 155,385; 2032: 157,700; 2033: 160,015; 2034: 162,330; 2035: 164,645; 2036: 166,960; 2037: 169,275; 2038: 171,590; 2039: 173,905; 2040: 176,220; 2041: 178,535; 2042: 180,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 189 | 9 F | Urban | 2414+12.230 | 2424+35.910 | 1,023.68 | 0.1939 | 2022: 126,250; 2023: 128,422; 2024: 130,595; 2025: 132,767; 2026: 134,940; 2027: 137,112; 2028: 139,285; 2029: 141,457; 2030: 143,630; 2031: 145,802; 2032: 147,975; 2033: 150,147; 2034: 152,320; 2035: 154,492; 2036: 156,665; 2037: 158,837; 2038: 161,010; 2039: 163,182; 2040: 165,355; 2041: 167,527; 2042: 169,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 190 | 9 F | Urban | 2424+35.910 | 2427+01.170 | 265.26 | 0.0502 | 2022: 123,000; 2023: 125,117; 2024: 127,235; 2025: 129,352; 2026: 131,470; 2027: 133,587; 2028: 135,705; 2029: 137,822; 2030: 139,940; 2031: 142,057; 2032: 144,175; 2033: 146,292; 2034: 148,410; 2035: 150,527; 2036: 152,$645 ; 2037: 154,762$; 2038: 156,880; 2039: 158,$997 ; 2040: 161,115 ; 2041: 163,232 ; 2042: 165,350$ | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 191 | 8 F | Urban | 2427+01.170 | 2443+40.790 | 1,639.62 | 0.3105 | 2022: 119,750; 2023: 121,812; 2024: 123,875; 2025: 125,937; 2026: 128,000; 2027: 130,062; 2028: 132,125; 2029: 134,187; 2030: 136,250; 2031: 138,312; 2032: 140,375; 2033: 142,437; 2034: 144,500; 2035: 146,562; 2036: 148,625; 2037: 150,687; 2038: 152,750; 2039: 154,812; 2040: 156,875; 2041: 158,937; 2042: 161,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 192 | 8 F | Urban | 2443+40.790 | 2450+69.650 | 728.86 | 0.1380 | 2022: 128,900; 2023: 131,117; 2024: 133,335; 2025: 135,552; 2026: 137,770; 2027: 139,987; 2028: 142,205; 2029: 144,422; 2030: 146,640; 2031: 148,857; 2032: 151,075; 2033: 153,292; 2034: 155,510; 2035: 157,727; 2036: 159,945; 2037: 162,162; 2038: 164,380; 2039: 166,597; 2040: 168,815; 2041: 171,032; 2042: 173,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 194 | 8 F | Urban | 2450+69.650 | 2471+86.300 | 2,116.65 | 0.4009 | 2022: 135,700; 2023: 138,032; 2024: 140,365; 2025: 142,697; 2026: 145,030; 2027: 147,362; 2028: 149,695; 2029: 152,027; 2030: 154,360; 2031: 156,692; 2032: 159,025; 2033: 161,357; 2034: 163,690; 2035: 166,022; 2036: 168,355; 2037: 170,687; 2038: 173,020; 2039: 175,352; 2040: 177,685; 2041: 180,017; 2042: 182,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 197 | 7 F | Urban | 2471+86.300 | 2473+42.600 | 156.30 | 0.0296 | 2022: 125,$850 ; 2023: 128,012 ; 2024: 130,175 ; 2025$ : 132,337; 2026: 134,500; 2027: 136,662; 2028: 138,825; 2029: 140,987 ; 2030: 143,150; 2031: 145,312; 2032: 147,475; 2033: 149,637; 2034: 151,800; 2035: 153,962; 2036: 156,125; 2037: 158,287; 2038: 160,450; 2039: 162,612; 2040: 164,775; 2041: 166,937; 2042: 169,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 198 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2473+42.600 | 2501+93.380 | 2,850.78 | 0.5399 | 2022: 115,700; 2023: 117,687; 2024: 119,675; 2025: 121,662; 2026: 123,650; 2027: 125,637; 2028: 127,625; 2029: 129,612; 2030: 131,600; 2031: 133,587; 2032: 135,575; 2033: 137,562; 2034: 139,550; 2035: 141,537; 2036: 143,525; 2037: 145,512; 2038: 147,500; 2039: 149,487; 2040: 151,475; 2041: 153,462; 2042: 155,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 199 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2501+93.380 | $2506+47.600$ | 454.22 | 0.0860 | 2022: 122,650; 2023: 124,757; 2024: 126,865; 2025: 128.972; 2026: 131,080; 2027: 133,187; 2028: 135,295; 2029: 137,402; 2030: 139,510; 2031: 141,617; 2032: 143,725; 2033: 145,832; 2034: 147,940; 2035: 150,047; 2036: 152,155; 2037: 154,262; 2038: 156,370; 2039: 158,477; 2040: 160,585; 2041: 162,692; 2042: 164,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 201 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2506+47.600 | 2519+74.560 | 1,326.96 | 0.2513 | 2022: 129,350; 2023: 131,575; 2024: 133,800; 2025: 136,025; 2026: 138,250; 2027: 140,475; 2028: 142,700; 2029: 144,925; 2030: 147,150; 2031: 149,375; 2032: 151,600; 2033: 153,825; 2034: 156,050; 2035: 158,275; 2036: 160,500; 2037: 162,725; 2038: 164,950; 2039: 167,175; 2040: 169,400; 2041: 171,625; 2042: 173,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 206 | 6 F | Urban | 2519+74.560 | 2521+89.240 | 214.68 | 0.0407 | 2022: 122,300; 2023: 124,405; 2024: 126,510; 2025: 128,615; 2026: 130,720; 2027: 132,825; 2028: 134,930; 2029: 137,035; 2030: 139,140; 2031: 141,245; 2032: 143,350; 2033: 145,455; 2034: 147,560; 2035: 149,665; 2036: 151,770; 2037: 153,875; 2038: 155,980; 2039: 158,085; 2040: 160,190; 2041: 162,295; 2042: 164,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 208 | 6 F | Urban | 2521+89.240 | 2545+80.950 | 2,391.71 | 0.4530 | 2022: 110,400; 2023: 112,300; 2024: 114,200; 2025: 116,100; 2026: 118,000; 2027: 119,900; 2028: 121,800; 2029: 123,700; 2030: 125,600; 2031: 127,500; 2032: 129,400; 2033: 131,300; 2034: 133,200; 2035: 135,100; 2036: 137,000; 2037: 138,900; 2038: 140,800; 2039: 142,700; 2040: 144,600; 2041: 146,500; 2042: 148,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 209 | 7F | Urban | $2545+80.950$ | 2550+11.330 | 430.38 | 0.0815 | 2022: 116,550; 2023: 118,555; 2024: 120,560; 2025: 122,565; 2026: 124,570; 2027: 126,575; 2028: 128,580; 2029: 130,585; 2030: 132,590; 2031: 134,595; 2032: 136,600; 2033: 138,605; 2034: 140,610; 2035: 142,615; 2036: 144,620; 2037: 146,625; 2038: 148,630; 2039: 150,635; 2040: 152,640; 2041: 154,645; 2042: 156,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 210 | 7 F | Urban | 2550+11.330 | 2569+42.420 | 1,931.09 | 0.3657 | 2022: 124,050; 2023: 126.182; 2024: 128.315; 2025: 130,447; 2026: 132.580; 2027: 134,712; 2028: 136,845; 2029: 138.977; 2030: 141,110; 2031: 143,242; 2032: 145,375; 2033: 147,507; 2034: 149,640; 2035: 151,772; 2036: 153,905; 2037: 156,037; 2038: 158,170; 2039: 160,302; 2040: 162,435; 2041: 164,567; 2042: 166,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | Start Location (Sta. ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \begin{array}{c} \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 213 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2569+42.420 | 2572+70.470 | 328.05 | 0.0621 | 2022: 116,000; 2023: 117,995; 2024: 119,990; 2025: 121,985; 2026: 123,980; 2027: 125,975; 2028: 127,970; 2029: 129,965; 2030: 131,960; 2031: 133,955; 2032: 135,950; 2033: 137,945; 2034: 139,940; 2035: 141,935; 2036: 143,930; 2037: 145,925; 2038: 147,920; 2039: 149,915; 2040: 151,910; 2041: 153,905; 2042: 155,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 215 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2572+70.470 | 2590+47.570 | 1,777.10 | 0.3366 | 2022: 108,000; 2023: 109,860; 2024: 111,720; 2025: 113.580; 2026: 115,440; 2027: 117,300; 2028: 119,160; 2029: 121,020; 2030: 122,880; 2031: 124,740; 2032: 126,600; 2033: 128,460; 2034: 130,320; 2035: 132,180; 2036: 134,040; 2037: 135,900; 2038: 137,760; 2039: 139,620; 2040: 141,480; 2041: 143,340; 2042: 145,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 217 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2590+47.570 | 2598+01.640 | 754.07 | 0.1428 | 2022: 94,700; 2023: 96,330; 2024: 97,960; 2025: 99,590; 2026: 101,220; 2027: 102,850; 2028: 104,480; 2029: 106,110; 2030: 107,740; 2031: 109,370; 2032: 111,000; 2033: 112,630; 2034: 114,260; 2035: 115,890; 2036: 117,520; 2037: 119,150; 2038: 120,780; 2039: 122,410; 2040: 124,040; 2041: 125,670; 2042: 127,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 219 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2598+01.640 | 2622+49.470 | 2,447.83 | 0.4636 | 2022: 84,.550; 2023: 86,002; 2024: 87,455; 2025: 88.907; 2026: 90,360; 2027: 91,812; 2028: 93,265; 2029: 94,717; 2030: 96,170; 2031: 97,622; 2032: 99,075; 2033: 100,527; 2034: 101,980; 2035: 103,432; 2036: 104,885; 2037: 106,337; 2038: 107,790; 2039: 109,242; 2040: 110,695; 2041: 112,147; 2042: 113,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26. |
| 221 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2622+49.470 | 2622+79.700 | 30.23 | 0.0057 | 2022: 78,550; 2023: 79,900; 2024: 81,250; 2025: 82,600; 2026: 83,950; 2027: 85,300; 2028: 86,650; 2029: 88,000; 2030: 89,350; 2031: 90,700; 2032: 92,050; 2033: 93,400; 2034: 94,750; 2035: 96,100; 2036: 97,450; 2037: 98,800; 2038: 100,150; 2039: 101,500; 2040: 102,850; 2041: 104,200; 2042: 105,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 222 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2622+79.700 | 2622+98.790 | 19.09 | 0.0036 | 2022: 85,150; 2023: 86,615; 2024: 88,080; 2025: 89,545; 2026: 91,010; 2027: 92,475; 2028: 93,940; 2029: 95,405; 2030: 96,870; 2031: 98,335; 2032: 99,800; 2033: 101,265; 2034: 102,730; 2035: 104,195; 2036: 105,660; 2037: 107,125; 2038: 108,590; 2039: 110,055; 2040: 111,520; 2041: 112,985; 2042: 114,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 223 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2622+98.790 | 2666+50.570 | 4,351.78 | 0.8242 | 2022: 85,150; 2023: 86,615; 2024: 88,080; 2025: 89,545; 2026: 91,010; 2027: 92,475; 2028: 93,940; 2029: 95,405; 2030: 96,870; 2031: 98,335; 2032: 99,800; 2033: 101,265; 2034: 102,730; 2035: 104,195; 2036: 105,660; 2037: 107,125; 2038: 108,590; 2039: 110,055; 2040: 111,520; 2041: 112,985; 2042: 114,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 225 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | $2666+50.570$ | 2667+75.600 | 125.03 | 0.0237 | 2022: 72,400; 2023: 73,645; 2024: 74,890; 2025: 76,135; 2026: 77,380; 2027: 78,625; 2028: 79,870; 2029: 81,115; 2030: 82,360; 2031: 83,605; 2032: 84,850; 2033: 86,095; 2034: 87,340; 2035: 88,585; 2036: 89,830; 2037: 91,075; 2038: 92,320; 2039: 93,565; 2040: 94,810; 2041: 96,055; 2042: 97,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 226 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2667+75.600 | 2689+23.280 | 2,147.68 | 0.4068 | 2022: 85,450; 2023: 86,920; 2024: 88,390; 2025: 89,860; 2026: 91,330; 2027: 92,800; 2028: 94,270; 2029: 95,740; 2030: 97,210; 2031: 98,680; 2032: 100,150; 2033: 101,620; 2034: 103,090; 2035: 104,560; 2036: 106,030; 2037: 107,500; 2038: 108,970; 2039: 110,440; 2040: 111,910; 2041: 113,380; 2042: 114,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 228 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2689+23.280 | 2716+03.470 | 2,680.19 | 0.5076 | 2022: 75,700; 2023: 77,002; 2024: 78,305; 2025: 79,607; 2026: 80,910; 2027: 82,212; 2028: 83,515; 2029: 84,817; 2030: 86,120; 2031: 87,422; 2032: 88,725; 2033: 90,027; 2034: 91,330; 2035: 92,632; 2036: 93,935; 2037: 95,237; 2038: 96,540; 2039: 97,842; 2040: 99,145; 2041: 100,447; 2042: 101,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 230 | 8 F | Urban | 2716+03.470 | 2723+97.650 | 794.18 | 0.1504 | 2022: 70,400; 2023: 71,612; 2024: 72,825; 2025: 74,037; 2026: 75,250; 2027: 76,462; 2028: 77,675; 2029: 78,887; 2030: 80,100; 2031: 81,312; 2032: 82,525; 2033: 83,737; 2034: 84,950; 2035: 86,162; 2036: 87,375; 2037: 88,587; 2038: 89,800; 2039: 91,012; 2040: 92,225; 2041: 93,437; 2042: 94,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 231 | 10F | Urban | 2723+97.650 | 2741+43.420 | 1,775.77 | 0.3306 | 2022: 72,250; 2023: 73,492; 2024: 74,735; 2025: 75,977; 2026: 77,220; 2027: 78,462; 2028: 79,705; 2029: 80,947; 2030: 82,190; 2031: 83,432; 2032: 84,675; 2033: 85,917; 2034: 87,160; 2035: 88,402; 2036: 89,645; 2037: 90,887; 2038: 92,130; 2039: 93,372; 2040: 94,615; 2041: 95,857; 2042: 97,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 232 | 10F | Urban | 2741+43.420 | 2758+30.970 | 1,687.55 | 0.3196 | 2022: 80,400; 2023: 81,782; 2024: 83,165; 2025: 84,547; 2026: 85,930; 2027: 87,312; 2028: 88,695; 2029: 90,077; 2030: 91,460; 2031: 92,842; 2032: 94,225; 2033: 95,607; 2034: 96,990; 2035: 98,372; 2036: 99,755; 2037: 101,137; 2038: 102,520; 2039: 103,902; 2040: 105,285; 2041: 106,667; 2042: 108,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 233 | 9 F | Urban | $2758+30.970$ | 2768+12.430 | 981.46 | 0.1859 | 2022: 72,400; 2023: 73,647; 2024: 74,895; 2025: 76,142; 2026: 77,390; 2027: 78,637; 2028: 79,885; 2029: 81,132; 2030: 82,380; 2031: 83,627; 2032: 84,875; 2033: 86,122; 2034: 87,370; 2035: 88,617; 2036: 89,865; 2037: 91,112; 2038: 92,360; 2039: 93,607; 2040: 94,855; 2041: 96,102; 2042: 97,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 234 | 8 F | Urban | 2768+12.430 | 2771+42.500 | 330.07 | 0.0625 | 2022: 58,850; 2023: 59,862; 2024: 60,875; 2025: 61,887; 2026: 62.900; 2027: 63,912; 2028: 64,925; 2029: 65.937; 2030: 66.950; 2031: 67,962; 2032: 68,975; 2033: 69,987; 2034: 71,000; 2035: 72,012; 2036: 73,025; 2037: 74,037; 2038: 75,050; 2039: 76,062; 2040: 77,075; 2041: 78,087; 2042: 79,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 236 | 8 F | Urban | 2771+42.500 | 2787+05.200 | 1,562.70 | 0.2960 | 2022: 56,250; 2023: 57,215; 2024: 58,180; 2025: 59,145; 2026: 60,110; 2027: 61,075; 2028: 62,040; 2029: 63,005; 2030; 63.970; 2031: 64,935; 2032: 65,900; 2033: 66,865; 2034: 67,830; 2035: 68,795; 2036: 69,760; 2037: 70,725; 2038: 71,690; 2039: 72,655; 2040: 73,620; 2041: 74,585; 2042: 75,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 237 | 8 F | Urban | 2787+05.200 | 2805+56.170 | 1,850.97 | 0.3506 | 2022: 59,750; 2023: 60,777; 2024: 61,805; 2025: 62,832; 2026: 63,860; 2027: 64,887; 2028: 65,915; 2029: 66,942; 2030: 67,970; 2031: 68,997; 2032: 70,025; 2033: 71,052; 2034: 72,080; 2035: 73,107; 2036: 74,135; 2037: 75,162; 2038: 76,190; 2039: 77,217 2040: 78,245; 2041: 79,272; 2042: 80,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 240 | 8 F | Urban | 2805+56.170 | 2816+87.790 | 1,131.62 | 0.2143 | 2022: 56,950; 2023: 57,930; 2024: 58.910; 2025: 59,890; 2026: 60,870; 2027: 61,850; 2028: 62,830; 2029: 63,810; 2030: 64,790; 2031: 65,770; 2032: 66,750; 2033: 67,730; 2034: 68,710; 2035: 69,690; 2036: 70,670; 2037: 71,650; 2038: 72,630; 2039: 73,610; 2040: 74,590; 2041: 75,570; 2042: 76,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 242 | 8 F | Urban | 2816+87.790 | 2821+10.420 | 422.63 | 0.0800 | 2022: 49,700; 2023: 50,552; 2024: 51,405; 2025: 52,257; 2026: 53,110; 2027: 53,962; 2028: 54,815; 2029: 55,667; 2030: 56,520; 2031: 57,372; 2032: 58,225; 2033: 59,077; 2034: 59,930; 2035: 60,782; 2036: 61,635; 2037: 62,487; 2038: 63,340; 2039: 64,192; 2040: 65,045; 2041: 65,897; 2042: 66,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 243 | 9 F | Urban | 2821+10.420 | 2835+32.750 | 1,422.33 | 0.2694 | 2022: 56,650; 2023: 57.622; 2024: 58.595; 2025: 59.567; 2026: 60,540; 2027: 61,512; 2028: 62,485; 2029: 63,457; 2030: 64.430; 2031: 65,402; 2032: 66,375; 2033: 67,347; 2034: 68,320; 2035: 69,292; 2036: 70,265; 2037: 71,237; 2038: 72,210; 2039: 73,182; 2040: 74,155; 2041: 75,127; 2042: 76,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | Start Location (Sta.ft) | End Location (Sta. <br> ft) | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | Median Width (ft) | Type | Effective Median Width (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 244 | 10F | Urban | 2835+32.750 | 2852+52.420 | 1,719.67 | 0.3257 | 2022: 68,450; 2023: 69,627; 2024: 70,805; 2025: 71,982; 2026: 73,160; 2027: 74,337; 2028: 75,515; 2029: 76,692; 2030: 77,870; 2031: 79,047; 2032: 80,225; 2033: 81,402; 2034: 82,580; 2035: 83,757; 2036: 84,935; 2037: 86,112; 2038: 87,290; 2039: 88,467; 2040: 89,645; 2041: 90,822; 2042: 92,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 246 | 7 F | Urban | 2852+52.420 | $2856+90.300$ | 437.88 | 0.0829 | 2022: 65,200; 2023: 66,322; 2024: 67,445; 2025: 68,567; 2026: 69,690; 2027: 70,812; 2028: 71,935; 2029: 73,057; 2030: 74,180; 2031: 75,302; 2032: 76,425; 2033: 77,547; 2034: 78,670; 2035: 79,792; 2036: 80,915; 2037: 82,037; 2038: 83,160; 2039: 84,282; 2040: 85,405; 2041: 86,527; 2042: 87,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 247 | 4 F | Urban | 2856+90.300 | $2896+04.190$ | 3,913.89 | 0.7413 | 2022: 49,850; 2023: 50,707; 2024: 51,565; 2025: 52,422; 2026: 53,280; 2027: 54,137; 2028: 54,995; 2029: 55,852; 2030: 56,710; 2031: 57,567; 2032: 58,425; 2033: 59,282; 2034: 60,140; 2035: 60,997; 2036: 61,855; 2037: 62,712; 2038: 63,570; 2039: 64,427; 2040: 65,285; 2041: 66,142; 2042: 67,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 248 | 4 F | Urban | 2896+04.190 | 2896+24.130 | 19.94 | 0.0038 | 2022: 50,800; 2023: 51,672; 2024: 52,545; 2025: 53,417; 2026: 54,290; 2027: 55,162; 2028: 56,035; 2029: 56,907; 2030: 57,780; 2031: 58,652; 2032: 59,525; 2033: 60,397; 2034: 61,270; 2035: 62,142; 2036: 63,015; 2037: 63,887; 2038: 64,760; 2039: 65,632; 2040: 66,505; 2041: 67,377; 2042: 68,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 250 | 4 F | Urban | 2896+24.130 | 2933+76.050 | 3,751.92 | 0.7106 | 2022: 51,400; 2023: 52,282; 2024: 53,165; 2025: 54,047; 2026: 54,930; 2027: 55,812; 2028: 56,695; 2029: 57,577; 2030: 58,460; 2031: 59,342; 2032: 60,225; 2033: 61,107; 2034: 61,990; 2035: 62,872; 2036: 63,755; 2037: 64,637; 2038: 65,520; 2039: 66,402; 2040: 67,285; 2041: 68,167; 2042: 69,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 254 | 4 F | Urban | 2933+76.050 | 2952+01.360 | 1,825.31 | 0.3457 | 2022: 36,250; 2023: 36,872; 2024: 37,495; 2025: 38,117; 2026: 38,740; 2027: 39,362; 2028: 39,985; 2029: 40,607; 2030: 41,230; 2031: 41,852; 2032: 42,475; 2033: 43,097; 2034: 43,720; 2035: 44,342; 2036: 44,965; 2037: 45,587; 2038: 46,210; 2039: 46,832; 2040: 47,455; 2041: 48,077; 2042: 48,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 256 | 4 F | Urban | 2952+01.360 | 3035+33.800 | 8,332.44 | 1.5781 | 2022: 20,400; 2023: 20,750; 2024: 21,100; 2025: 21,450; 2026: 21,800; 2027: 22,150; 2028: 22,500; 2029: 22,850; 2030: 23,200; 2031: 23,$550 ; 2032: 23,900 ; 2033: 24,250 ; 2034: 24,600 ; 2035: 24,950 ; 2036: 25,300 ; 2037: 25,650 ; 2038: 26,000 ; 2039: 26,350 ;$ 2040: 26,700; 2041: 27,050; 2042: 27,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 257 | 4 F | Urban | $3035+33.800$ | 3041+43.060 | 609.26 | 0.1154 | 2022: 22,750; 2023: 23,142; 2024: 23,535; 2025: 23,927; 2026: 24,320; 2027: 24,712; 2028: 25,105; 2029: 25,497; 2030: 25,890; 2031: 26,282; 2032: 26,675; 2033: 27,067; 2034: 27,460; 2035: 27,852; 2036: 28,245; 2037: 28,637; 2038: 29,030; 2039: 29,422; 2040: 29,815; 2041: 30,207; 2042: 30,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 259 | 4 F | Urban | 3041+43.060 | 3244+29.990 | 20,286.93 | 3.8422 | 2022: 25,500; 2023: 25,940; 2024: 26,380; 2025: 26,820; 2026: 27,260; 2027: 27,700; 2028: 28,140; 2029: 28,580; 2030: 29,020; 2031: 29,460; 2032: 29,900; 2033: 30,340; 2034: 30,780; 2035: 31,220; 2036: 31,660; 2037: 32,100; 2038: 32,540; 2039: 32,980; 2040: 33,420; 2041: 33,860; 2042: 34,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 263 | 4 F | Urban | 3244+29.990 | 3248+03.710 | 373.72 | 0.0708 | 2022: 22,100; 2023: 22,480; 2024: 22,860; 2025: 23,240; 2026: 23,620; 2027: 24,000; 2028: 24,380; 2029: 24,760; 2030: 25,140; 2031: 25,520; 2032: 25,900; 2033: 26,280; 2034: 26,660; 2035: 27,040; 2036: 27,420; 2037: 27,800; 2038: 28,180; 2039: 28,560; 2040: 28,940; 2041: 29,320; 2042: 29,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 265 | 4 F | Urban | 3248+03.710 | 3279+26.650 | 3,122.94 | 0.5915 | 2022: 18,650; 2023: 18,970; 2024: 19,290; 2025: 19,610; 2026: 19,930; 2027: 20,250; 2028: 20,570; 2029: 20,890; 2030: 21,210; 2031: 21,530; 2032: 21,850; 2033: 22,170; 2034: 22,490; 2035: 22,810; 2036: 23,130; 2037: 23,450; 2038: 23,770; 2039: 24,090; 2040: 24,410; 2041: 24,730; 2042: 25,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 266 | 4 F | Urban | 3279+26.650 | 3281+21.530 | 194.88 | 0.0369 | 2022: 19,600; 2023: 19,937; 2024: 20,275; 2025: 20,612; 2026: 20,950; 2027: 21,287; 2028: 21,625; 2029: 21,962; 2030: 22,300; 2031: 22,$637 ; 2032: 22,975 ; 2033: 23,312 ; 2034: 23,650 ; 2035: 23,987 ; 2036: 24,325 ; 2037: 24,662 ; 2038: 25,000 ; 2039: 25,337 ;$ 2040: 25,675; 2041: 26,012; 2042: 26,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 268 | 4 F | Urban | $3281+21.530$ | 3603+79.950 | 32,258.42 | 6.1095 | 2022: 20,250; 2023: 20,597; 2024: 20,945; 2025: 21,292; 2026: 21,640; 2027: 21,987; 2028: 22,335; 2029: 22,682; 2030: 23,030; 2031: 23,377; 2032: 23,725; 2033: 24,072; 2034: 24,420; 2035: 24,767; 2036: 25,115; 2037: 25,462; 2038: 25,810; 2039: 26,157; 2040: 26,505; 2041: 26,852; 2042: 27,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 273 | 4 F | Urban | 3603+79.950 | 3606+16.800 | 236.85 | 0.0449 | 2022: 17,000; 2023: 17,290; 2024: 17,580; 2025: 17,870; 2026: 18.160; 2027: 18.450; 2028: 18,740; 2029: 19,030; 2030: 19,320; 2031: 19,610; 2032: 19,900; 2033: 20,190; 2034: 20,480; 2035: 20,770; 2036: 21,060; 2037: 21,350; 2038: 21,640; 2039: 21,930; 2040: 22,220; 2041: 22,510; 2042: 22,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 275 | 4 F | Urban | $3606+16.800$ | 3624+73.190 | 1,856.39 | 0.3516 | 2022: 14,100; 2023: 14,340; 2024: 14,580; 2025: 14,820; 2026: 15,060; 2027: 15,300; 2028: 15,540; 2029: 15,780; 2030: 16,020; 2031: 16,$260 ; 2032: 16,500 ; 2033: 16,740 ; 2034: 16,980 ; 2035: 17,220 ; 2036: 17,460 ; 2037: 17,700 ; 2038: 17,940 ; 2039: 18,180$; 2040: 18,420; 2041: 18,660; 2042: 18,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 276 | 4 F | Urban | 3624+73.190 | 3627+05.090 | 231.90 | 0.0439 | 2022: 14,750; 2023: 15,002; 2024: 15,255; 2025: 15,507; 2026: 15,760; 2027: 16,012; 2028: 16,265; 2029: 16,517; 2030: 16,770; 2031: 17,022; 2032: 17,275; 2033: 17,527; 2034: 17,780; 2035: 18,032; 2036: 18,285; 2037: 18,537; 2038: 18,790; 2039: 19,042; 2040: 19,295; 2041: 19,547; 2042: 19,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 278 | 4 F | Urban | 3627+05.090 | $3662+27.630$ | 3,522.54 | 0.6672 | 2022: 15,500; 2023: 15,767; 2024: 16,035; 2025: 16,302; 2026: 16,570; 2027: 16,837; 2028: 17,105; 2029: 17,372; 2030: 17,640; 2031: 17,907; 2032: 18,175; 2033: 18,442; 2034: 18,710; 2035: 18,977; 2036: 19,245; 2037: 19,512; 2038: 19,780; 2039: 20,047; 2040: 20,315; 2041: 20,582; 2042: 20,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 283 | 4 F | Urban | 3662+27.630 | 3667+36.010 | 508.38 | 0.0963 | 2022: 15,450; 2023: 15,715; 2024: 15,980; 2025: 16,245; 2026: 16,510; 2027: 16,775; 2028: 17,040; 2029: 17.305; 2030: 17.570; 2031: 17,835; 2032: 18,100; 2033: 18,365; 2034: 18,630; 2035: 18,895; 2036: 19,160; 2037: 19,425; 2038: 19,690; 2039: 19,955; 2040: 20,220; 2041: 20,485; 2042: 20,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 285 | 4 F | Urban | 3667+36.010 | 3690+73.620 | 2,337.61 | 0.4427 | 2022: 15,400 ; 2023: 15,662 ; 2024: 15,925 ; 2025: 16,187; 2026: 16,450 ; 2027: 16,712; 2028: 16,975; 2029: 17,237; 2030: 17,500 2031: 17,762; 2032: 18,025; 2033: 18,287; 2034: 18,550; 2035: 18,812; 2036: 19,075; 2037: 19,337; 2038: 19,600; 2039: 19,862; 2040: 20,125; 2041: 20,387; 2042: 20,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 286 | 4 F | Urban | 3690+73.620 | 3699+52.710 | 879.09 | 0.1665 | 2022: 15,450; 2023: 15,715; 2024: 15,980; 2025: 16,245; 2026: 16.510; 2027: 16,775; 2028: 17,040; 2029: 17,305; 2030: 17.570; 2031: 17,835; 2032: 18,100; 2033: 18,365; 2034: 18,630; 2035: 18,895; 2036: 19,160; 2037: 19,425; 2038: 19,690; 2039: 19,955; 2040: 20,220; 2041: 20,485; 2042: 20,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | Start Location | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \text { ft) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\underset{\text { Width (ft) }}{\substack{\text { Median }}}$ | Type | Effective Median Width $(f t)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 288 | 4F | Urban | 3699+52.710 | 3923+33.470 | 22,380.76 | 4.2388 | 2022: 15,500; 2023: 15,767; 2024: 16,035; 2025: 16,302; 2026: 16,570; 2027: 16,837; 2028: 17,105; 2029: 17,372; 2030: 17,640; 2031: 17,907; 2032: 18,175; 2033: 18,442; 2034: 18,710; 2035: 18,977; 2036: 19,245; 2037: 19,512; 2038: 19,780; 2039: 20,047; 2040: 20,315; 2041: 20,582; 2042: 20,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 292 | ${ }^{4 F}$ | Urban | 3923+33.470 | 3924+35.300 | 101.83 | 0.0193 | 2022: 15,$050 ; 2023: 15,310 ; 2024: 15,570 ; 2025: 15,830 ; 2026: 16,090 ; 2027: 16,350 ; 2028: 16,610 ; 2029: 16,870 ; 2030: 17,130 ;$ 2031: 17,390; 2032: 17,650; 2033: 17,910; 2034: 18,170; 2035: 18,430; 2036: 18,690; 2037: 18,950; 2038: 19,210; 2039: 19,470; 2040: 19,730; 2041: 19,990; 2042: 20,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 294 | 4 F | Urban | 3924+35.300 | 3943+28.330 | 1,893.03 | 0.3585 | 2022: 14,450; 2023: 14,700; 2024: 14,950; 2025: 15,200; 2026: 15,450; 2027: 15,700; 2028: 15,950; 2029: 16,200; 2030: 16,450; 2031: 16,700; 2032: 16,950; 2033: 17,200; 2034: 17,450; 2035: 17,700; 2036: 17,950; 2037: 18,200; 2038: 18,450; 2039: 18,700; 2040: 18,950; 2041: 19,200; 2042: 19,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 295 | 4 F | Urban | $3943+28.330$ | 3945+80.010 | 251.68 | 0.0477 | 2022: 14,850; 2023: 15,105 ; 2024: 15,360; 2025: 15,615; 2026: 15,870; 2027: 16,125; 2028: 16,380; 2029: 16,635; 2030: 16,890; 2031: 17,145 ; 2032: 17,400 ; 2033: 17,655 ; 2034: 17,910; 2035: 18,165; 2036: 18,420; 2037: 18,675; 2038: 18,930; 2039: 19,185; 2040: 19,440; 2041: 19,695; 2042: 19,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 297 | 4 F | Urban | 3945+80.010 | 4035+90.691 | 9,010.68 | 1.7066 | 2022: 15,250; 2023: 15,510; 2024: 15,770; 2025: 16,030; 2026: 16,290; 2027: 16,550; 2028: 16,810; 2029: 17,070; 2030: 17,330; 2031: 17,590; 2032: 17,850; 2033: 18,110; 2034: 18,370; 2035: 18,630; 2036: 18,890; 2037: 19,150; 2038: 19,410; 2039: 19,670; 2040: 19,930; 2041: 20,190; 2042: 20,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |

Table 2. Evaluation Freeway - Speed Change Lanes (Speed Change)

| Seg. No. | Type | Ramp Type | Start Location (Sta. ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \text { ft) } \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Type | Effective Median Width (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 4SC | Exit | 1000+00.000 | 1001+07.510 | 107.51 | 0.0204 | 2022: 28,450; 2023: 28,937; 2024: 29,425; 2025: 29,912; 2026: 30,400; 2027: 30,887; 2028: 31,375; 2029: 31,862; 2030: 32,350; 2031: 32,837; 2032: 33,325; 2033: 33,812; 2034: 34,300; 2035: 34,787; 2036: 35,275; 2037: 35,762; 2038: 36,250; 2039: 36,737; 2040: 37,225; 2041: 37,712; 2042: 38,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 4 | 4SC | Exit | 1001+07.510 | 1001+30.470 | 22.96 | 0.0043 | 2022: 25,800; 2023: 26,242; 2024: 26,685; 2025: 27,127; 2026: 27,570; 2027: 28,012; 2028: 28,455; 2029: 28,897; 2030: 29,340; 2031: 29,782; 2032: 30,225; 2033: 30,667; 2034: 31,110; 2035: 31,552; 2036: 31,995; 2037: 32,437; 2038: 32,880; 2039: 33,322; 2040: 33,765; 2041: 34,207; 2042: 34,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 10 | 4SC | Exit | 1084+46.040 | 1087+36.040 | 290.00 | 0.0549 | 2022: 32,800; 2023: 33,365; 2024: 33,930; 2025: 34,495; 2026: 35,060; 2027: 35,625; 2028: 36,190; 2029: 36,755; 2030 37,320; 2031: 37,885; 2032: 38,450; 2033: 39,015; 2034: 39,580; 2035: 40,145; 2036: 40,710; 2037: 41,275; 2038: 41,840; 2039: 42,405; 2040: 42,970; 2041: 43,535; 2042: 44,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 12 | 4SC | Entrance | $1108+25.790$ | 1113+55.790 | 530.00 | 0.1004 | 2022: 34,050; 2023: 34,635; 2024: 35,220; 2025: 35,805; 2026: 36,390; 2027: 36,975; 2028: 37,560; 2029: 38,145; 2030: 38,730; 2031: 39,315; 2032: 39,900; 2033: 40,485; 2034: 41,070; 2035: 41,655; 2036: 42,240; 2037: 42,825; 2038: 43,410; 2039: 43,995; 2040: 44,580; 2041: 45,165; 2042: 45,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 13 | 4SC | Exit | $1138+01.180$ | 1141+21.180 | 320.00 | 0.0606 | 2022: 34,050; 2023: 34,635; 2024: 35,220; 2025: 35,805; 2026: 36,390; 2027: 36,975; 2028: 37,.560; 2029: 38.145; 2030 38,730; 2031: 39,315; 2032: 39,900; 2033: 40,485; 2034: 41,070; 2035: 41,655; 2036: 42,240; 2037: 42,825; 2038: 43,410; 2039: 43,995; 2040: 44,580; 2041: 45,165; 2042: 45,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 14 | 4SC | Entrance | 1138+97.170 | 1141+21.180 | 224.01 | 0.0424 | 2022: 34,050; 2023: 34,635; 2024: 35,220; 2025: 35,805; 2026: 36,390; 2027: 36.975; 2028: 37.560; 2029: 38.145; 2030; 38,730; 2031: 39,315; 2032: 39,900; 2033: 40,485; 2034: 41,070; 2035: 41,655; 2036: 42,240; 2037: 42,825; 2038: 43,410; 2039: 43,995; 2040: 44,580; 2041: 45, 165; 2042: 45,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 16 | 4SC | Entrance | 1141+21.180 | 1142+97.170 | 175.99 | 0.0333 | 2022: 32,350; 2023: 32,907; 2024: 33,465; 2025: 34,022; 2026: 34,580; 2027: 35,137; 2028: 35,695; 2029: 36,252; 2030: 36,810; 2031: 37,367; 2032: 37,925; 2033: 38,482; 2034: 39,040; 2035: 39,597; 2036: 40,155; 2037: 40,712; 2038: 41,270; 2039: 41,827; 2040: 42,385; 2041: 42,942; 2042: 43,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 19 | 4SC | Entrance | 1171+25.410 | 1178+75.410 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 35.250; 2023: 35,.855; 2024: 36.460; 2025: 37,065; 2026: 37,670; 2027: 38,275; 2028: 38,880; 2029: 39,485; 2030; 40,$090 ; 2031: 40,695 ; 2032: 41,300 ; 2033: 41,905 ; 2034: 42,510 ; 2035: 43,115 ; 2036: 43,720 ; 2037: 44,325 ; 2038: 44,930 ;$ 2039: 45,535; 2040: 46,140; 2041: 46,745; 2042: 47,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 21 | 4SC | Exit | 1181+76.080 | 1184+86.080 | 310.00 | 0.0587 | 2022: 39,650; 2023: 40,330; 2024: 41,010; 2025: 41,690; 2026: 42,370; 2027: 43,050; 2028: 43,730; 2029: 44,410; 2030: 45,090; 2031: 45,770; 2032: 46,450; 2033: 47,130; 2034: 47,810; 2035: 48,490; 2036: 49,170; 2037: 49,850; 2038: 50,530; 2039: 51,210; 2040: 51,890; 2041: 52,570; 2042: 53,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 22 | 4SC | Exit | 1307+34.960 | 1310+09.960 | 275.00 | 0.0521 | 2022: 39,650; 2023: 40,330; 2024: 41,010; 2025: 41,690; 2026: 42,370; 2027: 43,050; 2028: 43,730; 2029: 44,410; 2030: 45,090; 2031: 45,770; 2032: 46,450; 2033: 47,130; 2034: 47,810; 2035: 48,490; 2036: 49,170; 2037: 49,850; 2038: 50,530; 2039: 51,210; 2040: 51,890; 2041: 52,570; 2042: 53,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 23 | 4SC | Entrance | 1304+66.670 | 1310+09.960 | 543.29 | 0.1029 | 2022: 39,650; 2023: 40,330; 2024: 41,010; 2025: 41,690; 2026: 42,370; 2027: 43,050; 2028: 43,730; 2029: 44,410; 2030: 45,090; 2031: 45,770; 2032: 46,450; 2033: 47,130; 2034: 47,810; 2035: 48,490; 2036: 49,170; 2037: 49,850; 2038: 50,530; 2039: 51,210; 2040: 51,890; 2041: 52,570; 2042: 53,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 25 | 4SC | Entrance | 1310+09.960 | 1311+36.670 | 126.71 | 0.0240 | 2022: 36.450; 2023: 37,.075; 2024: 37,700; 2025: 38.325; 2026: 38.950; 2027: 39.575; 2028: 40, 200; 2029: 40, 825; 2030: 41,450; 2031: 42,075; 2032: 42,700; 2033: 43,325; 2034: 43,950; 2035: 44,575; 2036: 45,200; 2037: 45,825; 2038: 46,450; 2039: 47,075; 2040: 47,700; 2041: 48,325; 2042: 48,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 28 | 4SC | Exit | 1353+89.440 | 1355+18.280 | 128.84 | 0.0244 | 2022: 33,100; 2023: 33,670; 2024: 34,240; 2025: 34,810; 2026: 35,380; 2027: 35,950; 2028: 36,520; 2029: 37,090; 2030: 37,660; 2031: 38,230; 2032: 38,800; 2033: 39,370; 2034: 39,940; 2035: 40,510; 2036: 41,080; 2037: 41,650; 2038: 42,220; 2039: 42,790; 2040: 43,360; 2041: 43,930; 2042: 44,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 30 | 4SC | Exit | $1355+18.280$ | 1356+89.440 | 171.16 | 0.0324 | 2022: 37,950; 2023: 38,605; 2024: 39,260; 2025: 39,915; 2026: 40,570; 2027: 41,225; 2028: 41,880; 2029: 42,535; 2030: 43,190; 2031: 43,845; 2032: 44,500; 2033: 45,155; 2034: 45,810; 2035: 46,465; 2036: 47,120; 2037: 47,775; 2038: 48,430; 2039: 49,085; 2040: 49,740; 2041: 50,395; 2042: 51,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 31 | 4SC | Entrance | $1355+18.280$ | 1361+68.280 | 650.00 | 0.1231 | 2022: 37,950; 2023: 38,605; 2024: 39,260; 2025: 39,915; 2026: 40,570; 2027: 41,225; 2028: 41,880; 2029: 42,535; 2030 43,190; 2031: 43,845; 2032: 44,500; 2033: 45,155; 2034: 45,810; 2035: 46,465; 2036: 47,120; 2037: 47,775; 2038: 48,430; 2039: 49,085; 2040: 49,740; 2041: 50,395; 2042: 51,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 33 | 4SC | Exit | $1365+82.620$ | 1366+63.080 | 80.46 | 0.0152 | 2022: 43,450; 2023: 44,200; 2024: 44,950; 2025: 45,700; 2026: 46,450; 2027: 47,200; 2028: 47,950; 2029: 48,700; 2030: 49,450; 2031: 50,200; 2032: 50,950; 2033: 51,700; 2034: 52,450; 2035: 53,200; 2036: 53,950; 2037: 54,700; 2038: 55,450; 2039: 56,200; 2040: 56,950; 2041: 57,700; 2042: 58,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 35 | 4SC | Exit | 1366+63.080 | 1369+92.620 | 329.54 | 0.0624 | 2022: 45,100; 2023: 45,877; 2024: 46,655; 2025: 47,432; 2026: 48,210; 2027: 48,987; 2028: 49,765; 2029: 50,542; 2030 51,320; 2031: 52,097; 2032: 52,875; 2033: 53,652; 2034: 54,430; 2035: 55,207; 2036: 55,985; 2037: 56,762; 2038: 57,540; 2039: 58,317; 2040: 59,095; 2041: 59,872; 2042: 60,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 36 | 4SC | Entrance | 1366+63.080 | 1374+93.080 | 830.00 | 0.1572 | 2022: 45,100; 2023: 45,877; 2024: 46,655; 2025: 47,432; 2026: 48,210; 2027: 48,987; 2028: 49,765; 2029: 50,542; 2030 51,320; 2031: 52,097; 2032: 52,875; 2033: 53,652; 2034: 54,430; 2035: 55,207; 2036: 55,985; 2037: 56,762; 2038: 57,540; 2039: 58,317; 2040: 59,095; 2041: 59,872; 2042: 60,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 37 | 4SC | Entrance | 1382+12.400 | 1387+72.400 | 560.00 | 0.1061 | 2022: 45,100; 2023: 45,877; 2024: 46,655; 2025: 47,432; 2026: 48,210; 2027: 48,987; 2028: 49,765; 2029: 50.542; 2030 51,320; 2031: 52,097; 2032: 52,875; 2033: 53,652; 2034: 54,430; 2035: 55,207; 2036: 55,985; 2037: 56,762; 2038: 57,540; 2039: 58,317; 2040: 59,095; 2041: 59,872; 2042: 60,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Ramp Type | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Start Location } \\ \text { (Sta. ft) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \quad \text { Width (ft) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39 | 4SC | Exit | 1399+68.800 | 1401+83.800 | 215.00 | 0.0407 | 2022: 41,250; 2023: 41,960; 2024: 42,670; 2025: 43,380; 2026: 44,090; 2027: 44,800; 2028: 45,510; 2029: 46,220; 2030 46,930; 2031: 47,640; 2032: 48,350; 2033: 49,060; 2034: 49,770; 2035: 50,480; 2036: 51,190; 2037: 51,900; 2038: 52,610; 2039: 53,320; 2040: 54,030; 2041: 54,740; 2042: 55,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 42 | 5SC | Exit | 1448+14.880 | 1448+51.680 | 36.80 | 0.0070 | 2022: 51,850; 2023: 52,742; 2024: 53,635; 2025: 54,527; 2026: 55,420; 2027: 56,312; 2028: 57,205; 2029: 58,097; 2030 58,990; 2031: 59,882; 2032: 60,775; 2033: 61,667; 2034: 62,560; 2035: 63,452; 2036: 64,345; 2037: 65,237; 2038: 66,130; 2039: 67,022; 2040: 67,915; 2041: 68,807; 2042: 69,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 43 | 5SC | Exit | 1448+48.620 | 1448+51.680 | 3.06 | 0.0006 | 2022: 51,850; 2023: 52,742; 2024: 53,635; 2025: 54,527; 2026: 55,420; 2027: 56,312; 2028: 57,205; 2029: 58,097; 2030 58,990; 2031: 59,882; 2032: 60,775; 2033: 61,667; 2034: 62,560; 2035: 63,452; 2036: 64,345; 2037: 65,237; 2038: 66,130; 2039: 67,022; 2040: 67,915; 2041: 68,807; 2042: 69,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 44 | 5SC | Entrance | 1448+16.890 | 1448+51.680 | 34.79 | 0.0066 | 2022: 51,850; 2023: 52,742; 2024: 53,635; 2025: 54.527; 2026: 55,420; 2027: 56,312; 2028: 57,205; 2029: 58.097; 2030; 58,990; 2031: 59,882; 2032: 60,775; 2033: 61,667; 2034: 62,560; 2035: 63,452; 2036: 64,345; 2037: 65,237; 2038: 66,130; 2039: 67,022; 2040: 67,915; 2041: 68,807; 2042: 69,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 46 | 6SC | Exit | 1448+51.680 | $1461+68.620$ | 1,316.94 | 0.2494 | 2022: 64,300; 2023: 65,407; 2024: 66.515; 2025: 67,.622; 2026: 68,730; 2027: 69,837; 2028: 70,945; 2029: 72,052; 2030: 73,160; 2031: 74,267; 2032: 75,375; 2033: 76,482; 2034: 77,590; 2035: 78,697; 2036: 79,805; 2037: 80,912; 2038: 82,020 2039: 83,127; 2040: 84,235; 2041: 85,342; 2042: 86,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 47 | 6SC | Entrance | 1448+51.680 | 1461+68.620 | 1,316.94 | 0.2494 | 2022: 64,300; 2023: 65,407; 2024: 66,515; 2025: 67,622; 2026: 68,730; 2027: 69,837; 2028: 70,945; 2029: 72,052; 2030 73,160; 2031: 74,267; 2032: 75,375; 2033: 76,482; 2034: 77,590; 2035: 78,697; 2036: 79,805; 2037: 80,912; 2038: 82,020; 2039: 83,127; 2040: 84,235; 2041: 85,342; 2042: 86,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 48 | 6SC | Exit | 1448+51.680 | 1461+68.620 | 1,316.94 | 0.2494 | 2022: 64,300; 2023: 65,407; 2024: 66,515; 2025: 67,622; 2026: 68,730; 2027: 69,837; 2028: 70,945; 2029: 72,052; 2030: 73,160; 2031: 74,267; 2032: 75,375; 2033: 76,482; 2034: 77,590; 2035: 78,697; 2036: 79,805; 2037: 80,912; 2038: 82,020 2039: 83,127; 2040: 84,235; 2041: 85,342; 2042: 86,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 49 | 6SC | Entrance | 1448+51.680 | $1461+68.620$ | 1,316.94 | 0.2494 | 2022: 64,300; 2023: 65,407; 2024: 66,515; 2025: 67,622; 2026: 68,730; 2027: 69,837; 2028: 70,945; 2029: 72,052; 2030; 73,160; 2031: 74,267; 2032: 75,375; 2033: 76,482; 2034: 77,590; 2035: 78,697; 2036: 79,805; 2037: 80,912; 2038: 82,020; 2039: 83,127; 2040: 84,235; 2041: 85,342; 2042: 86,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 51 | 5SC | Exit | 1461+68.620 | 1463+34.880 | 166.26 | 0.0315 | 2022: 59,750; 2023: 60,777; 2024: 61,805; 2025: 62.832; 2026: 63,860; 2027: 64,887; 2028: 65.915; 2029: 66,942; 2030: 67,970; 2031: 68,997; 2032: 70,025; 2033: 71,052; 2034: 72,080; 2035: 73,107; 2036: 74,135; 2037: 75,162; 2038: 76,190 2039: 77,217; 2040: 78,245; 2041: 79,272; 2042: 80,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 52 | 5SC | Entrance | 1461+68.620 | 1461+71.680 | 3.06 | 0.0006 | 2022: 59,750; 2023: 60,777; 2024: 61,805; 2025: 62,832; 2026: 63,860; 2027: 64,887; 2028: 65,915; 2029: 66,942; 2030 67,970; 2031: 68,997; 2032: 70,025; 2033: 71,052; 2034: 72,080; 2035: 73,107; 2036: 74,135; 2037: 75,162; 2038: 76,190; 2039: 77,217; 2040: 78,245; 2041: 79,272; 2042: 80,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 53 | 5SC | Entrance | 1461+68.620 | 1463+36.890 | 168.27 | 0.0319 | 2022: 59,750; 2023: 60,777; 2024: 61,805; 2025: 62,832; 2026: 63,860; 2027: 64,887; 2028: 65,915; 2029: 66,942; 2030 67,970; 2031: 68,997; 2032: 70,025; 2033: 71,052; 2034: 72,080; 2035: 73,107; 2036: 74,135; 2037: 75,162; 2038: 76,190; 2039: 77,217; 2040: 78,245; 2041: 79,272; 2042: 80,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 56 | 4SC | Entrance | 1532+41.010 | 1540+41.010 | 800.00 | 0.1515 | 2022: 64,950; 2023: 66,065; 2024: 67,180; 2025: 68,295; 2026: 69,410; 2027: 70,525; 2028: 71,640; 2029: 72,755; 2030 73,870; 2031: 74,985; 2032: 76,100; 2033: 77,215; 2034: 78,330; 2035: 79,445; 2036: 80,560; 2037: 81,675; 2038: 82,790; 2039: 83,905; 2040: 85,020; 2041: 86,135; 2042: 87,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 58 | 4SC | Exit | 1542+72.380 | 1545+72.380 | 300.00 | 0.0568 | 2022: 74,850; 2023: 76,137; 2024: 77,425; 2025: 78,712; 2026: 80,000; 2027: 81,287; 2028: 82,575; 2029: 83,862; 2030: 85,150; 2031: 86,437; 2032: 87,725; 2033: 89,012; 2034: 90,300; 2035: 91,587; 2036: 92,875; 2037: 94,162; 2038: 95,450; 2039: 96,737; 2040: 98,025; 2041: 99,312; 2042: 100,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 59 | 4SC | Exit | 1568+23.740 | 1571+03.740 | 280.00 | 0.0530 | 2022: 74,850; 2023: 76,137; 2024: 77,425; 2025: 78,712; 2026: 80,000; 2027: 81,287; 2028: 82,575; 2029: 83,862; 2030 85,$150 ; 2031: 86,437 ; 2032: 87,725 ; 2033: 89,012 ; 2034: 90,300 ; 2035: 91,587 ; 2036: 92,875 ; 2037: 94,162 ; 2038: 95,450$; 2039: 96,737; 2040: 98,025; 2041: 99,312; 2042: 100,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 60 | 4SC | Entrance | 1567+65.940 | 1571+03.740 | 337.80 | 0.0640 | 2022: 74,850; 2023: 76,137; 2024: 77,425; 2025: 78,712; 2026: 80,000; 2027: 81,287; 2028: 82,575; 2029: 83,862; 2030 85,$150 ; 2031: 86,437 ; 2032: 87,725 ; 2033: 89,012 ; 2034: 90,300 ; 2035: 91,587 ; 2036: 92,875 ; 2037: 94,162 ; 2038: 95,450$; 2039: 96,737; 2040: 98,025; 2041: 99,312; 2042: 100,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 62 | 4SC | Entrance | 1571+03.740 | 1571+65.940 | 62.20 | 0.0118 | 2022: 68,050; 2023: 69,220; 2024: 70,390; 2025: 71,560; 2026: 72,730; 2027: 73,900; 2028: 75,070; 2029: 76,240; 2030 77,410; 2031: 78,580; 2032: 79,750; 2033: 80,920; 2034: 82,090; 2035: 83,260; 2036: 84,430; 2037: 85,600; 2038: 86,770; 2039: 87,940; 2040: 89,110; 2041: 90,280; 2042: 91,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 69 | 9SC | Entrance | 1800+10.210 | 1802+00.210 | 190.00 | 0.0360 | 2022: 101,350; 2023: 103,092; 2024: 104,835; 2025: 106.,577; 2026: 108,320; 2027: 110.062; 2028: 111,805; 2029: 113.,547; 2030: 115,290; 2031: 117,032; 2032: 118,775; 2033: 120,517; 2034: 122,260; 2035: 124,002; 2036: 125,745; 2037: 127,487; 2038: 129,$230 ; 2039: 130,972 ; 2040: 132,715 ;$ 2041: 134,457; 2042: 136,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 73 | 8SC | Exit | 1858+89.680 | 1861+14.680 | 225.00 | 0.0426 | 2022: 106,850; 2023: 108,687; 2024: 110.525; 2025: 112,362; 2026: 114,200; 2027: 116,037; 2028: 117,875; 2029: 119,712; 2030: 121,550; 2031: 123,387; 2032: 125,225; 2033: 127,062; 2034: 128,900; 2035: 130,737; 2036: 132,575; 2037: 134,412; 2038: 136,250; 2039: 138,087; 2040: 139,925; 2041: 141,762; 2042: 143,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 75 | 8SC | Entrance | 1862+31.360 | 1871+31.360 | 900.00 | 0.1704 | 2022: 118,200; 2023: 120,230; 2024: 122,260; 2025: 124,290; 2026: 126,320; 2027: 128,350; 2028: 130,380; 2029: 132,410; 2030: 134,440; 2031: 136,470; 2032: 138,500; 2033: 140,530; 2034: 142,560; 2035: 144,590; 2036: 146,620; 2037: 148,650; 2038: 150,680; 2039: 152,710; 2040: 154,740; 2041: 156,770; 2042: 158,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 76 | 8SC | Entrance | 1934+07.720 | 1937+57.720 | 350.00 | 0.0663 | 2022: 118,200; 2023: 120,230; 2024: 122,260; 2025: 124,290; 2026: 126,320; 2027: 128,350; 2028: 130,380; 2029: 132,410; 2030: 134,440; 2031: 136,470; 2032: 138,500; 2033: 140,530; 2034: 142,560; 2035: 144,590; 2036: 146,620; 2037: 148,650; 2038: 150,680; 2039: 152,710; 2040: 154,740; 2041: 156,770; 2042: 158,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Ramp Type | Start Location (Sta. ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathbf{f t}) \end{gathered}$ | Type | Effective Median Width (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 78 | 8 SC | Exit | 1943+40.160 | 1945+10.160 | 170.00 | 0.0322 | 2022: 114,600; 2023: 116,570; 2024: 118,540; 2025: 120,510; 2026: 122,480; 2027: 124,450; 2028: 126,420; 2029: 128,390; 2030: 130,360; 2031: 132,330; 2032: 134,300; 2033: 136,270; 2034: 138,240; 2035: 140,210; 2036: 142,180; 2037: 144,150; 2038: 146,120; 2039: 148,090; 2040: 150,060; 2041: 152,030; 2042: 154,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 81 | 8SC | Entrance | 1962+27.940 | 1964+92.940 | 265.00 | 0.0502 | 2022: 112,750; 2023: 114,690; 2024: 116,630; 2025: 118,570; 2026: 120.510; 2027: 122,450; 2028: 124,390; 2029: 126,330; 2030: 128,270; 2031: 130,210; 2032: 132,150; 2033: 134,090; 2034: 136,030; 2035: 137,970; 2036: 139,910; 2037: 141,850; 2038: 143,790; 2039: 145,730; 2040: 147,670; 2041: 149,610; 2042: 151,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 83 | 8SC | Exit | 1969+25.480 | 1973+25.480 | 400.00 | 0.0758 | 2022: 122,250; 2023: 124,352; 2024: 126,455; 2025: 128,557; 2026: 130,660; 2027: 132,762; 2028: 134,865; 2029: 136,967; 2030: 139,070; 2031: 141,172; 2032: 143,275; 2033: 145,377; 2034: 147,480; 2035: 149,582; 2036: 151,685; 2037: 153,787; 2038: 155,890; 2039: 157,992; 2040: 160,095; 2041: 162,197; 2042: 164,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 84 | 8SC | Exit | 1982+00. 120 | 1983+70.120 | 170.00 | 0.0322 | 2022: 122,250; 2023: 124,352; 2024: 126,455; 2025: 128,557; 2026: 130,660; 2027: 132,762; 2028: 134,865; 2029: 136,967; 2030: 139,070; 2031: 141,172; 2032: 143,275; 2033: 145,377; 2034: 147,480; 2035: 149,582; 2036: 151,685; 2037: 153,787; 2038: 155,890; 2039: 157,992; 2040: 160,095; 2041: 162,197; 2042: 164,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 87 | 8SC | Exit | 1992+04.960 | 1993+20.390 | 115.43 | 0.0219 | 2022: 123,950; 2023: 126,080; 2024: 128,210; 2025: 130,340; 2026: 132,470; 2027: 134,600; 2028: 136,730; 2029: 138,860; 2030: 140,990; 2031: 143,120; 2032: 145,250; 2033: 147,380; 2034: 149,510; 2035: 151,640; 2036: 153,770; 2037: 155,900; 2038: 158,030; 2039: 160,160; 2040: 162,290; 2041: 164,420; 2042: 166,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 89 | 8SC | Exit | 1993+20.390 | 1993+94.960 | 74.57 | 0.0141 | 2022: 130,350; 2023: 132,590; 2024: 134,830; 2025: 137,070; 2026: 139,310; 2027: 141,550; 2028: 143,790; 2029: 146,030; 2030: 148,270; 2031: 150,510; 2032: 152,750; 2033: 154,990; 2034: 157,230; 2035: 159,470; 2036: 161,710; 2037: 163,950; 2038: 166,190; 2039: 168,430; 2040: 170,670; 2041: 172,910; 2042: 175,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 90 | 8SC | Entrance | 1993+20.390 | 1995+45.390 | 225.00 | 0.0426 | 2022: 130,350; 2023: 132,590; 2024: 134,830; 2025: 137,070; 2026: 139,310; 2027: 141,550; 2028: 143,790; 2029: 146,030; 2030: 148,270; 2031: 150,510; 2032: 152,750; 2033: 154,990; 2034: 157,230; 2035: 159,470; 2036: 161,710; 2037: 163,950; 2038: 166,190; 2039: 168,430; 2040: 170,670; 2041: 172,910; 2042: 175, 150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 91 | 8SC | Exit | 2004+81.220 | 2006+55.130 | 173.91 | 0.0329 | 2022: 130,350; 2023: 132,590; 2024: 134,830; 2025: 137,070; 2026: 139,310; 2027: 141,550; 2028: 143,790; 2029: 146,030; 2030: 148,270; 2031: 150,510; 2032: 152,750; 2033: 154,990; 2034: 157,230; 2035: 159,470; 2036: 161,710; 2037: 163,950; 2038: 166,190; 2039: 168,430; 2040: 170,670; 2041: 172,910; 2042: 175,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 93 | 7SC | Exit | 2006+55.130 | 2006+91.220 | 36.09 | 0.0068 | 2022: 121,900; 2023: 123.997; 2024: 126,095; 2025: 128,192; 2026: 130,290; 2027: 132,387; 2028: 134,485; 2029: 136.582; 2030: 138,680; 2031: 140,777; 2032: 142,875; 2033: 144,972; 2034: 147,070; 2035: 149,167; 2036: 151,265; 2037: 153,362; 2038: 155,460; 2039: 157,557; 2040: 159,655; 2041: 161,752; 2042: 163,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 96 | 7SC | Exit | 2045+17.910 | 2046+03.220 | 85.31 | 0.0162 | 2022: 120.650; 2023: 122,722; 2024: 124.795; 2025: 126,867; 2026: 128.940; 2027: 131,012; 2028: 133,085; 2029: 135,157; 2030: 137,230; 2031: 139,302; 2032: 141,375; 2033: 143,447; 2034: 145,520; 2035: 147,592; 2036: 149,665; 2037: 151,737; 2038: 153,810; 2039: 155,882; 2040: 157,955; 2041: 160,027; 2042: 162,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 98 | 8 SC | Exit | 2046+03.220 | 2047+37.910 | 134.69 | 0.0255 | 2022: 133.950; 2023: 136.252; 2024: 138.555; 2025: 140,857; 2026: 143.160; 2027: 145,462; 2028: 147,765; 2029: 150,067; 2030: 152,370; 2031: 154,672; 2032: 156,975; 2033: 159,277; 2034: 161,580; 2035: 163,882; 2036: 166,185; 2037: 168,487; 2038: 170,790; 2039: 173,092; 2040: 175,395; 2041: 177,697; 2042: 180,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 100 | 9SC | Entrance | 2049+38.400 | 2051+11.970 | 173.57 | 0.0329 | 2022: 148,750; 2023: 151,310; 2024: 153,870; 2025: 156,430; 2026: 158,990; 2027: 161,550; 2028: 164,110; 2029: 166,670; 2030: 169,230; 2031: 171,790; 2032: 174,350; 2033: 176,910; 2034: 179,470; 2035: 182,030; 2036: 184,590; 2037: 187,150; 2038: 189,710; 2039: 192,270; 2040: 194,830; 2041: 197,390; 2042: 199,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 102 | 10SC | Entrance | 2051+11.970 | 2054+58.400 | 346.43 | 0.0656 | 2022: 158.450; 2023: 161,175; 2024: 163.,900; 2025: 166,625; 2026: 169,350; 2027: 172,075; 2028: 174,800; 2029: 177.,525; 2030: 180,250; 2031: 182,975; 2032: 185,700; 2033: 188,425; 2034: 191,150; 2035: 193,875; 2036: 196,600; 2037: 199,325; 2038: 202,050; 2039: 204,775; 2040: 207,500; 2041: 210,225; 2042: 212,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 103 | 10SC | Entrance | 2063+12.740 | 2067+62.740 | 450.00 | 0.0852 | 2022: 158,$450 ; 2023: 161,175 ; 2024: 163,900 ; 2025$ : 166,$625 ; 2026$ : 169,$350 ; 2027$ : 172,075 ; 2028: 174,800; 2029: 177,525; 2030: 180,$250 ; 2031: 182,975 ; 2032: 185,700 ; 2033: 188,425 ; 2034: 191,150 ; 2035: 193,875 ; 2036: 196,600 ; 2037: 199,325$; 2038: 202,050; 2039: 204,775; 2040: 207,500; 2041: 210,225; 2042: 212,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 105 | 10SC | Exit | 2070+65.530 | 2072+80.530 | 215.00 | 0.0407 | 2022: 155.400; 2023: 158,070; 2024: 160.740; 2025: 163.410; 2026: 166,080; 2027: 168.750; 2028: 171,420; 2029: 174,090; 2030: 176,760; 2031: 179,430; 2032: 182, 100; 2033: 184,770; 2034: 187,440; 2035: 190,110; 2036: 192,780; 2037: 195,450; 2038: 198,120; 2039: 200,790; 2040: 203,460; 2041: 206, 130; 2042: 208,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 107 | 10SC | Exit | 2096+62.880 | 2096+65.070 | 2.19 | 0.0004 | 2022: 152,400; 2023: 155,020; 2024: 157,640; 2025: 160,260; 2026: 162,880; 2027: 165,500; 2028: 168,120; 2029: 170,740; 2030: 173,360; 2031: 175,980; 2032: 178,600; 2033: 181,220; 2034: 183,840; 2035: 186,460; 2036: 189,080; 2037: 191,700; 2038: 194,320; 2039: 196,940; 2040: 199,560; 2041: 202,180; 2042: 204,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 109 | 10SC | Entrance | 2096+65.070 | 2108+05.270 | 1,140.20 | 0.2160 | 2022: 162,300; 2023: 165,090; 2024: 167,880; 2025: 170,670; 2026: 173,460; 2027: 176,250; 2028: 179,040; 2029: 181,830; 2030: 184,620; 2031: 187,410; 2032: 190,200; 2033: 192,990; 2034: 195,780; 2035: 198,570; 2036: 201,360; 2037: 204,150; 2038: 206,940; 2039: 209,730; 2040: 212,520; 2041: 215,310; 2042: 218,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 110 | 10SC | Entrance | 2102+85.270 | 2108+05.270 | 520.00 | 0.0985 | 2022: 162,300; 2023: 165,090; 2024: 167,880; 2025: 170,670; 2026: 173,460; 2027: 176,250; 2028: 179,040; 2029: 181,830; 2030: 184,620; 2031: 187,410; 2032: 190,200; 2033: 192,990; 2034: 195,780; 2035: 198,570; 2036: 201,360; 2037: 204,150; 2038: 206,940; 2039: 209,730; 2040: 212,520; 2041: 215,310; 2042: 218,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 111 | 10SC | Exit | 2096+65.070 | 2108+05.270 | 1,140.20 | 0.2160 | 2022: 162,300; 2023: 165,090; 2024: 167,880; 2025: 170,670; 2026: 173,460; 2027: 176,250; 2028: 179,040; 2029: 181,830; 2030: 184,620; 2031: 187,410; 2032: 190,200; 2033: 192,990; 2034: 195,780; 2035: 198,570; 2036: 201,360; 2037: 204,150; 2038: 206,940; 2039: 209,730; 2040: 212,520; 2041: 215,310; 2042: 218,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 113 | 10SC | Entrance | 2108+05.270 | 2112+02.880 | 397.61 | 0.0753 | 2022: 158,150; 2023: 160,870; 2024: 163,590; 2025: 166,310; 2026: 169,030; 2027: 171,750; 2028: 174,470; 2029: 177,190; 2030: 179,910; 2031: 182,630; 2032: 185,350; 2033: 188,070; 2034: 190,790; 2035: 193,510; 2036: 196,230; 2037: 198,950; 2038: 201,670; 2039: 204,390; 2040: 207,110; 2041: 209, 830; 2042: 212,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Ramp Type | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Start Location } \\ \text { (Sta. ft) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \quad \text { Width (ft) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 114 | 10SC | Exit | 2108+05.270 | 2112+02.880 | 397.61 | 0.0753 | 2022: 158,150; 2023: 160,870; 2024: 163,590; 2025: 166,310; 2026: 169,030; 2027: 171,750; 2028: 174,470; 2029: 177,190; 2030: 179,910; 2031: 182,630; 2032: 185,350; 2033: 188,070; 2034: 190,790; 2035: 193,510; 2036: 196,230; 2037: 198,950; 2038: 201,670; 2039: 204,390; 2040: 207,110; 2041: 209,830; 2042: 212,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 116 | 10SC | Entrance | 2112+02.880 | 2112+05.070 | 2.19 | 0.0004 | 2022: 152,800 ; 2023: 155,427 ; 2024: 158,055; 2025: 160,682; 2026: 163,310; 2027: 165,937; 2028: 168,565; 2029: 171,192; 2030: 173,820; 2031: 176,447; 2032: 179,075; 2033: 181,702; 2034: 184,330; 2035: 186,957; 2036: 189,585; 2037: 192,212; 2038: 194,840; 2039: 197,467; 2040: 200,095; 2041: 202,722; 2042: 205,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 117 | 10SC | Entrance | 2132+88.040 | 2132+94.000 | 5.96 | 0.0011 | 2022: 152,800; 2023: 155,427; 2024: 158,055; 2025: 160,682; 2026: 163,310; 2027: 165,937; 2028: 168,565; 2029: 171,192; 2030: 173,820; 2031: 176,447; 2032: 179,075; 2033: 181,702; 2034: 184,330; 2035: 186,957; 2036: 189,585; 2037: 192,212; 2038: 194,840; 2039: 197,467; 2040: 200,095; 2041: 202,722; 2042: 205,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 119 | 10SC | Exit | 2132+94.000 | $2141+38.040$ | 844.04 | 0.1599 | 2022: 163,$000 ; 2023: 165,802 ; 2024: 168,605 ; 2025: 171,407 ; 2026: 174,210 ; 2027: 177,012 ; 2028: 179,815 ; 2029: 182,617$; 2030: 185,420; 2031: 188,222; 2032: 191,025; 2033: 193,827; 2034: 196,630; 2035: 199,432; 2036: 202,235; 2037: 205,037; 2038: 207,840; 2039: 210,642; 2040: 213,445; 2041: 216,247; 2042: 219,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 120 | 10SC | Entrance | 2132+94.000 | $2141+38.040$ | 844.04 | 0.1599 | 2022: 163,000; 2023: 165,802; 2024: 168,605; 2025: 171,407; 2026: 174,210; 2027: 177,012; 2028: 179,815; 2029: 182,617; 2030: 185,420; 2031: 188,222; 2032: 191,025; 2033: 193,827; 2034: 196,630; 2035: 199,432; 2036: 202,235; 2037: 205,037; 2038: 207,840; 2039: 210,642; 2040: 213,445; 2041: 216,247; 2042: 219,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 122 | 10SC | Exit | 2141+38.040 | 2141+44.000 | 5.96 | 0.0011 | 2022: 160,600; 2023: 163,360; 2024: 166,120; 2025: 168,880; 2026: 171,640; 2027: 174,400; 2028: 177,160; 2029: 179,920; 2030: 182,680; 2031: 185,$440 ; 2032$ : 188,200; 2033: 190,960; 2034: 193,720; 2035: 196,480; 2036: 199,240; 2037: 202,000; 2038: 204,760; 2039: 207,520; 2040: 210,280; 2041: 213,040; 2042: 215,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 126 | 8SC | Exit | 2159+38.930 | 2171+54.400 | 1,215.47 | 0.2302 | 2022: 142,500; 2023: 144,952; 2024: 147,405; 2025: 149,857; 2026: 152,310; 2027: 154,762; 2028: 157,215; 2029: 159,667; 2030: 162,120; 2031: 164,572; 2032: 167,025; 2033: 169,477; 2034: 171,930; 2035: 174,382; 2036: 176,835; 2037: 179,287; 2038: 181,740; 2039: 184,192; 2040: 186,645; 2041: 189,097; 2042: 191,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 128 | 7SC | Exit | 2171+54.400 | $2171+68.930$ | 14.53 | 0.0027 | 2022: 123,850; 2023: 125,980; 2024: 128,110; 2025: 130,240; 2026: 132,370; 2027: 134,500; 2028: 136,630; 2029: 138,760; 2030: 140,890; 2031: 143,020; 2032: 145,150; 2033: 147,280; 2034: 149,410; 2035: 151,540; 2036: 153,670; 2037: 155,800; 2038: 157,930; 2039: 160,060; 2040: 162,190; 2041: 164,320; 2042: 166,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 129 | 7SC | Exit | 2183+61.760 | 2183+64.830 | 3.07 | 0.0006 | 2022: 123,850; 2023: 125,980; 2024: 128,110; 2025: 130,240; 2026: 132,370; 2027: 134,500; 2028: 136,630; 2029: 138,760; 2030: 140,890; 2031: 143,020; 2032: 145,150; 2033: 147,280; 2034: 149,410; 2035: 151,540; 2036: 153,670; 2037: 155,800; 2038: 157,930; 2039: 160,060; 2040: 162,190; 2041: 164,320; 2042: 166,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 131 | 8SC | Entrance | $2183+64.830$ | $2187+07.690$ | 342.86 | 0.0649 | 2022: 130,200; 2023: 132,440; 2024: 134,680; 2025: 136,920; 2026: 139,160; 2027: 141,400; 2028: 143,640; 2029: 145,880; 2030: 148,120; 2031: 150,360; 2032: 152,600; 2033: 154,840; 2034: 157,080; 2035: 159,320; 2036: 161,560; 2037: 163,800; 2038: 166,040; 2039: 168,280; 2040: 170,520; 2041: 172,760; 2042: 175,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 132 | 8SC | Entrance | 2187+06.440 | $2187+07.690$ | 1.25 | 0.0002 | 2022: 130,200; 2023: 132,440; 2024: 134,680; 2025: 136,920; 2026: 139,160; 2027: 141,400; 2028: 143,640; 2029: 145,880; 2030: 148,120; 2031: 150,360; 2032: 152,600; 2033: 154,840; 2034: 157,080; 2035: 159,320; 2036: 161,560; 2037: 163,800; 2038: 166,040; 2039: 168,280; 2040: 170,520; 2041: 172,760; 2042: 175,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 133 | 8SC | Exit | 2183+64.830 | $2187+07.690$ | 342.86 | 0.0649 | 2022: 130,200; 2023: 132,440; 2024: 134,680; 2025: 136,920; 2026: 139,160; 2027: 141,400; 2028: 143,640; 2029: 145,880; 2030: 148,120; 2031: 150,360 ; 2032: 152,600; 2033: 154,840; 2034: 157,080; 2035: 159,320; 2036: 161,560; 2037: 163,800; 2038: 166,040; 2039: 168,280; 2040: 170,520; 2041: 172,760; 2042: 175,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 135 | 9SC | Entrance | 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | 1,058.75 | 0.2005 | 2022: 135,250; 2023: 137,577; 2024: 139,905; 2025: 142,232; 2026: 144.560; 2027: 146,887; 2028: 149,215; 2029: 151,542; 2030: 153,870; 2031: 156,197; 2032: 158,525; 2033: 160,852; 2034: 163,180; 2035: 165,507; 2036: 167,835; 2037: 170,162; 2038: 172,490; 2039: 174,817; 2040: 177,145; 2041: 179,472; 2042: 181,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 136 | 9SC | Exit | 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | 1,058.75 | 0.2005 | 2022: 135,250; 2023: 137,577; 2024: 139,905; 2025: 142,232; 2026: 144,560; 2027: 146,887; 2028: 149,215; 2029: 151,542; 2030: 153,870; 2031: 156,197; 2032: 158,525; 2033: 160,852; 2034: 163,180; 2035: 165,507; 2036: 167,835; 2037: 170,162; 2038: 172,490; 2039: 174,817; 2040: 177,145; 2041: 179,472; 2042: 181,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 137 | 9SC | Entrance | 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | 1,058.75 | 0.2005 | 2022: 135,250; 2023: 137,577; 2024: 139,905; 2025: 142,232; 2026: 144,560; 2027: 146,887; 2028: 149,215; 2029: 151,542; 2030: 153,$870 ; 2031: 156,197 ; 2032: 158,525 ; 2033: 160,852 ; 2034: 163,180 ; 2035: 165,507 ; 2036: 167,835 ; 2037: 170,162$; 2038: 172,490; 2039: 174,817; 2040: 177,145; 2041: 179,472; 2042: 181,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 138 | 9SC | Exit | 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | 1,058.75 | 0.2005 | 2022: 135,250; 2023: 137,577; 2024: 139,905; 2025: 142,232; 2026: 144,560; 2027: 146,887; 2028: 149,215; 2029: 151,542; 2030: 153,870; 2031: 156,197; 2032: 158,525; 2033: 160,852; 2034: 163,180; 2035: 165,507; 2036: 167,835; 2037: 170,162; 2038: 172,490; 2039: 174,817; 2040: 177,145; 2041: 179,472; 2042: 181,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 140 | ${ }^{8 S C}$ | Entrance | 2197+66.440 | $2198+41.760$ | 75.32 | 0.0143 | 2022: 129,650; 2023: 131,880; 2024: 134,110; 2025: 136,340; 2026: 138,570; 2027: 140,800; 2028: 143,030; 2029: 145,260; 2030: 147,490; 2031: 149,720; 2032: 151,950; 2033: 154,180; 2034: 156,410; 2035: 158,640; 2036: 160,870; 2037: 163,100; 2038: 165,330; 2039: 167,560; 2040: 169,790; 2041: 172,020; 2042: 174,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 141 | ${ }^{\text {8SC }}$ | Exit | 2197+66.440 | 2197+67.690 | 1.25 | 0.0002 | 2022: 129,650; 2023: 131,880; 2024: 134,110; 2025: 136,340; 2026: 138,570; 2027: 140,800; 2028: 143,030; 2029: 145,260; 2030: 147,490; 2031: 149,720; 2032: 151,950; 2033: 154,180; 2034: 156,410; 2035: 158,640; 2036: 160,870; 2037: 163,100; 2038: 165,330; 2039: 167,560; 2040: 169,790; 2041: 172,020; 2042: 174,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 142 | 8SC | Exit | 2197+66.440 | 2198+41.760 | 75.32 | 0.0143 | 2022: 129,650; 2023: 131,880; 2024: 134,110; 2025: 136,340; 2026: 138.570; 2027: 140,800; 2028: 143,030; 2029: 145,260; 2030: 147,490; 2031: 149,720; 2032: 151,950; 2033: 154,180; 2034: 156,410; 2035: 158,640; 2036: 160,870; 2037: 163,100; 2038: 165,330; 2039: 167,560; 2040: 169,790; 2041: 172,020; 2042: 174,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 143 | 8SC | Entrance | 2198+04.630 | $2198+41.760$ | 37.13 | 0.0070 | 2022: 129,650; 2023: 131,880; 2024: 134,110; 2025: 136,340; 2026: 138,570; 2027: 140,800; 2028: 143,030; 2029: 145,260; 2030: 147,490; 2031: 149,720; 2032: 151,950; 2033: 154,180; 2034: 156,410; 2035: 158,640; 2036: 160,870; 2037: 163,100; 2038: 165,330; 2039: 167,560; 2040: 169,790; 2041: 172,020; 2042: 174,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Ramp Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Start Location } \\ (\text { Sta. ft) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\underset{\substack{\text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}}}{ }$ | Type | Effective Median Width (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 145 | 7SC | Entrance | $2198+41.760$ | $2198+44.830$ | 3.07 | 0.0006 | 2022: 128,850; 2023: 131,065; 2024: 133,280; 2025: 135,495; 2026: 137,710; 2027: 139,925; 2028: 142,140; 2029: 144,355; 2030: 146,570; 2031: 148,785; 2032: 151,000; 2033: 153,215; 2034: 155,430; 2035: 157,645; 2036: 159,860; 2037: 162,075; 2038: 164,290; 2039: 166,505; 2040: 168,720; 2041: 170,935; 2042: 173,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 146 | 7SC | Entrance | $2198+41.760$ | $2201+64.630$ | 322.87 | 0.0612 | 2022: 128,850; 2023: 131,065; 2024: 133,280; 2025: 135,495; 2026: 137,710; 2027: 139,925; 2028: 142,140; 2029: 144,355; 2030: 146,570; 2031: 148,785 ; 2032: 151,000; 2033: 153,215; 2034: 155,430; 2035: 157,645; 2036: 159,860; 2037: 162,075; 2038: 164,290; 2039: 166,505; 2040: 168,720; 2041: 170,935; 2042: 173,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 149 | 7SC | Exit | 2216+63.010 | 2220+53.010 | 390.00 | 0.0739 | 2022: 142,150; 2023: 144,595; 2024: 147,040; 2025: 149,485; 2026: 151,930; 2027: 154,375; 2028: 156,820; 2029: 159,265; 2030: 161,710; 2031: 164,155; 2032: 166,600; 2033: 169,045; 2034: 171,490; 2035: 173,935; 2036: 176,380; 2037: 178,825; 2038: 181,270; 2039: 183,715; 2040: 186,160; 2041: 188,605; 2042: 191,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 151 | 9SC | Entrance | 2221+59.740 | 2230+01.910 | 842.17 | 0.1595 | 2022: 161,650; 2023: 164,430; 2024: 167,210; 2025: 169,990; 2026: 172,770; 2027: 175,550; 2028: 178,330; 2029: 181,110; 2030: 183,890; 2031: 186,670; 2032: 189,450; 2033: 192,230; 2034: 195,010; 2035: 197,790; 2036: 200,570; 2037: 203,350; 2038: 206,130; 2039: 208,910; 2040: 211,690; 2041: 214,470; 2042: 217,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 152 | 9SC | Exit | $2226+41.910$ | 2230+01.910 | 360.00 | 0.0682 | 2022: 161,650; 2023: 164,430; 2024: 167,210; 2025: 169,990; 2026: 172,770; 2027: 175,550; 2028: 178,330; 2029: 181,110; 2030: 183,890; 2031: 186,670; 2032: 189,450; 2033: 192,230; 2034: 195,010; 2035: 197,790; 2036: 200,570; 2037: 203,350; 2038: 206,130; 2039: 208,910; 2040: 211,690; 2041: 214,470; 2042: 217,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 154 | 8SC | Entrance | 2230+01.910 | 2230+09.740 | 7.83 | 0.0015 | 2022: 155,100; 2023: 157,767; 2024: 160,435; 2025: 163,102; 2026: 165,770; 2027: 168,437; 2028: 171,105; 2029: 173,772; 2030: 176,440; 2031: 179,107; 2032: 181,775; 2033: 184,442; 2034: 187,110; 2035: 189,777; 2036: 192,445; 2037: 195,112, 2038: 197,780; 2039: 200,447; 2040: 203,115; 2041: 205,782; 2042: 208,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 156 | 8SC | Exit | 2234+63.570 | 2238+23.570 | 360.00 | 0.0682 | 2022: 159,550; 2023: 162,292; 2024: 165,035; 2025: 167,777; 2026: 170,520; 2027: 173,262; 2028: 176,005; 2029: 178,747; 2030: 181,490; 2031: 184,232; 2032: 186,975; 2033: 189,717; 2034: 192,460; 2035: 195,202; 2036: 197,945; 2037: 200,687; 2038: 203,430; 2039: 206, 172; 2040: 208,915; 2041: 211,657; 2042: 214,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 158 | 8SC | Entrance | 2240+93.000 | $2243+13.000$ | 220.00 | 0.0417 | 2022: 164,350; 2023: 167,175; 2024: 170,000; 2025: 172,825; 2026: 175,650; 2027: 178,475; 2028: 181,300; 2029: 184,125; 2030: 186,950; 2031: 189,775; 2032: 192,600; 2033: 195,425; 2034: 198,250; 2035: 201,075; 2036: 203,900; 2037: 206,725; 2038: 209,550; 2039: 212,375; 2040: 215,200; 2041: 218,025; 2042: 220,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 159 | 8SC | Entrance | $2241+51.310$ | 2245+71.310 | 420.00 | 0.0795 | 2022: 164,350; 2023: 167,175; 2024: 170,000; 2025: 172,825; 2026: 175,650; 2027: 178,475; 2028: 181,300; 2029: 184,125; 2030: 186,950; 2031: 189,775; 2032: 192,600; 2033: 195,425; 2034: 198,250; 2035: 201,075; 2036: 203,900; 2037: 206,725; 2038: 209,550; 2039: 212,375; 2040: 215,200; 2041: 218,025; 2042: 220,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 161 | 8SC | Entrance | 2253+90.450 | 2258+50.450 | 460.00 | 0.0871 | 2022: 157.,50; 2023: 160,260; 2024: 162,970; 2025: 165,680; 2026: 168,.390; 2027: 171,100; 2028: 173.810; 2029: 176.520; 2030: 179,230; 2031: 181,940; 2032: 184,650; 2033: 187,360; 2034: 190,070; 2035: 192,780; 2036: 195,490; 2037: 198,200; 2038: 200,910; 2039: 203,620; 2040: 206,330; 2041: 209,040; 2042: 211,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 162 | 8SC | Exit | 2256+64.500 | $2258+50.450$ | 185.95 | 0.0352 | 2022: 157,$550 ; 2023: 160,260 ; 2024: 162,970 ; 2025$ : 165,$680 ; 2026$ : 168,$390 ; 2027$ : 171,$100 ; 2028: 173,810 ; 2029$ : 176,520 ; 2030: 179,230; 2031: 181,940; 2032: 184,650; 2033: 187,360; 2034: 190,070; 2035: 192,780; 2036: 195,490; 2037: 198,200; 2038: 200,910; 2039: 203,620; 2040: 206,330; 2041: 209,040; 2042: 211,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 164 | 8SC | Exit | 2258+50.450 | 2258+79.500 | 29.05 | 0.0055 | 2022: 152,000; 2023: 154,615; 2024: 157,230; 2025: 159,845; 2026: 162,460; 2027: 165,075; 2028: 167,690; 2029: 170,305; 2030: 172,920; 2031: 175,535; 2032: 178,150; 2033: 180,765; 2034: 183,380; 2035: 185,995; 2036: 188,610; 2037: 191,225; 2038: 193,840; 2039: 196,455; 2040: 199,070; 2041: 201,685; 2042: 204,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 167 | 8SC | Exit | 2268+46.280 | $2271+96.280$ | 350.00 | 0.0663 | 2022: 151,650; 2023: 154,260; 2024: 156,870; 2025: 159,480; 2026: 162,090; 2027: 164,700; 2028: 167,310; 2029: 169,920; 2030: 172,530; 2031: 175,140; 2032: 177,750; 2033: 180,360; 2034: 182,970; 2035: 185,580; 2036: 188,190; 2037: 190,800; 2038: 193,410; 2039: 196,020; 2040: 198,630; 2041: 201,240; 2042: 203,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 168 | 8SC | Exit | 2272+92.630 | 2274+72.630 | 180.00 | 0.0341 | 2022: 151,650; 2023: 154,260; 2024: 156,870; 2025: 159,480; 2026: 162,090; 2027: 164,700; 2028: 167.310; 2029: 169.920; 2030: 172,530; 2031: 175,140; 2032: 177,750; 2033: 180,360; 2034: 182,970; 2035: 185,580; 2036: 188,190; 2037: 190,800; 2038: 193,410; 2039: 196,020; 2040: 198,630; 2041: 201,240; 2042: 203,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 170 | 8SC | Entrance | 2279+80.230 | $2284+00.230$ | 420.00 | 0.0795 | 2022: 142,750; 2023: 145,205; 2024: 147,660; 2025: 150,115; 2026: 152,570; 2027: 155,025; 2028: 157,480; 2029: 159,935; 2030: 162,390; 2031: 164,845; 2032: 167,300; 2033: 169,755; 2034: 172,210; 2035: 174,665; 2036: 177,120; 2037: 179,575; 2038: 182,030; 2039: 184,485; 2040: 186,940; 2041: 189,395; 2042: 191,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 173 | 8SC | Entrance | 2289+18.000 | $2296+18.000$ | 700.00 | 0.1326 | 2022: 144,400; 2023: 146,885; 2024: 149,370; 2025: 151,855; 2026: 154,340; 2027: 156,825; 2028: 159,310; 2029: 161,795; 2030: 164,280; 2031: 166,765; 2032: 169,250; 2033: 171,735; 2034: 174,220; 2035: 176,705; 2036: 179,190; 2037: 181,675; 2038: 184,160; 2039: 186,645; 2040: 189,130; 2041: 191,615; 2042: 194,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 178 | 8SC | Exit | 2362+64.260 | 2365+64.260 | 300.00 | 0.0568 | 2022: 143,450; 2023: 145,917; 2024: 148,385; 2025: 150,852; 2026: 153,320; 2027: 155,787; 2028: 158,255; 2029: 160,722; 2030: 163,190; 2031: 165,657; 2032: 168,125; 2033: 170,592; 2034: 173,060; 2035: 175,527; 2036: 177,995; 2037: 180,462; 2038: 182,930; 2039: 185,397; 2040: 187,865; 2041: 190,332; 2042: 192,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 179 | 8SC | Entrance | 2362+57.960 | 2365+64.260 | 306.30 | 0.0580 | 2022: 143,450; 2023: 145,917; 2024: 148,385; 2025: 150,852; 2026: 153,320; 2027: 155,787; 2028: 158,255; 2029: 160,722; 2030: 163,190; 2031: 165,657; 2032: 168,125; 2033: 170,592; 2034: 173,060; 2035: 175,527; 2036: 177,995; 2037: 180,462; 2038: 182,930; 2039: 185,397; 2040: 187,865; 2041: 190,332; 2042: 192,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 181 | 8SC | Entrance | 2365+64.260 | $2366+17.960$ | 53.70 | 0.0102 | 2022: 131,400; 2023: 133,660; 2024: 135,920; 2025: 138,180; 2026: 140,440; 2027: 142,700; 2028: 144,960; 2029: 147,220; 2030: 149,480; 2031: 151,740; 2032: 154,000; 2033: 156,260; 2034: 158,520; 2035: 160,780; 2036: 163,040; 2037: 165,300; 2038: 167,560; 2039: 169,820; 2040: 172,080; 2041: 174,340; 2042: 176,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 183 | 8SC | Entrance | 2401+60.900 | 2401+60.950 | 0.05 | 0.0000 | 2022: 120,000; 2023: 122,065 ; 2024: 124,130; 2025: 126,195; 2026: 128,260; 2027: 130,325; 2028: 132,390; 2029: 134,455; 2030: 136,520; 2031: 138,585 ; 2032: 140,650; 2033: 142,715; 2034: 144,780; 2035: 146,845; 2036: 148,910; 2037: 150,975; 2038: 153,040; 2039: 155,105; 2040: 157,170; 2041: 159,235; 2042: 161,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Ramp Type | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Start Location } \\ \text { (Sta. ft) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \quad \text { Width (ft) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 185 | 8SC | Entrance | 2401+60.950 | 2402+12.440 | 51.49 | 0.0097 | 2022: 126,150; 2023: 128,322; 2024: 130,495; 2025: 132,667; 2026: 134,840; 2027: 137,012; 2028: 139,185; 2029: 141,357; 2030: 143,530; 2031: 145,702; 2032: 147,875; 2033: 150,047; 2034: 152,220; 2035: 154,392; 2036: 156,565; 2037: 158,737; 2038: 160,910; 2039: 163,082; 2040: 165,255; 2041: 167,427; 2042: 169,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 187 | 9SC | Entrance | 2402+12.440 | 2406+30.900 | 418.46 | 0.0793 | 2022: 134,550; 2023: 136,865; 2024: 139,180; 2025: 141,495; 2026: 143,810; 2027: 146,125; 2028: 148,440; 2029: 150,755 ; 2030: 153,070; 2031: 155,385 ; 2032: 157,700; 2033: 160,015; 2034: 162,330; 2035: 164,645; 2036: 166,960; 2037: 169,275; 2038: 171,590; 2039: 173,905; 2040: 176,220; 2041: 178,535; 2042: 180,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 188 | 9SC | Exit | 2411+57.230 | 2414+12.230 | 255.00 | 0.0483 | 2022: 134,550; 2023: 136,865; 2024: 139,180; 2025: 141,495; 2026: 143,810; 2027: 146,125; 2028: 148,440; 2029: 150,755; 2030: 153,070; 2031: 155,385 ; 2032: 157,700; 2033: 160,015; 2034: 162,330; 2035: 164,645; 2036: 166,960; 2037: 169,275; 2038: 171,590; 2039: 173,905; 2040: 176,220; 2041: 178,535; 2042: 180,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 193 | 8SC | Exit | 2443+40.790 | 2447+40.790 | 400.00 | 0.0758 | 2022: 128.900; 2023: 131,117; 2024: 133,.335; 2025: 135,.552; 2026: 137,770; 2027: 139.987; 2028: 142,205; 2029: 144,422; 2030: 146,640; 2031: 148,857; 2032: 151,075; 2033: 153,292; 2034: 155,510; 2035: 157,727; 2036: 159,945; 2037: 162,162; 2038: 164,380; 2039: 166,597; 2040: 168,815; 2041: 171,032; 2042: 173,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 195 | 8SC | Entrance | 2450+69.650 | 2455+14.650 | 445.00 | 0.0843 | 2022: 135,700; 2023: 138,032; 2024: 140,365; 2025: 142,697; 2026: 145,030; 2027: 147,.362; 2028: 149,695; 2029: 152,027; 2030: 154,360; 2031: 156,692; 2032: 159,025; 2033: 161,357; 2034: 163,690; 2035: 166,022; 2036: 168,355; 2037: 170,687; 2038: 173,020; 2039: 175,352; 2040: 177,685; 2041: 180,017; 2042: 182,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 196 | 8SC | Exit | 2463+46.300 | 2471+86.300 | 840.00 | 0.1591 | 2022: 135,700; 2023: 138,032; 2024: 140,365; 2025: 142,697; 2026: 145,030; 2027: 147,362; 2028: 149,695; 2029: 152,027; 2030: 154,360 ; 2031: 156,692 ; 2032: 159,025; 2033: 161,357; 2034: 163,690; 2035: 166,022; 2036: 168,355; 2037: 170,687; 2038: 173,020; 2039: 175,352; 2040: 177,685; 2041: 180,017; 2042: 182,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 200 | 6SC | Entrance | 2501+93.380 | 2506+47.600 | 454.22 | 0.0860 | 2022: 122.650; 2023: 124,757; 2024: 126,865; 2025: 128,972; 2026: 131,080; 2027: 133,187; 2028: 135,295; 2029: 137,402; 2030: 139,510; 2031: 141,617; 2032: 143,725; 2033: 145,832; 2034: 147,940; 2035: 150,047; 2036: 152,155; 2037: 154,262; 2038: 156,370; 2039: 158,477; 2040: 160,585; 2041: 162,692; 2042: 164,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 202 | 6SC | Entrance | 2506+47.600 | 2506+58.380 | 10.78 | 0.0020 | 2022: 129,350; 2023: 131,575; 2024: 133,800; 2025: 136,025; 2026: 138,250; 2027: 140,475; 2028: 142,700; 2029: 144,925; 2030: 147,150; 2031: 149,375; 2032: 151,600; 2033: 153,825; 2034: 156,050; 2035: 158,275; 2036: 160,500; 2037: 162,725; 2038: 164,950; 2039: 167,175; 2040: 169,400; 2041: 171,625; 2042: 173,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 203 | 6SC | Exit | 2506+47.600 | 2508+27.600 | 180.00 | 0.0341 | 2022: 129,350; 2023: 131,575; 2024: 133,800; 2025: 136,025; 2026: 138,250; 2027: 140,475; 2028: 142,700; 2029: 144,925; 2030: 147,150; 2031: 149,375; 2032: 151,600; 2033: 153,825; 2034: 156,050; 2035: 158,275; 2036: 160,500; 2037: 162,725; 2038: 164,950; 2039: 167,175; 2040: 169,400; 2041: 171,625; 2042: 173,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 204 | 6SC | Exit | 2517+24.560 | 2519+74.560 | 250.00 | 0.0474 | 2022: 129,350; 2023: 131,575; 2024: 133,800; 2025: 136,025; 2026: 138,250; 2027: 140,475; 2028: 142,700; 2029: 144,925; 2030: 147,150; 2031: 149,375; 2032: 151,600; 2033: 153,825; 2034: 156,050; 2035: 158,275; 2036: 160,500; 2037: 162,725; 2038: 164,950; 2039: 167,175; 2040: 169,400; 2041: 171,625; 2042: 173,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 205 | 6SC | Entrance | 2516+89.240 | 2519+74.560 | 285.32 | 0.0540 | 2022: 129,350; 2023: 131,575; 2024: 133,800; 2025: 136,025; 2026: 138,250; 2027: 140,475; 2028: 142,700; 2029: 144,925; 2030: 147,150; 2031: 149,375; 2032: 151,600; 2033: 153,825; 2034: 156,050; 2035: 158,275; 2036: 160,500; 2037: 162,725; 2038: 164,950; 2039: 167,175; 2040: 169,400; 2041: 171,625; 2042: 173,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 207 | 6SC | Entrance | 2519+74.560 | 2521+89.240 | 214.68 | 0.0407 | 2022: 122,300; 2023: 124,405; 2024: 126,510; 2025: 128,615; 2026: 130,720; 2027: 132,825; 2028: 134,930; 2029: 137,035; 2030: 139,140; 2031: 141,245; 2032: 143,350; 2033: 145,455; 2034: 147,560; 2035: 149,665; 2036: 151,770; 2037: 153,875; 2038: 155,980; 2039: 158,085; 2040: 160,190; 2041: 162,295; 2042: 164,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 211 | 7SC | Exit | 2550+11.330 | 2552+71.330 | 260.00 | 0.0492 | 2022: 124,050; 2023: 126, 182; 2024: 128,315; 2025: 130,447; 2026: 132,580; 2027: 134,712; 2028: 136,845; 2029: 138,977; 2030: 141,110; 2031: 143,242; 2032: 145,375; 2033: 147,507; 2034: 149,640; 2035: 151,772; 2036: 153,905; 2037: 156,037; 2038: 158,170; 2039: 160,302; 2040: 162,435; 2041: 164,567; 2042: 166,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 212 | 7SC | Entrance | 2567+70.470 | 2569+42.420 | 171.95 | 0.0326 | 2022: 124,050; 2023: 126,182; 2024: 128,315; 2025: 130,447; 2026: 132,580; 2027: 134,712; 2028: 136,845; 2029: 138,977;, 2030: 141,110; 2031: 143,$242 ; 2032: 145,375 ; 2033: 147,507 ; 2034: 149,640 ; 2035: 151,772 ; 2036: 153,905 ; 2037: 156,037$; 2038: 158,170; 2039: 160,302; 2040: 162,435; 2041: 164,567; 2042: 166,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 214 | 6SC | Entrance | 2569+42.420 | 2572+70.470 | 328.05 | 0.0621 | 2022: 116,000; 2023: 117.995; 2024: 119,990; 2025: 121,985; 2026: 123.980; 2027: 125,975; 2028: 127,970; 2029: 129,965; 2030: 131,$960 ; 2031: 133,955 ; 2032$ : 135,$950 ; 2033$ : 137,945 ; 2034: 139,940; 2035: 141,935; 2036: 143,930; 2037: 145,925; 2038: 147,920; 2039: 149,915; 2040: 151,910; 2041: 153,905; 2042: 155,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.0 |
| 216 | 6SC | Exit | 2582+32.570 | 2590+47.570 | 815.00 | 0.1544 | 2022: 108,000; 2023: 109,860; 2024: 111,720; 2025: 113,580; 2026: 115,440; 2027: 117,300; 2028: 119,160; 2029: 121,020; 2030: 122,880; 2031: 124,740; 2032: 126,600; 2033: 128,460; 2034: 130,320; 2035: 132,180; 2036: 134,040; 2037: 135,900; 2038: 137,760; 2039: 139,620; 2040: 141,480; 2041: 143,340; 2042: 145,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 218 | 6SC | Entrance | 2594+31.640 | 2598+01.640 | 370.00 | 0.0701 | 2022: 94,700; 2023: 96,330; 2024: 97,960; 2025: 99,590; 2026: 101,220; 2027: 102,850; 2028: 104,480; 2029: 106,110; 2030: 107,740; 2031: 109,370; 2032: 111,000; 2033: 112,630; 2034: 114,260; 2035: 115,890; 2036: 117,520; 2037: 119,150; 2038: 120,780; 2039: 122,410; 2040: 124,040; 2041: 125,670; 2042: 127,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 220 | 6SC | Entrance | 2617+69.470 | 2622+49.470 | 480.00 | 0.0909 | 2022: 84,550; 2023: 86,002; 2024: 87,455; 2025: 88,907; 2026: 90,360; 2027: 91,812; 2028: 93,265; 2029: 94,717; 2030 96,170; 2031: 97,622; 2032: 99,075; 2033: 100,527; 2034: 101,980; 2035: 103,432; 2036: 104,885; 2037: 106,337; 2038: 107,790; 2039: 109,242; 2040: 110,695; 2041: 112,147; 2042: 113,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 224 | 6SC | Entrance | 2622+98.790 | 2626+48.790 | 350.00 | 0.0663 | 2022: 85,150; 2023: 86,615; 2024: 88,080; 2025: 89,545; 2026: 91,010; 2027: 92,475; 2028: 93,940; 2029: 95,405; 2030 96,870; 2031: 98,335; 2032: 99,800; 2033: 101,265; 2034: 102,730; 2035: 104,195; 2036: 105,660; 2037: 107,125; 2038: 108,590; 2039: 110,055; 2040: 111,520; 2041: 112,985; 2042: 114,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 227 | 6SC | Exit | 2667+75.600 | 2670+20.600 | 245.00 | 0.0464 | 2022: 85,450; 2023: 86,920; 2024: 88,390; 2025: 89,860; 2026: 91,330; 2027: 92,800; 2028: 94,270; 2029: 95,740; 2030 97,210; 2031: 98,680; 2032: 100,150; 2033: 101,620; 2034: 103,090; 2035: 104,560; 2036: 106,030; 2037: 107,500; 2038 108,970; 2039: 110,440; 2040: 111,910; 2041: 113,380; 2042: 114,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Ramp Type | Start Location (Sta. ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \text { ft) } \end{array}$ | Length (fit) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | Type | Effective Median Width (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 229 | 6 SC | Entrance | 2713+53.470 | 2716+03.470 | 250.00 | 0.0474 | 2022: 75,700; 2023: 77,002; 2024: 78,305; 2025: 79,607; 2026: 80,910; 2027: 82,212; 2028: 83,515; 2029: 84,817; 2030: 86,120; 2031: 87,422; 2032: 88,725; 2033: 90,027; 2034: 91,330; 2035: 92,632; 2036: 93,935; 2037: 95,237; 2038: 96,540; 2039: 97,842; 2040: 99,145; 2041: 100,447; 2042: 101,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 235 | 8SC | Exit | 2768+72.500 | 2771+42.500 | 270.00 | 0.0511 | 2022: 58,850; 2023: 59,862; 2024: 60,875; 2025: 61,887; 2026: 62,900; 2027: 63,912; 2028: 64,925; 2029: 65,937; 2030: 66,950; 2031: 67,962; 2032: 68,975; 2033: 69,987; 2034: 71,000; 2035: 72,012; 2036: 73,025; 2037: 74,037; 2038: 75,050; 2039: 76,062; 2040: 77,075; 2041: 78,087; 2042: 79,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 238 | 8SC | Exit | 2787+05.200 | 2788+65.200 | 160.00 | 0.0303 | 2022: 59,750; 2023: 60,777; 2024: 61,805; 2025: 62,832; 2026: 63,860; 2027: 64,887; 2028: 65,915; 2029: 66,942; 2030: 67,970; 2031: 68,997; 2032: 70,025; 2033: 71,052; 2034: 72,080; 2035: 73,107; 2036: 74,135; 2037: 75,162; 2038: 76,190; 2039: 77,217; 2040: 78,245; 2041: 79,272; 2042: 80,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 239 | 8SC | Exit | 2803+51.170 | 2805+56.170 | 205.00 | 0.0388 | 2022: 59,750; 2023: 60,777; 2024: 61,805; 2025: 62,832; 2026: 63,860; 2027: 64,887; 2028: 65,915; 2029: 66,942; 2030: 67,970; 2031: 68,997; 2032: 70,025; 2033: 71,052; 2034: 72,080; 2035: 73,107; 2036: 74,135; 2037: 75,162; 2038: 76,190; 2039: 77,217; 2040: 78,245; 2041: 79,272; 2042: 80,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 241 | 8SC | Entrance | 2814+77.790 | 2816+87.790 | 210.00 | 0.0398 | 2022: 56,950; 2023: 57,930; 2024: 58,910; 2025: 59,890; 2026: 60,870; 2027: 61,850; 2028: 62,830; 2029: 63,810; 2030: 64,790; 2031: 65,770; 2032: 66,750; 2033: 67,730; 2034: 68,710; 2035: 69,690; 2036: 70,670; 2037: 71,650; 2038: 72,630; 2039: 73,610; 2040: 74,590; 2041: 75,570; 2042: 76,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 245 | 10SC | Exit | 2850+92.420 | 2852+52.420 | 160.00 | 0.0303 | 2022: 68,450; 2023: 69,627; 2024: 70,805; 2025: 71,982; 2026: 73,160; 2027: 74,337; 2028: 75,515; 2029: 76,692; 2030: 77,870; 2031: 79,047; 2032: 80,225; 2033: 81,402; 2034: 82,580; 2035: 83,757; 2036: 84,935; 2037: 86,112; 2038: 87,290; 2039: 88,467; 2040: 89,645; 2041: 90,822; 2042: 92,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 249 | 4SC | Entrance | 2896+04.190 | 2896+24.130 | 19.94 | 0.0038 | 2022: 50,800; 2023: 51,672; 2024: 52,545; 2025: 53,417; 2026: 54,290; 2027: 55,162; 2028: 56,035; 2029: 56,907; 2030; 57,780; 2031: 58,652; 2032: 59,525; 2033: 60,397; 2034: 61,270; 2035: 62,142; 2036: 63,015; 2037: 63,887; 2038: 64,760; 2039: 65,632; 2040: 66,505; 2041: 67,377; 2042: 68,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 251 | 4SC | Entrance | 2896+24.130 | $2901+84.190$ | 560.06 | 0.1061 | 2022: 51,400; 2023: 52,282; 2024: 53,165; 2025: 54,047; 2026: 54,930; 2027: 55,812; 2028: 56,695; 2029: 57,577; 2030: 58,$460 ; 2031: 59,342 ; 2032: 60,225 ; 2033: 61,107 ; 2034: 61,990 ; 2035: 62,872 ; 2036: 63,755 ; 2037: 64,637 ; 2038: 65,520$; 2039: 66,402; 2040: 67,285; 2041: 68,167; 2042: 69,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 252 | 4SC | Exit | 2896+24.130 | 2898+34.130 | 210.00 | 0.0398 | 2022: 51,400; 2023: 52,282; 2024: 53,165; 2025: 54,047; 2026: 54,930; 2027: 55,812; 2028: 56,695; 2029: 57,577; 2030: 58,$460 ; 2031: 59,342 ; 2032: 60,225 ; 2033: 61,107 ; 2034: 61,990 ; 2035: 62,872 ; 2036: 63,755 ; 2037: 64,637 ; 2038: 65,520$; 2039: 66,402; 2040: 67,285; 2041: 68,167; 2042: 69,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 253 | 4SC | Entrance | 2924+26.050 | 2933+76.050 | 950.00 | 0.1799 | 2022: 51,400; 2023: 52,282; 2024: 53,165; 2025: 54,047; 2026: 54,930; 2027: 55,812; 2028: 56,695; 2029: 57,577; 2030: 58,$460 ; 2031: 59,342 ; 2032: 60,225 ; 2033: 61,107 ; 2034: 61,990 ; 2035: 62,872 ; 2036: 63,755 ; 2037: 64,637 ; 2038: 65,520$; 2039: 66,402; 2040: 67,285; 2041: 68,167; 2042: 69,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 255 | 4SC | Exit | 2949+41.360 | 2952+01.360 | 260.00 | 0.0492 | 2022: 36,250; 2023: 36,872; 2024: 37,495; 2025: 38,117; 2026: 38,740; 2027: 39,362; 2028: 39,985; 2029: 40,607; 2030: 41,230; 2031: 41,852; 2032: 42,475; 2033: 43,097; 2034: 43,720; 2035: 44,342; 2036: 44,965; 2037: 45,587; 2038: 46,210; 2039: 46,832; 2040: 47,455; 2041: 48,077; 2042: 48,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 258 | 4SC | Exit | 3035+33.800 | 3037+48.800 | 215.00 | 0.0407 | 2022: 22,750; 2023: 23,142; 2024: 23,535; 2025: 23,927; 2026: 24,320; 2027: 24,712; 2028: 25,105; 2029: 25,497; 2030: 25,890; 2031: 26,282; 2032: 26,675; 2033: 27,067; 2034: 27,460; 2035: 27,852; 2036: 28,245; 2037: 28,637; 2038: 29,030; 2039: 29,422; 2040: 29,815; 2041: 30,207; 2042: 30,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 260 | 4SC | Entrance | 3041+43.060 | 3050+93.060 | 950.00 | 0.1799 | 2022: 25,500; 2023: 25,940; 2024: 26,380; 2025: 26,820; 2026: 27,260; 2027: 27,700; 2028: 28,140; 2029: 28,580; 2030: 29,020; 2031: 29,460; 2032: 29,900; 2033: 30,340; 2034: 30,780; 2035: 31,220; 2036: 31,660; 2037: 32,100; 2038: 32,540; 2039: 32,980; 2040: 33,420; 2041: 33,860; 2042: 34,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 261 | 4SC | Exit | $3241+29.990$ | $3244+29.990$ | 300.00 | 0.0568 | 2022: 25,500; 2023: 25,940; 2024: 26,380; 2025: 26,820; 2026: 27,260; 2027: 27,700; 2028: 28,140; 2029: 28,580; 2030: 29,020; 2031: 29,460; 2032: 29,900; 2033: 30,340; 2034: 30,780; 2035: 31,220; 2036: 31,660; 2037: 32,100; 2038: 32,540; 2039: 32,980; 2040: 33,420; 2041: 33,860; 2042: 34,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 262 | 4SC | Entrance | 3240+83.710 | 3244+29.990 | 346.28 | 0.0656 | 2022: 25,500; 2023: 25,940; 2024: 26,380; 2025: 26,820; 2026: 27,260; 2027: 27,700; 2028: 28,140; 2029: 28,580; 2030: 29,$020 ; 2031: 29,460 ; 2032: 29,900 ; 2033: 30,340 ; 2034: 30,780 ; 2035: 31,220 ; 2036: 31,660 ; 2037: 32,100 ; 2038: 32,540$; 2039: 32,980; 2040: 33,420; 2041: 33,860; 2042: 34,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 264 | 4SC | Entrance | 3244+29.990 | 3248+03.710 | 373.72 | 0.0708 | 2022: 22,100; 2023: 22,480; 2024: 22,860; 2025: 23,240; 2026: 23,620; 2027: 24,000; 2028: 24,380; 2029: 24,760; 2030: 25,140; 2031: 25,520; 2032: 25,900; 2033: 26,280; 2034: 26,660; 2035: 27,040; 2036: 27,420; 2037: 27,800; 2038: 28,180; 2039: 28,560; 2040: 28,940; 2041: 29,320; 2042: 29,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 267 | 4SC | Entrance | 3279+26.650 | $3281+21.530$ | 194.88 | 0.0369 | 2022: 19,600; 2023: 19,937; 2024: 20,275; 2025: 20,612; 2026: 20,950; 2027: 21,287; 2028: 21,625; 2029: 21,962; 2030: 22,300; 2031: 22,637; 2032: 22,975; 2033: 23,312; 2034: 23,650; 2035: 23,987; 2036: 24,325; 2037: 24,662; 2038: 25,000; 2039: 25,337; 2040: 25,675; 2041: 26,012; 2042: 26,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 269 | 4SC | Entrance | $3281+21.530$ | $3283+26.650$ | 205.12 | 0.0389 | 2022: 20,250; 2023: 20.,597; 2024: 20,945; 2025: 21,292; 2026: 21,640; 2027: 21,987; 2028: 22,335; 2029: 22,682; 2030: 23,030; 2031: 23,377; 2032: 23,725; 2033: 24,072; 2034: 24,420; 2035: 24,767; 2036: 25,115; 2037: 25,462; 2038: 25,810; 2039: 26,157; 2040: 26,505; 2041: 26,852; 2042: 27,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 270 | 4SC | Exit | $3281+21.530$ | $3283+51.530$ | 230.00 | 0.0436 | 2022: 20,250; 2023: 20,597; 2024: 20,945; 2025: 21,292; 2026: 21,640; 2027: 21,987; 2028: 22,335; 2029: 22,682; 2030: 23,030; 2031: 23,377; 2032: 23,725; 2033: 24,072; 2034: 24,420; 2035: 24,767; 2036: 25,115; 2037: 25,462; 2038: 25,810; 2039: 26,157; 2040: 26,505; 2041: 26,852; 2042: 27,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 271 | 4SC | Exit | 3599+99.950 | 3603+79.950 | 380.00 | 0.0720 | 2022: 20,250; 2023: 20,597; 2024: 20,945; 2025: 21,292; 2026: 21,640; 2027: 21,987; 2028: 22,335; 2029: 22,682; 2030: 23,$030 ; 2031: 23,377 ; 2032: 23,725 ; 2033: 24,072 ; 2034: 24,420 ; 2035: 24,767 ; 2036: 25,115 ; 2037: 25,462 ; 2038: 25,810$; 2039: 26,157; 2040: 26,505; 2041: 26,852; 2042: 27,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Ramp Type | Start Location (Sta. ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 272 | 4SC | Entrance | $3598+16.800$ | 3603+79.950 | 563.15 | 0.1067 | 2022: 20,250; 2023: 20,597; 2024: 20,945; 2025: 21,292; 2026: 21,640; 2027: 21,987; 2028: 22,335; 2029: 22,682; 2030: 23,030; 2031: 23,377; 2032: 23,725; 2033: 24,072; 2034: 24,420; 2035: 24,767; 2036: 25,115; 2037: 25,462; 2038: 25,810; 2039: 26,157; 2040: 26,505; 2041: 26,852; 2042: 27,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 274 | 4SC | Entrance | 3603+79.950 | $3606+16.800$ | 236.85 | 0.0449 | 2022: 17,000; 2023: 17,290; 2024: 17,580; 2025: 17,870; 2026: 18,160; 2027: 18,450; 2028: 18,740; 2029: 19,030; 2030: 19,320; 2031: 19,610; 2032: 19,900; 2033: 20,190; 2034: 20,480; 2035: 20,770; 2036: 21,060; 2037: 21,350; 2038: 21,640; 2039: 21,930; 2040: 22,220; 2041: 22,510; 2042: 22,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 277 | 4SC | Exit | 3624+73.190 | 3627+05.090 | 231.90 | 0.0439 | 2022: 14,750; 2023: 15,002; 2024: 15,255; 2025: 15,507; 2026: 15,760; 2027: 16,012; 2028: 16,265; 2029: 16,517; 2030: 16,770; 2031: 17,022; 2032: 17,275; 2033: 17,527; 2034: 17,780; 2035: 18,032; 2036: 18,285; 2037: 18,537; 2038: 18,790; 2039: 19,042; 2040: 19,295; 2041: 19,547; 2042: 19,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 279 | 4SC | Exit | 3627+05.090 | $3628+43.190$ | 138.10 | 0.0262 | 2022: 15,500 ; 2023: 15,767 ; 2024: 16,035; 2025: 16,302; 2026: 16,570; 2027: 16,837; 2028: 17,105; 2029: 17,372; 2030: 17,640; 2031: 17,907; 2032: 18,175; 2033: 18,442; 2034: 18,710; 2035: 18,977; 2036: 19,245; 2037: 19,512; 2038: 19,780; 2039: 20,047; 2040: 20,315; 2041: 20,582; 2042: 20,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 280 | 4SC | Entrance | 3627+05.090 | 3633+05.090 | 600.00 | 0.1136 | 2022: 15,500; 2023: 15,767; 2024: 16,035; 2025: 16,302; 2026: 16.570; 2027: 16,837; 2028: 17,105; 2029: 17,372; 2030: 17,640; 2031: 17,907; 2032: 18,175; 2033: 18,442; 2034: 18,710; 2035: 18,977; 2036: 19,245; 2037: 19,512; 2038: 19,780; 2039: 20,047; 2040: 20,315; 2041: 20,582; 2042: 20,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 281 | 4SC | Exit | 3659+77.630 | 3662+27.630 | 250.00 | 0.0474 | 2022: 15,500 ; 2023: 15,767; 2024: 16,035; 2025: 16,302; 2026: 16,570; 2027: 16,837; 2028: 17,105; 2029: 17,372; 2030: 17,640; 2031: 17,907; 2032: 18,175 ; 2033: 18,442; 2034: 18,710; 2035: 18,977; 2036: 19,245; 2037: 19,512; 2038: 19,780; 2039: 20,047; 2040: 20,315; 2041: 20,582; 2042: 20,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 282 | 4SC | Entrance | 3661+76.010 | 3662+27.630 | 51.62 | 0.0098 | 2022: 15,500 ; 2023: 15,767 ; 2024: 16,035; 2025: 16,302; 2026: 16,570; 2027: 16,837; 2028: 17,105; 2029: 17,372; 2030: 17,640; 2031: 17,907 ; 2032: 18,175 ; 2033: 18,442; 2034: 18,710; 2035: 18,977; 2036: 19,245; 2037: 19,512; 2038: 19,780; 2039: 20,047; 2040: 20,315; 2041: 20,582; 2042: 20,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 284 | 4SC | Entrance | $3662+27.630$ | 3667+36.010 | 508.38 | 0.0963 | 2022: 15,450; 2023: 15,715 ; 2024: 15,980; 2025: 16,245; 2026: 16,510; 2027: 16,775; 2028: 17,040; 2029: 17,305; 2030: 17,570; 2031: 17,835 ; 2032: 18,$100 ; 2033: 18,365$; 2034: 18,630; 2035: 18,895; 2036: 19,160; 2037: 19,425; 2038: 19,690; 2039: 19,955; 2040: 20,220; 2041: 20,485; 2042: 20,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 287 | 4SC | Entrance | 3690+73.620 | 3695+53.620 | 480.00 | 0.0909 | 2022: 15,450 ; 2023: 15,715 ; 2024: 15,980; 2025: 16,245; 2026: 16,510; 2027: 16,775; 2028: 17,040; 2029: 17,305; 2030: 17,570; 2031: 17,835; 2032: 18,100; 2033: 18,365; 2034: 18,630; 2035: 18,895; 2036: 19,160; 2037: 19,425; 2038: 19,690; 2039: 19,955; 2040: 20,220; 2041: 20,485; 2042: 20,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 289 | 4SC | Exit | 3699+52.710 | 3703+22.710 | 370.00 | 0.0701 | 2022: 15,500; 2023: 15,767; 2024: 16,035; 2025: 16,302; 2026: 16,570; 2027: 16,837; 2028: 17,105; 2029: 17,372; 2030: 17,640; 2031: 17,907; 2032: 18,175; 2033: 18,442; 2034: 18,710; 2035: 18,977; 2036: 19,245; 2037: 19,512; 2038: 19,780; 2039: 20,047; 2040: 20,315; 2041: 20,582; 2042: 20,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 290 | 4SC | Entrance | 3917+83.470 | 3923+33.470 | 550.00 | 0.1042 | 2022: 15,500 ; 2023: 15,767 ; 2024: 16,035; 2025: 16,302; 2026: 16,570; 2027: 16,837; 2028: 17,105; 2029: 17,372; 2030: 17,640; 2031: 17,907; 2032: 18,175 ; 2033: 18,442; 2034: 18,710; 2035: 18,977; 2036: 19,245; 2037: 19,512; 2038: 19,780; 2039: 20,047; 2040: 20,315; 2041: 20,582; 2042: 20,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 291 | 4SC | Exit | 3917+65.300 | 3923+33.470 | 568.17 | 0.1076 | 2022: 15,500; 2023: 15,767; 2024: 16,035; 2025: 16,302; 2026: 16,570; 2027: 16,837; 2028: 17,105; 2029: 17,372; 2030: 17,640; 2031: 17,907; 2032: 18,175; 2033: 18,442; 2034: 18,710; 2035: 18,977; 2036: 19,245; 2037: 19,512; 2038: 19,780; 2039: 20,047; 2040: 20,315; 2041: 20,582; 2042: 20,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 293 | 4SC | Exit | 3923+33.470 | 3924+35.300 | 101.83 | 0.0193 | 2022: 15,050; 2023: 15,310; 2024: 15,570; 2025: 15,830; 2026: 16,090; 2027: 16,350; 2028: 16,610; 2029: 16,870; 2030: 17,130; 2031: 17,390; 2032: 17,650; 2033: 17,910; 2034: 18,170; 2035: 18,430; 2036: 18,690; 2037: 18,950; 2038: 19,210; 2039: 19,470; 2040: 19,730; 2041: 19,990; 2042: 20,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 296 | 4SC | Exit | 3943+28.330 | 3945+80.010 | 251.68 | 0.0477 | 2022: 14,850; 2023: 15,105; 2024: 15,360; 2025: 15,615; 2026: 15,870 ; 2027: 16,125; 2028: 16,380; 2029: 16,635; 2030: 16,890; 2031: 17,145; 2032: 17,400; 2033: 17,655; 2034: 17,910; 2035: 18,165; 2036: 18,420; 2037: 18,675; 2038: 18,930; 2039: 19,185; 2040: 19,440; 2041: 19,695; 2042: 19,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 298 | 4SC | Exit | 3945+80.010 | 3947+88.330 | 208.32 | 0.0394 | 2022: 15,250; 2023: 15,510; 2024: 15,770; 2025: 16,030; 2026: 16,290; 2027: 16,550; 2028: 16,810; 2029: 17,070; 2030: 17,330; 2031: 17,590; 2032: 17,850; 2033: 18,110; 2034: 18,370; 2035: 18,630; 2036: 18,890; 2037: 19,150; 2038: 19,410; 2039: 19,670; 2040: 19,930; 2041: 20,190; 2042: 20,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |
| 299 | 4SC | Entrance | 3945+80.010 | 3949+10.010 | 330.00 | 0.0625 | 2022: 15,250 ; 2023: 15,$510 ; 2024: 15,770 ; 2025$ : 16,030; 2026: 16,$290 ; 2027: 16,550 ; 2028: 16,810 ; 2029: 17,070 ; 2030$ : 17,330; 2031: 17,$590 ; 2032: 17,850 ; 2033: 18,110 ; 2034: 18,370 ; 2035: 18,630 ; 2036: 18,890 ; 2037: 19,150 ; 2038: 19,410 ;$ 2039: 19,670; 2040: 19,930; 2041: 20,190; 2042: 20,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 26.00 |

Table 3. Predicted Freeway Crash Rates and Frequencies (Section 1)

| First Year of Analysis | 2022 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Last Year of Analysis | 2042 |
| Evaluated Length (mi) | 57.4982 |
| Average Future Road AADT (vpd) | 71,596 |
| Predicted Crashes |  |
| Total Crashes | 18,168.99 |
| Fatal and Injury Crashes | 5,531.68 |
| Property-Damage-Only Crashes | 12,637.30 |
| Percent of Total Predicted Crashes |  |
| Percent Fatal and Injury Crashes (\%) | 30 |
| Percent Property-Damage-Only Crashes (\%) | 70 |
| Predicted Crash Rate |  |
| Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | 15.0472 |
| FI Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | 4.5812 |
| PDO Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | 10.4660 |
| Predicted Travel Crash Rate |  |
| Total Travel (million veh-mi) | 31,554.03 |
| Travel Crash Rate (crashes/million veh-mi) | 0.58 |
| Travel FI Crash Rate (crashes/million veh-mi) | 0.17 |
| Travel PDO Crash Rate (crashes/million veh-mi) | 0.40 |

Table 4. Predicted Freeway Speed Change Lane Crash Rates and Frequencies (Speed Change)

| First Year of Analysis | 2022 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Last Year of Analysis | 2042 |
| Evaluated Length (mi) | 10.4300 |
| Average Future Road AADT (vpd) | 54,376 |
| Predicted Crashes |  |
| Total Crashes | 2,590.17 |
| Fatal and Injury Crashes | 791.82 |
| Property-Damage-Only Crashes | 1,798.36 |
| Percent of Total Predicted Crashes |  |
| Percent Fatal and Injury Crashes (\%) | 31 |
| Percent Property-Damage-Only Crashes (\%) | 69 |
| Predicted Crash Rate |  |
| Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | 11.8256 |
| FI Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | 3.6151 |
| PDO Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | 8.2105 |
| Predicted Travel Crash Rate |  |
| Total Travel (million veh-mi) | 4,347.13 |
| Travel Crash Rate (crashes/million veh-mi) | 0.60 |
| Travel FI Crash Rate (crashes/million veh-mi) | 0.18 |
| Travel PDO Crash Rate (crashes/million veh-mi) | 0.41 |

Note: Total Travel and Crash Rates/Million Vehicle Miles for Speed Change Lanes reflect AADTs that are half of the Freeway Segment AADTs based on the assumption of 50/50 directional distribution.

Table 5. Predicted Crash Frequencies and Rates by Freeway Segment/Intersection (Section 1)

| Segment <br> Number/Intersectio <br> n Name/Cross Road | Start Location <br> (Sta. ft) | End Location <br> (Sta. ft) | Effective <br> Length (mi) | Total Predicted <br> Crashes for <br> Evaluation <br> Period | Predicted <br> Total Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI <br> Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDo <br> Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted <br> Crash Rate <br> (crashes/mi/yr) | Predicted <br> Travel Crash <br> Rate <br> (crashes/millio <br> n veh-mi) |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | $1000+00.000$ | $1001+07.510$ | 0.0102 | 1.681 | 0.0800 | 0.0279 | 0.0521 | 7.8603 | 0.65 |
| 3 | $1001+07.510$ | $1001+30.470$ | 0.0022 | 0.293 | 0.0139 | 0.0049 | 0.0090 | 6.4125 | 0.58 |
| 5 | $1001+30.470$ | $1018+93.610$ | 0.3339 | 36.090 | 1.7186 | 0.6024 | 1.1162 | 5.1465 | 0.51 |
| 6 | $1018+93.610$ | $1035+88.900$ | 0.3211 | 45.636 | 2.1731 | 0.7440 | 1.4292 | 6.7682 | 0.55 |
| 7 | $1035+88.900$ | $1081+93.610$ | 0.8721 | 115.612 | 5.5053 | 1.8739 | 3.6314 | 6.3127 | 0.52 |
| 8 | $1081+93.610$ | $1084+46.040$ | 0.0478 | 6.880 | 0.3276 | 0.1127 | 0.2149 | 6.8522 |  |


| Segment Number/Intersectio n Name/Cross Road | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Effective <br> Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted <br> Total Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO <br> Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Predicted } \\ \text { Travel Crash } \\ \text { Rate } \\ \text { (crashes/millio } \\ \mathbf{n} \text { veh-mi) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | 1084+46.040 | 1108+25.790 | 0.4232 | 68.801 | 3.2762 | 1.0932 | 2.1830 | 7.7407 | 0.55 |
| 11 | 1108+25.790 | 1141+21.180 | 0.5224 | 91.169 | 4.3414 | 1.4435 | 2.8979 | 8.3101 | 0.57 |
| 15 | 1141+21.180 | 1142+97.170 | 0.0167 | 2.940 | 0.1400 | 0.0472 | 0.0928 | 8.3999 | 0.61 |
| 17 | 1142+97.170 | 1171+25.410 | 0.5357 | 78.289 | 3.7281 | 1.2511 | 2.4769 | 6.9599 | 0.53 |
| 18 | 1171+25.410 | 1181+76.080 | 0.1280 | 23.010 | 1.0957 | 0.3612 | 0.7345 | 8.5625 | 0.57 |
| 20 | 1181+76.080 | 1310+09.960 | 2.3238 | 467.069 | 22.2414 | 7.1406 | 15.1008 | 9.5711 | 0.56 |
| 24 | 1310+09.960 | $1311+36.670$ | 0.0120 | 2.421 | 0.1153 | 0.0380 | 0.0773 | 9.6091 | 0.62 |
| 26 | 1311+36.670 | $1353+89.440$ | 0.8054 | 120.634 | 5.7445 | 1.9209 | 3.8236 | 7.1320 | 0.53 |
| 27 | 1353+89.440 | $1355+18.280$ | 0.0122 | 2.163 | 0.1030 | 0.0345 | 0.0685 | 8.4417 | 0.60 |
| 29 | $1355+18.280$ | $1365+82.620$ | 0.1238 | 25.272 | 1.2034 | 0.3929 | 0.8105 | 9.7192 | 0.60 |
| 32 | $1365+82.620$ | 1366+63.080 | 0.0076 | 1.973 | 0.0940 | 0.0299 | 0.0640 | 12.3321 | 0.66 |
| 34 | 1366+63.080 | 1387+72.400 | 0.2367 | 60.242 | 2.8687 | 0.9049 | 1.9637 | 12.1216 | 0.63 |
| 38 | 1387+72.400 | $1401+83.800$ | 0.2470 | 53.646 | 2.5546 | 0.8163 | 1.7383 | 10.3444 | 0.59 |
| 40 | 1401+83.800 | $1448+14.880$ | 0.8771 | 181.227 | 8.6299 | 2.7523 | 5.8776 | 9.8391 | 0.57 |
| 41 | $1448+14.880$ | $1448+51.680$ | -0.0001 | -0.026 | -0.0012 | -0.0004 | -0.0008 | 12.3444 | 0.56 |
| 45 | 1448+51.680 | 1461+68.620 | -0.2494 | -88.421 | -4.2105 | -1.3652 | -2.8453 | 16.8812 | 0.61 |
| 50 | 1461+68.620 | $1463+36.890$ | -0.0001 | -0.031 | -0.0015 | -0.0005 | -0.0010 | 14.9998 | 0.59 |
| 54 | 1463+36.890 | 1532+41.010 | 1.3076 | 394.344 | 18.7783 | 5.6276 | 13.1508 | 14.3609 | 0.61 |
| 55 | 1532+41.010 | 1542+72.380 | 0.1196 | 47.838 | 2.2780 | 0.6589 | 1.6191 | 19.0505 | 0.69 |
| 57 | 1542+72.380 | 1571+03.740 | 0.4493 | 225.430 | 10.7347 | 2.9999 | 7.7349 | 23.8906 | 0.75 |
| 61 | 1571+03.740 | 1571+65.940 | 0.0059 | 2.759 | 0.1314 | 0.0376 | 0.0938 | 22.3070 | 0.77 |
| 63 | 1571+65.940 | 1616+96.040 | 0.8580 | 312.390 | 14.8757 | 4.3271 | 10.5487 | 17.3382 | 0.66 |
| 64 | 1616+96.040 | $1620+37.170$ | 0.0646 | 25.317 | 1.2056 | 0.4052 | 0.8004 | 18.6596 | 0.62 |
| 65 | 1620+37.170 | $1641+82.890$ | 0.4064 | 183.393 | 8.7330 | 2.8488 | 5.8842 | 21.4894 | 0.61 |
| 66 | 1641+82.890 | 1752+45.780 | 2.0952 | 554.769 | 26.4176 | 8.6707 | 17.7469 | 12.6083 | 0.57 |
| 67 | 1752+45.780 | $1774+96.080$ | 0.4262 | 161.959 | 7.7123 | 2.5617 | 5.1506 | 18.0959 | 0.57 |
| 68 | 1774+96.080 | $1802+00.210$ | 0.4942 | 327.074 | 15.5749 | 5.0047 | 10.5702 | 31.5184 | 0.73 |
| 70 | 1802+00.210 | 1802+34.860 | 0.0066 | 4.003 | 0.1906 | 0.0622 | 0.1284 | 29.0433 | 0.70 |
| 71 | 1802+34.860 | $1858+89.680$ | 1.0710 | 574.319 | 27.3485 | 8.5507 | 18.7978 | 25.5358 | 0.63 |
| 72 | $1858+89.680$ | $1862+31.360$ | 0.0434 | 29.178 | 1.3894 | 0.4256 | 0.9638 | 32.0104 | 0.70 |
| 74 | 1862+31.360 | 1937+57.720 | 1.3071 | 973.962 | 46.3791 | 13.7702 | 32.6089 | 35.4831 | 0.70 |
| 77 | 1937+57.720 | 1945+10.160 | 0.1264 | 96.291 | 4.5853 | 1.3726 | 3.2127 | 36.2733 | 0.74 |
| 79 | 1945+10.160 | 1962+27.940 | 0.3253 | 206.856 | 9.8503 | 2.9869 | 6.8633 | 30.2771 | 0.65 |
| 80 | 1962+27.940 | 1969+25.480 | 0.1070 | 79.077 | 3.7656 | 1.1369 | 2.6287 | 35.1872 | 0.73 |
| 82 | 1969+25.480 | 1983+70.120 | 0.2196 | 226.614 | 10.7912 | 3.1165 | 7.6747 | 49.1337 | 0.94 |
| 85 | 1983+70.120 | 1992+04.960 | 0.1581 | 147.814 | 7.0388 | 2.0265 | 5.0123 | 44.5172 | 0.86 |
| 86 | 1992+04.960 | 1993+20.390 | 0.0109 | 12.017 | 0.5722 | 0.1651 | 0.4071 | 52.3501 | 0.99 |
| 88 | 1993+20.390 | 2006+55.130 | 0.2080 | 280.892 | 13.3758 | 3.7484 | 9.6274 | 64.3209 | 1.15 |
| 92 | 2006+55.130 | $2006+91.220$ | 0.0034 | 4.038 | 0.1923 | 0.0547 | 0.1376 | 56.2602 | 1.08 |
| 94 | 2006+91.220 | 2045+17.910 | 0.7248 | 574.500 | 27.3572 | 7.4345 | 19.9227 | 37.7469 | 0.78 |
| 95 | 2045+17.910 | 2046+03.220 | 0.0081 | 7.803 | 0.3715 | 0.1082 | 0.2634 | 45.9916 | 0.89 |
| 97 | 2046+03.220 | 2049+38.400 | 0.0507 | 59.233 | 2.8206 | 0.8003 | 2.0203 | 55.6049 | 0.97 |
| 99 | 2049+38.400 | 2051+11.970 | 0.0164 | 18.737 | 0.8922 | 0.2601 | 0.6321 | 54.2841 | 0.85 |
| 101 | 2051+11.970 | 2067+62.740 | 0.2372 | 252.054 | 12.0025 | 3.5018 | 8.5008 | 50.5953 | 0.75 |
| 104 | 2067+62.740 | 2072+80.530 | 0.0777 | 78.504 | 3.7383 | 1.0942 | 2.6440 | 48.1075 | 0.72 |
| 106 | 2072+80.530 | 2096+65.070 | 0.4514 | 393.742 | 18.7496 | 5.5105 | 13.2391 | 41.5357 | 0.64 |
| 108 | 2096+65.070 | 2108+05.270 | -0.0492 | -49.676 | -2.3655 | -0.6970 | -1.6685 | 48.0383 | 0.69 |
| 112 | 2108+05.270 | 2112+02.880 | 0.0000 | 0.000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 45.4324 | 0.67 |
| 115 | 2112+02.880 | 2132+94.000 | 0.3953 | 413.464 | 19.6888 | 5.6883 | 14.0005 | 49.8105 | 0.76 |


| Segment Number/Intersectio n Name/Cross Road | Start Location (Sta. ft) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { End Location } \\ & \text { (Sta. ft) } \end{aligned}$ | Effective Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted <br> Total Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Predicted } \\ \text { Travel Crash } \\ \text { Rate } \\ \text { (crashes/millio } \\ \mathbf{n} \text { veh-mi) } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 118 | 2132+94.000 | 2141+38.040 | 0.0000 | 0.000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 121 | $2141+38.040$ | 2142+01.770 | 0.0115 | 13.056 | 0.6217 | 0.1800 | 0.4417 | 54.0345 | 0.79 |
| 123 | 2142+01.770 | $2156+10.790$ | 0.2669 | 250.944 | 11.9497 | 3.4943 | 8.4554 | 44.7790 | 0.67 |
| 124 | $2156+10.790$ | $2159+38.930$ | 0.0621 | 46.473 | 2.2130 | 0.6697 | 1.5433 | 35.6085 | 0.61 |
| 125 | $2159+38.930$ | $2171+54.400$ | 0.1151 | 105.926 | 5.0441 | 1.5056 | 3.5386 | 43.8233 | 0.72 |
| 127 | $2171+54.400$ | 2183+64.830 | 0.2276 | 182.924 | 8.7107 | 2.5463 | 6.1644 | 38.2750 | 0.72 |
| 130 | 2183+64.830 | $2187+07.690$ | -0.0001 | -0.102 | -0.0049 | -0.0014 | -0.0034 | 41.0804 | 0.74 |
| 134 | $2187+07.690$ | 2197+66.440 | -0.2005 | -171.125 | -8.1488 | -2.5304 | -5.6184 | 40.6382 | 0.70 |
| 139 | 2197+66.440 | $2198+41.760$ | -0.0036 | -3.807 | -0.1813 | -0.0538 | -0.1275 | 49.8784 | 0.90 |
| 144 | $2198+41.760$ | 2201+64.630 | 0.0303 | 27.907 | 1.3289 | 0.3889 | 0.9400 | 43.8811 | 0.80 |
| 147 | 2201+64.630 | 2216+63.010 | 0.2838 | 215.011 | 10.2386 | 3.0122 | 7.2264 | 36.0788 | 0.68 |
| 148 | 2216+63.010 | 2221+59.740 | 0.0571 | 57.979 | 2.7609 | 0.7862 | 1.9747 | 48.3133 | 0.80 |
| 150 | $2221+59.740$ | $2230+01.910$ | 0.0457 | 50.397 | 2.3999 | 0.6978 | 1.7021 | 52.5594 | 0.76 |
| 153 | 2230+01.910 | $2234+63.570$ | 0.0867 | 93.430 | 4.4490 | 1.2348 | 3.2142 | 51.3189 | 0.77 |
| 155 | $2234+63.570$ | 2240+93.000 | 0.0851 | 108.228 | 5.1537 | 1.4250 | 3.7287 | 60.5468 | 0.89 |
| 157 | 2240+93.000 | 2245+71.310 | 0.0300 | 44.419 | 2.1152 | 0.5810 | 1.5342 | 70.5469 | 1.00 |
| 160 | $2245+71.310$ | $2258+50.450$ | 0.1811 | 257.948 | 12.2832 | 3.3309 | 8.9523 | 67.8288 | 1.01 |
| 163 | $2258+50.450$ | 2258+79.500 | 0.0028 | 4.553 | 0.2168 | 0.0576 | 0.1592 | 78.8101 | 1.21 |
| 165 | $2258+79.500$ | 2268+46.280 | 0.1831 | 201.337 | 9.5875 | 2.6586 | 6.9288 | 52.3612 | 0.84 |
| 166 | $2268+46.280$ | 2274+72.630 | 0.0684 | 84.217 | 4.0103 | 1.1249 | 2.8855 | 58.5983 | 0.90 |
| 169 | $2274+72.630$ | $2284+00.230$ | 0.1359 | 170.852 | 8.1358 | 2.2438 | 5.8920 | 59.8622 | 0.98 |
| 171 | $2284+00.230$ | 2289+18.000 | 0.0981 | 115.263 | 5.4887 | 1.5195 | 3.9692 | 55.9715 | 0.97 |
| 172 | $2289+18.000$ | 2319+47.290 | 0.5074 | 527.314 | 25.1102 | 7.0233 | 18.0869 | 49.4839 | 0.80 |
| 174 | 2319+47.290 | $2324+20.370$ | 0.0896 | 119.302 | 5.6810 | 1.6084 | 4.0727 | 63.4056 | 0.96 |
| 175 | $2324+20.370$ | 2342+71.190 | 0.3505 | 422.459 | 20.1171 | 5.7568 | 14.3603 | 57.3898 | 0.83 |
| 176 | 2342+71.190 | 2343+28.110 | 0.0108 | 10.858 | 0.5170 | 0.1519 | 0.3651 | 47.9610 | 0.73 |
| 177 | $2343+28.110$ | 2365+64.260 | 0.3661 | 362.512 | 17.2625 | 4.8961 | 12.3664 | 47.1526 | 0.77 |
| 180 | $2365+64.260$ | 2366+17.960 | 0.0051 | 4.818 | 0.2294 | 0.0666 | 0.1628 | 45.1164 | 0.80 |
| 182 | $2366+17.960$ | $2401+60.950$ | 0.6710 | 485.292 | 23.1091 | 6.8472 | 16.2619 | 34.4390 | 0.67 |
| 184 | 2401+60.950 | $2402+12.440$ | 0.0049 | 4.501 | 0.2143 | 0.0630 | 0.1513 | 43.9605 | 0.81 |
| 186 | 2402+12.440 | 2414+12.230 | 0.1635 | 138.615 | 6.6007 | 2.0186 | 4.5821 | 40.3815 | 0.70 |
| 189 | $2414+12.230$ | $2424+35.910$ | 0.1939 | 139.386 | 6.6374 | 2.0558 | 4.5816 | 34.2350 | 0.63 |
| 190 | $2424+35.910$ | 2427+01.170 | 0.0502 | 37.936 | 1.8065 | 0.5608 | 1.2457 | 35.9578 | 0.68 |
| 191 | 2427+01.170 | 2443+40.790 | 0.3105 | 227.246 | 10.8213 | 3.2013 | 7.6200 | 34.8472 | 0.68 |
| 192 | 2443+40.790 | 2450+69.650 | 0.1002 | 86.585 | 4.1231 | 1.2036 | 2.9194 | 41.1638 | 0.75 |
| 194 | 2450+69.650 | 2471+86.300 | 0.2792 | 264.685 | 12.6040 | 3.6404 | 8.9636 | 45.1442 | 0.78 |
| 197 | $2471+86.300$ | 2473+42.600 | 0.0296 | 26.003 | 1.2382 | 0.3637 | 0.8745 | 41.8283 | 0.78 |
| 198 | $2473+42.600$ | 2501+93.380 | 0.5399 | 408.410 | 19.4481 | 5.3063 | 14.1418 | 36.0203 | 0.73 |
| 199 | 2501+93.380 | $2506+47.600$ | 0.0430 | 39.693 | 1.8902 | 0.5100 | 1.3801 | 43.9435 | 0.84 |
| 201 | $2506+47.600$ | 2519+74.560 | 0.1826 | 189.742 | 9.0353 | 2.4139 | 6.6214 | 49.4927 | 0.89 |
| 206 | 2519+74.560 | 2521+89.240 | 0.0203 | 18.924 | 0.9011 | 0.2433 | 0.6579 | 44.3268 | 0.85 |
| 208 | $2521+89.240$ | 2545+80.950 | 0.4530 | 320.064 | 15.2411 | 4.2114 | 11.0297 | 33.6467 | 0.71 |
| 209 | $2545+80.950$ | 2550+11.330 | 0.0815 | 62.836 | 2.9922 | 0.8972 | 2.0950 | 36.7088 | 0.74 |
| 210 | $2550+11.330$ | 2569+42.420 | 0.3248 | 271.694 | 12.9378 | 3.8302 | 9.1076 | 39.8292 | 0.75 |
| 213 | 2569+42.420 | 2572+70.470 | 0.0311 | 26.500 | 1.2619 | 0.3455 | 0.9164 | 40.6205 | 0.82 |
| 215 | 2572+70.470 | 2590+47.570 | 0.2594 | 184.244 | 8.7735 | 2.4457 | 6.3278 | 33.8231 | 0.73 |
| 217 | 2590+47.570 | 2598+01.640 | 0.1078 | 65.172 | 3.1034 | 0.8958 | 2.2076 | 28.7944 | 0.71 |
| 219 | $2598+01.640$ | 2622+49.470 | 0.4181 | 212.168 | 10.1032 | 2.9858 | 7.1174 | 24.1618 | 0.67 |
| 221 | 2622+49.470 | 2622+79.700 | 0.0057 | 2.491 | 0.1186 | 0.0357 | 0.0829 | 20.7215 | 0.62 |


| Segment Number/Intersectio n Name/Cross Road | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Effective Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted <br> Total Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes $/ \mathbf{m i} / \mathbf{y r}$ ) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes $/$ millio $\mathbf{n}$ veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 222 | 2622+79.700 | 2622+98.790 | 0.0036 | 1.760 | 0.0838 | 0.0247 | 0.0591 | 23.1784 | 0.64 |
| 223 | 2622+98.790 | $2666+50.570$ | 0.7911 | 396.126 | 18.8631 | 5.5814 | 13.2817 | 23.8455 | 0.66 |
| 225 | 2666+50.570 | 2667+75.600 | 0.0237 | 9.226 | 0.4393 | 0.1347 | 0.3046 | 18.5530 | 0.60 |
| 226 | 2667+75.600 | 2689+23.280 | 0.3836 | 198.068 | 9.4318 | 2.7946 | 6.6372 | 24.5904 | 0.67 |
| 228 | 2689+23.280 | 2716+03.470 | 0.4839 | 205.299 | 9.7761 | 2.9738 | 6.8024 | 20.2012 | 0.62 |
| 230 | 2716+03.470 | $2723+97.650$ | 0.1504 | 46.410 | 2.2100 | 0.7787 | 1.4312 | 14.6928 | 0.49 |
| 231 | 2723+97.650 | 2741+43.420 | 0.3306 | 109.809 | 5.2290 | 1.8388 | 3.3902 | 15.8149 | 0.51 |
| 232 | 2741+43.420 | $2758+30.970$ | 0.3196 | 123.907 | 5.9004 | 2.0333 | 3.8671 | 18.4610 | 0.54 |
| 233 | $2758+30.970$ | $2768+12.430$ | 0.1859 | 63.790 | 3.0376 | 1.0703 | 1.9674 | 16.3417 | 0.53 |
| 234 | $2768+12.430$ | 2771+42.500 | 0.0369 | 11.386 | 0.5422 | 0.1899 | 0.3523 | 14.6752 | 0.58 |
| 236 | $2771+42.500$ | 2787+05.200 | 0.2960 | 77.237 | 3.6779 | 1.2880 | 2.3899 | 12.4269 | 0.52 |
| 237 | 2787+05.200 | 2805+56.170 | 0.3160 | 95.361 | 4.5410 | 1.5841 | 2.9569 | 14.3704 | 0.56 |
| 240 | 2805+56.170 | 2816+87.790 | 0.1944 | 53.739 | 2.5590 | 0.8983 | 1.6607 | 13.1611 | 0.54 |
| 242 | 2816+87.790 | $2821+10.420$ | 0.0800 | 17.937 | 0.8541 | 0.3059 | 0.5483 | 10.6710 | 0.50 |
| 243 | $2821+10.420$ | $2835+32.750$ | 0.2694 | 65.861 | 3.1362 | 1.1559 | 1.9803 | 11.6423 | 0.48 |
| 244 | $2835+32.750$ | 2852+52.420 | 0.3105 | 98.948 | 4.7118 | 1.6802 | 3.0316 | 15.1728 | 0.52 |
| 246 | 2852+52.420 | $2856+90.300$ | 0.0829 | 24.680 | 1.1752 | 0.4223 | 0.7529 | 14.1709 | 0.51 |
| 247 | $2856+90.300$ | 2896+04.190 | 0.7413 | 197.429 | 9.4014 | 2.8753 | 6.5260 | 12.6828 | 0.59 |
| 248 | 2896+04.190 | 2896+24.130 | 0.0019 | 0.659 | 0.0314 | 0.0096 | 0.0217 | 16.6079 | 0.76 |
| 250 | 2896+24.130 | 2933+76.050 | 0.5477 | 162.438 | 7.7351 | 2.3657 | 5.3695 | 14.1228 | 0.64 |
| 254 | 2933+76.050 | 2952+01.360 | 0.3211 | 58.214 | 2.7721 | 0.9064 | 1.8657 | 8.6336 | 0.56 |
| 256 | 2952+01.360 | $3035+33.800$ | 1.5781 | 144.975 | 6.9036 | 2.4752 | 4.4284 | 4.3746 | 0.50 |
| 257 | $3035+33.800$ | 3041+43.060 | 0.0950 | 10.411 | 0.4958 | 0.1766 | 0.3191 | 5.2169 | 0.54 |
| 259 | 3041+43.060 | $3244+29.990$ | 3.6911 | 435.283 | 20.7278 | 7.1894 | 13.5383 | 5.6157 | 0.52 |
| 263 | $3244+29.990$ | $3248+03.710$ | 0.0354 | 3.779 | 0.1799 | 0.0645 | 0.1155 | 5.0845 | 0.54 |
| 265 | $3248+03.710$ | $3279+26.650$ | 0.5915 | 48.985 | 2.3326 | 0.8474 | 1.4852 | 3.9438 | 0.50 |
| 266 | $3279+26.650$ | $3281+21.530$ | 0.0185 | 1.798 | 0.0856 | 0.0314 | 0.0542 | 4.6382 | 0.55 |
| 268 | $3281+21.530$ | $3603+79.950$ | 5.9790 | 544.108 | 25.9099 | 9.3115 | 16.5984 | 4.3335 | 0.50 |
| 273 | 3603+79.950 | $3606+16.800$ | 0.0224 | 1.804 | 0.0859 | 0.0320 | 0.0539 | 3.8302 | 0.53 |
| 275 | $3606+16.800$ | $3624+73.190$ | 0.3516 | 21.718 | 1.0342 | 0.3905 | 0.6437 | 2.9414 | 0.49 |
| 276 | $3624+73.190$ | 3627+05.090 | 0.0220 | 1.563 | 0.0745 | 0.0285 | 0.0460 | 3.3902 | 0.54 |
| 278 | 3627+05.090 | $3662+27.630$ | 0.5687 | 41.644 | 1.9831 | 0.7504 | 1.2327 | 3.4871 | 0.53 |
| 283 | $3662+27.630$ | $3667+36.010$ | 0.0481 | 3.803 | 0.1811 | 0.0691 | 0.1119 | 3.7615 | 0.57 |
| 285 | $3667+36.010$ | $3690+73.620$ | 0.4427 | 30.710 | 1.4624 | 0.5456 | 0.9168 | 3.3031 | 0.50 |
| 286 | $3690+73.620$ | $3699+52.710$ | 0.1210 | 9.152 | 0.4358 | 0.1656 | 0.2702 | 3.6005 | 0.55 |
| 288 | $3699+52.710$ | $3923+33.470$ | 4.0979 | 283.158 | 13.4837 | 5.0369 | 8.4468 | 3.2904 | 0.50 |
| 292 | 3923+33.470 | 3924+35.300 | 0.0096 | 0.716 | 0.0341 | 0.0130 | 0.0211 | 3.5331 | 0.55 |
| 294 | $3924+35.300$ | $3943+28.330$ | 0.3585 | 22.763 | 1.0839 | 0.4078 | 0.6762 | 3.0233 | 0.49 |
| 295 | $3943+28.330$ | $3945+80.010$ | 0.0238 | 1.735 | 0.0826 | 0.0316 | 0.0510 | 3.4657 | 0.55 |
| 297 | 3945+80.010 | 4035+90.691 | 1.6556 | 112.061 | 5.3363 | 1.9989 | 3.3373 | 3.2232 | 0.50 |
| Total |  |  | 52.2832 | 18,168.987 | 865.1898 | 263.4135 | 601.7764 | 16.5481 |  |

Note: Effective Length is the segment length minus the length of the speed change lanes if present.

Table 6. Predicted Crash Frequencies and Rates by Freeway Speed Change Lane (Speed Change)

| Segment <br> Number/Intersection Name/Cross Road | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted Total Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO <br> Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Predicted } \\ \text { Travel Crash } \\ \text { Rate } \\ \text { (crashes/millio } \\ \mathbf{n} \text { veh-mi) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 1000+00.000 | 1001+07.510 | 0.0204 | 1.675 | 0.0797 | 0.0258 | 0.0540 | 3.9166 | 0.64 |
| 4 | 1001+07.510 | 1001+30.470 | 0.0043 | 0.327 | 0.0156 | 0.0050 | 0.0105 | 3.5792 | 0.65 |
| 10 | 1084+46.040 | 1087+36.040 | 0.0549 | 5.100 | 0.2428 | 0.0765 | 0.1664 | 4.4213 | 0.63 |
| 12 | 1108+25.790 | 1113+55.790 | 0.1004 | 10.215 | 0.4864 | 0.1381 | 0.3483 | 4.8459 | 0.67 |
| 13 | $1138+01.180$ | 1141+21.180 | 0.0606 | 5.787 | 0.2756 | 0.0855 | 0.1900 | 4.5468 | 0.62 |
| 14 | $1138+97.170$ | 1141+21.180 | 0.0424 | 4.773 | 0.2273 | 0.0675 | 0.1597 | 5.3568 | 0.74 |
| 16 | $1141+21.180$ | 1142+97.170 | 0.0333 | 3.527 | 0.1680 | 0.0500 | 0.1180 | 5.0395 | 0.73 |
| 19 | 1171+25.410 | 1178+75.410 | 0.1420 | 15.033 | 0.7158 | 0.2383 | 0.4775 | 5.0395 | 0.67 |
| 21 | 1181+76.080 | 1184+86.080 | 0.0587 | 6.463 | 0.3077 | 0.0956 | 0.2121 | 5.2416 | 0.62 |
| 22 | $1307+34.960$ | 1310+09.960 | 0.0521 | 5.778 | 0.2752 | 0.0870 | 0.1882 | 5.2831 | 0.62 |
| 23 | 1304+66.670 | 1310+09.960 | 0.1029 | 12.572 | 0.5987 | 0.1911 | 0.4075 | 5.8182 | 0.69 |
| 25 | 1310+09.960 | 1311+36.670 | 0.0240 | 2.650 | 0.1262 | 0.0404 | 0.0858 | 5.2585 | 0.68 |
| 28 | $1353+89.440$ | 1355+18.280 | 0.0244 | 2.280 | 0.1086 | 0.0340 | 0.0745 | 4.4486 | 0.63 |
| 30 | $1355+18.280$ | 1356+89.440 | 0.0324 | 3.437 | 0.1637 | 0.0511 | 0.1125 | 5.0485 | 0.62 |
| 31 | $1355+18.280$ | 1361+68.280 | 0.1231 | 14.779 | 0.7038 | 0.2381 | 0.4657 | 5.7166 | 0.70 |
| 33 | $1365+82.620$ | 1366+63.080 | 0.0152 | 1.800 | 0.0857 | 0.0257 | 0.0600 | 5.6253 | 0.60 |
| 35 | 1366+63.080 | 1369+92.620 | 0.0624 | 7.630 | 0.3633 | 0.1089 | 0.2544 | 5.8212 | 0.60 |
| 36 | 1366+63.080 | 1374+93.080 | 0.1572 | 22.261 | 1.0600 | 0.3586 | 0.7014 | 6.7433 | 0.70 |
| 37 | 1382+12.400 | 1387+72.400 | 0.1061 | 15.987 | 0.7613 | 0.2500 | 0.5112 | 7.1779 | 0.74 |
| 39 | 1399+68.800 | 1401+83.800 | 0.0407 | 4.783 | 0.2278 | 0.0751 | 0.1527 | 5.5933 | 0.63 |
| 42 | $1448+14.880$ | $1448+51.680$ | 0.0070 | 0.939 | 0.0447 | 0.0124 | 0.0323 | 6.4154 | 0.58 |
| 43 | $1448+48.620$ | $1448+51.680$ | 0.0006 | 0.078 | 0.0037 | 0.0010 | 0.0027 | 6.4263 | 0.58 |
| 44 | $1448+16.890$ | 1448+51.680 | 0.0066 | 0.814 | 0.0387 | 0.0123 | 0.0265 | 5.8798 | 0.53 |
| 46 | 1448+51.680 | 1461+68.620 | 0.2494 | 40.999 | 1.9523 | 0.5375 | 1.4148 | 7.8275 | 0.57 |
| 47 | $1448+51.680$ | $1461+68.620$ | 0.2494 | 42.994 | 2.0473 | 0.7292 | 1.3181 | 8.2083 | 0.60 |
| 48 | $1448+51.680$ | 1461+68.620 | 0.2494 | 41.068 | 1.9556 | 0.5408 | 1.4148 | 7.8407 | 0.57 |
| 49 | $1448+51.680$ | 1461+68.620 | 0.2494 | 39.891 | 1.8996 | 0.5988 | 1.3007 | 7.6159 | 0.55 |
| 51 | $1461+68.620$ | $1463+34.880$ | 0.0315 | 4.836 | 0.2303 | 0.0635 | 0.1668 | 7.3127 | 0.57 |
| 52 | $1461+68.620$ | 1461+71.680 | 0.0006 | 0.091 | 0.0044 | 0.0016 | 0.0028 | 7.5142 | 0.59 |
| 53 | $1461+68.620$ | $1463+36.890$ | 0.0319 | 4.665 | 0.2222 | 0.0702 | 0.1520 | 6.9710 | 0.55 |
| 56 | 1532+41.010 | 1540+41.010 | 0.1515 | 34.967 | 1.6651 | 0.6065 | 1.0585 | 10.9895 | 0.79 |
| 58 | 1542+72.380 | 1545+72.380 | 0.0568 | 11.270 | 0.5367 | 0.1654 | 0.3713 | 9.4457 | 0.59 |
| 59 | $1568+23.740$ | 1571+03.740 | 0.0530 | 10.567 | 0.5032 | 0.1567 | 0.3465 | 9.4884 | 0.59 |
| 60 | 1567+65.940 | 1571+03.740 | 0.0640 | 20.355 | 0.9693 | 0.3419 | 0.6274 | 15.1504 | 0.95 |
| 62 | 1571+03.740 | 1571+65.940 | 0.0118 | 3.343 | 0.1592 | 0.0563 | 0.1029 | 13.5128 | 0.93 |
| 69 | $1800+10.210$ | 1802+00.210 | 0.0360 | 12.059 | 0.5742 | 0.1711 | 0.4032 | 15.9577 | 0.74 |
| 73 | $1858+89.680$ | 1861+14.680 | 0.0426 | 11.993 | 0.5711 | 0.1831 | 0.3880 | 13.4021 | 0.59 |
| 75 | 1862+31.360 | 1871+31.360 | 0.1705 | 51.077 | 2.4322 | 0.8166 | 1.6157 | 14.2691 | 0.56 |
| 76 | 1934+07.720 | 1937+57.720 | 0.0663 | 24.834 | 1.1826 | 0.3478 | 0.8348 | 17.8397 | 0.71 |
| 78 | 1943+40.160 | 1945+10.160 | 0.0322 | 10.020 | 0.4771 | 0.1617 | 0.3155 | 14.8193 | 0.60 |
| 81 | 1962+27.940 | 1964+92.940 | 0.0502 | 20.405 | 0.9717 | 0.2973 | 0.6744 | 19.3605 | 0.80 |
| 83 | 1969+25.480 | 1973+25.480 | 0.0758 | 23.275 | 1.1083 | 0.3264 | 0.7819 | 14.6302 | 0.56 |
| 84 | 1982+00.120 | 1983+70.120 | 0.0322 | 13.253 | 0.6311 | 0.1971 | 0.4340 | 19.6009 | 0.75 |
| 87 | 1992+04.960 | 1993+20.390 | 0.0219 | 7.987 | 0.3804 | 0.1207 | 0.2596 | 17.3980 | 0.66 |
| 89 | 1993+20.390 | 1993+94.960 | 0.0141 | 5.405 | 0.2574 | 0.0816 | 0.1758 | 18.2254 | 0.65 |
| 90 | 1993+20.390 | 1995+45.390 | 0.0426 | 26.885 | 1.2802 | 0.4015 | 0.8788 | 30.0430 | 1.08 |


| Segment Number/Intersection Name/Cross Road | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted Total Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes $/ \mathbf{m i} / \mathbf{y r}$ ) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes/millio n veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 91 | $2004+81.220$ | 2006+55.130 | 0.0329 | 14.086 | 0.6707 | 0.1994 | 0.4713 | 20.3642 | 0.73 |
| 93 | 2006+55.130 | 2006+91.220 | 0.0068 | 2.748 | 0.1309 | 0.0390 | 0.0919 | 19.1454 | 0.73 |
| 96 | 2045+17.910 | 2046+03.220 | 0.0162 | 5.628 | 0.2680 | 0.0829 | 0.1851 | 16.5863 | 0.64 |
| 98 | 2046+03.220 | 2047+37.910 | 0.0255 | 9.787 | 0.4660 | 0.1438 | 0.3222 | 18.2688 | 0.64 |
| 100 | 2049+38.400 | 2051+11.970 | 0.0329 | 12.800 | 0.6095 | 0.1878 | 0.4217 | 18.5419 | 0.58 |
| 102 | 2051+11.970 | 2054+58.400 | 0.0656 | 27.081 | 1.2896 | 0.3992 | 0.8903 | 19.6549 | 0.58 |
| 103 | 2063+12.740 | 2067+62.740 | 0.0852 | 31.643 | 1.5068 | 0.4140 | 1.0928 | 17.6800 | 0.52 |
| 105 | 2070+65.530 | 2072+80.530 | 0.0407 | 16.256 | 0.7741 | 0.2485 | 0.5255 | 19.0102 | 0.57 |
| 107 | 2096+62.880 | 2096+65.070 | 0.0004 | 0.151 | 0.0072 | 0.0019 | 0.0053 | 17.3690 | 0.53 |
| 109 | 2096+65.070 | 2108+05.270 | 0.2159 | 70.464 | 3.3554 | 1.0430 | 2.3124 | 15.5382 | 0.45 |
| 110 | $2102+85.270$ | 2108+05.270 | 0.0985 | 36.646 | 1.7450 | 0.4957 | 1.2494 | 17.7190 | 0.51 |
| 111 | 2096+65.070 | 2108+05.270 | 0.2159 | 83.483 | 3.9754 | 1.0729 | 2.9025 | 18.4091 | 0.53 |
| 113 | $2108+05.270$ | $2112+02.880$ | 0.0753 | 23.821 | 1.1343 | 0.3529 | 0.7815 | 15.0632 | 0.45 |
| 114 | $2108+05.270$ | $2112+02.880$ | 0.0753 | 28.425 | 1.3536 | 0.3655 | 0.9881 | 17.9748 | 0.53 |
| 116 | $2112+02.880$ | 2112+05.070 | 0.0004 | 0.126 | 0.0060 | 0.0019 | 0.0041 | 14.4524 | 0.44 |
| 117 | $2132+88.040$ | 2132+94.000 | 0.0011 | 0.351 | 0.0167 | 0.0043 | 0.0125 | 14.8192 | 0.45 |
| 119 | $2132+94.000$ | $2141+38.040$ | 0.1599 | 63.102 | 3.0049 | 0.8274 | 2.1775 | 18.7974 | 0.54 |
| 120 | $2132+94.000$ | $2141+38.040$ | 0.1599 | 52.650 | 2.5072 | 0.6440 | 1.8631 | 15.6838 | 0.45 |
| 122 | $2141+38.040$ | 2141+44.000 | 0.0011 | 0.436 | 0.0208 | 0.0057 | 0.0150 | 18.3916 | 0.54 |
| 126 | $2159+38.930$ | 2171+54.400 | 0.2302 | 82.165 | 3.9126 | 1.0503 | 2.8623 | 16.9965 | 0.56 |
| 128 | $2171+54.400$ | 2171+68.930 | 0.0028 | 0.831 | 0.0396 | 0.0108 | 0.0288 | 14.3790 | 0.54 |
| 129 | $2183+61.760$ | 2183+64.830 | 0.0006 | 0.175 | 0.0083 | 0.0023 | 0.0061 | 14.3461 | 0.54 |
| 131 | $2183+64.830$ | 2187+07.690 | 0.0649 | 19.793 | 0.9425 | 0.2891 | 0.6535 | 14.5149 | 0.52 |
| 132 | 2187+06.440 | 2187+07.690 | 0.0002 | 0.074 | 0.0035 | 0.0011 | 0.0025 | 14.9707 | 0.54 |
| 133 | 2183+64.830 | 2187+07.690 | 0.0649 | 20.489 | 0.9757 | 0.2649 | 0.7108 | 15.0252 | 0.54 |
| 135 | 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | 0.2005 | 51.379 | 2.4466 | 0.7197 | 1.7269 | 12.2014 | 0.42 |
| 136 | 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | 0.2005 | 65.831 | 3.1348 | 0.8605 | 2.2743 | 15.6333 | 0.54 |
| 137 | 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | 0.2005 | 53.003 | 2.5240 | 0.7344 | 1.7896 | 12.5870 | 0.43 |
| 138 | 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | 0.2005 | 65.537 | 3.1208 | 0.8465 | 2.2743 | 15.5635 | 0.54 |
| 140 | 2197+66.440 | 2198+41.760 | 0.0143 | 4.326 | 0.2060 | 0.0632 | 0.1428 | 14.4406 | 0.52 |
| 141 | $2197+66.440$ | 2197+67.690 | 0.0002 | 0.075 | 0.0036 | 0.0010 | 0.0026 | 15.0332 | 0.54 |
| 142 | 2197+66.440 | $2198+41.760$ | 0.0143 | 4.483 | 0.2135 | 0.0580 | 0.1555 | 14.9661 | 0.54 |
| 143 | 2198+04.630 | $2198+41.760$ | 0.0070 | 2.848 | 0.1356 | 0.0425 | 0.0931 | 19.2867 | 0.69 |
| 145 | $2198+41.760$ | $2198+44.830$ | 0.0006 | 0.175 | 0.0083 | 0.0026 | 0.0058 | 14.3321 | 0.52 |
| 146 | $2198+41.760$ | 2201+64.630 | 0.0611 | 24.581 | 1.1705 | 0.3669 | 0.8036 | 19.1418 | 0.69 |
| 149 | 2216+63.010 | 2220+53.010 | 0.0739 | 26.115 | 1.2436 | 0.3661 | 0.8775 | 16.8362 | 0.55 |
| 151 | $2221+59.740$ | 2230+01.910 | 0.1595 | 58.410 | 2.7815 | 0.9582 | 1.8233 | 17.4384 | 0.50 |
| 152 | $2226+41.910$ | $2230+01.910$ | 0.0682 | 27.249 | 1.2976 | 0.3846 | 0.9130 | 19.0313 | 0.55 |
| 154 | $2230+01.910$ | $2230+09.740$ | 0.0015 | 0.645 | 0.0307 | 0.0110 | 0.0197 | 20.7264 | 0.62 |
| 156 | $2234+63.570$ | $2238+23.570$ | 0.0682 | 26.921 | 1.2819 | 0.3800 | 0.9019 | 18.8016 | 0.55 |
| 158 | $2240+93.000$ | 2243+13.000 | 0.0417 | 28.824 | 1.3726 | 0.4415 | 0.9311 | 32.9412 | 0.94 |
| 159 | $2241+51.310$ | 2245+71.310 | 0.0795 | 41.189 | 1.9614 | 0.6274 | 1.3339 | 24.6575 | 0.70 |
| 161 | $2253+90.450$ | $2258+50.450$ | 0.0871 | 51.723 | 2.4630 | 0.7011 | 1.7619 | 28.2709 | 0.84 |
| 162 | $2256+64.500$ | $2258+50.450$ | 0.0352 | 17.908 | 0.8527 | 0.2514 | 0.6014 | 24.2133 | 0.72 |
| 164 | $2258+50.450$ | 2258+79.500 | 0.0055 | 2.707 | 0.1289 | 0.0380 | 0.0909 | 23.4252 | 0.72 |
| 167 | $2268+46.280$ | 2271+96.280 | 0.0663 | 25.014 | 1.1911 | 0.3547 | 0.8365 | 17.9693 | 0.55 |
| 168 | $2272+92.630$ | 2274+72.630 | 0.0341 | 13.553 | 0.6454 | 0.2152 | 0.4302 | 18.9309 | 0.58 |
| 170 | $2279+80.230$ | 2284+00.230 | 0.0795 | 44.146 | 2.1022 | 0.6354 | 1.4668 | 26.4276 | 0.87 |
| 173 | $2289+18.000$ | $2296+18.000$ | 0.1326 | 54.681 | 2.6038 | 0.8440 | 1.7598 | 19.6404 | 0.64 |


| Segment Number/Intersection Name/Cross Road | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted Total Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes $/ \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{yr}$ ) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes/millio n veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 178 | 2362+64.260 | 2365+64.260 | 0.0568 | 20.546 | 0.9784 | 0.2977 | 0.6807 | 17.2196 | 0.56 |
| 179 | 2362+57.960 | 2365+64.260 | 0.0580 | 27.948 | 1.3308 | 0.4622 | 0.8687 | 22.9412 | 0.75 |
| 181 | 2365+64.260 | $2366+17.960$ | 0.0102 | 4.410 | 0.2100 | 0.0731 | 0.1369 | 20.6475 | 0.73 |
| 183 | 2401+60.900 | $2401+60.950$ | 0.0000 | 0.003 | 0.0002 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 16.1910 | 0.63 |
| 185 | 2401+60.950 | $2402+12.440$ | 0.0098 | 3.522 | 0.1677 | 0.0531 | 0.1146 | 17.1956 | 0.64 |
| 187 | $2402+12.440$ | $2406+30.900$ | 0.0793 | 24.814 | 1.1816 | 0.3588 | 0.8228 | 14.9093 | 0.52 |
| 188 | 2411+57.230 | 2414+12.230 | 0.0483 | 16.646 | 0.7927 | 0.2476 | 0.5451 | 16.4129 | 0.57 |
| 193 | 2443+40.790 | 2447+40.790 | 0.0758 | 24.443 | 1.1640 | 0.3424 | 0.8215 | 15.3642 | 0.56 |
| 195 | 2450+69.650 | $2455+14.650$ | 0.0843 | 33.980 | 1.6181 | 0.5190 | 1.0991 | 19.1989 | 0.66 |
| 196 | $2463+46.300$ | $2471+86.300$ | 0.1591 | 52.601 | 2.5048 | 0.6951 | 1.8097 | 15.7445 | 0.54 |
| 200 | 2501+93.380 | $2506+47.600$ | 0.0860 | 37.850 | 1.8024 | 0.6037 | 1.1987 | 20.9513 | 0.80 |
| 202 | $2506+47.600$ | $2506+58.380$ | 0.0020 | 0.958 | 0.0456 | 0.0153 | 0.0304 | 22.3375 | 0.81 |
| 203 | $2506+47.600$ | $2508+27.600$ | 0.0341 | 11.703 | 0.5573 | 0.1864 | 0.3709 | 16.3467 | 0.59 |
| 204 | 2517+24.560 | 2519+74.560 | 0.0473 | 15.760 | 0.7505 | 0.2353 | 0.5151 | 15.8498 | 0.57 |
| 205 | $2516+89.240$ | 2519+74.560 | 0.0540 | 25.730 | 1.2253 | 0.4378 | 0.7875 | 22.6741 | 0.82 |
| 207 | 2519+74.560 | $2521+89.240$ | 0.0407 | 18.103 | 0.8620 | 0.3085 | 0.5536 | 21.2016 | 0.81 |
| 211 | $2550+11.330$ | 2552+71.330 | 0.0492 | 15.722 | 0.7486 | 0.2334 | 0.5152 | 15.2033 | 0.57 |
| 212 | 2567+70.470 | $2569+42.420$ | 0.0326 | 11.494 | 0.5473 | 0.1788 | 0.3685 | 16.8067 | 0.63 |
| 214 | 2569+42.420 | 2572+70.470 | 0.0621 | 25.245 | 1.2021 | 0.4090 | 0.7931 | 19.3486 | 0.78 |
| 216 | $2582+32.570$ | $2590+47.570$ | 0.1544 | 41.366 | 1.9698 | 0.5501 | 1.4197 | 12.7615 | 0.55 |
| 218 | $2594+31.640$ | $2598+01.640$ | 0.0701 | 25.149 | 1.1976 | 0.4298 | 0.7678 | 17.0897 | 0.84 |
| 220 | 2617+69.470 | 2622+49.470 | 0.0909 | 25.091 | 1.1948 | 0.3959 | 0.7989 | 13.1427 | 0.73 |
| 224 | $2622+98.790$ | $2626+48.790$ | 0.0663 | 20.780 | 0.9895 | 0.3381 | 0.6515 | 14.9276 | 0.82 |
| 227 | 2667+75.600 | $2670+20.600$ | 0.0464 | 10.551 | 0.5024 | 0.1594 | 0.3430 | 10.8281 | 0.59 |
| 229 | 2713+53.470 | 2716+03.470 | 0.0473 | 14.982 | 0.7134 | 0.2438 | 0.4696 | 15.0677 | 0.93 |
| 235 | $2768+72.500$ | $2771+42.500$ | 0.0511 | 8.182 | 0.3896 | 0.1226 | 0.2670 | 7.6193 | 0.60 |
| 238 | 2787+05.200 | $2788+65.200$ | 0.0303 | 5.178 | 0.2466 | 0.0861 | 0.1605 | 8.1364 | 0.64 |
| 239 | 2803+51.170 | $2805+56.170$ | 0.0388 | 6.447 | 0.3070 | 0.1014 | 0.2056 | 7.9075 | 0.62 |
| 241 | 2814+77.790 | 2816+87.790 | 0.0398 | 8.146 | 0.3879 | 0.1364 | 0.2515 | 9.7526 | 0.80 |
| 245 | 2850+92.420 | 2852+52.420 | 0.0303 | 5.869 | 0.2795 | 0.0973 | 0.1822 | 9.2230 | 0.63 |
| 249 | 2896+04.190 | 2896+24.130 | 0.0038 | 0.585 | 0.0278 | 0.0070 | 0.0209 | 7.3739 | 0.68 |
| 251 | 2896+24.130 | $2901+84.190$ | 0.1061 | 16.658 | 0.7933 | 0.1992 | 0.5940 | 7.4785 | 0.68 |
| 252 | 2896+24.130 | $2898+34.130$ | 0.0398 | 5.734 | 0.2730 | 0.0900 | 0.1830 | 6.8647 | 0.62 |
| 253 | 2924+26.050 | 2933+76.050 | 0.1799 | 31.378 | 1.4942 | 0.5727 | 0.9215 | 8.3044 | 0.76 |
| 255 | 2949+41.360 | 2952+01.360 | 0.0492 | 5.051 | 0.2405 | 0.0769 | 0.1637 | 4.8844 | 0.63 |
| 258 | $3035+33.800$ | $3037+48.800$ | 0.0407 | 2.763 | 0.1316 | 0.0439 | 0.0877 | 3.2316 | 0.66 |
| 260 | 3041+43.060 | $3050+93.060$ | 0.1799 | 12.038 | 0.5733 | 0.1797 | 0.3935 | 3.1861 | 0.58 |
| 261 | $3241+29.990$ | $3244+29.990$ | 0.0568 | 4.173 | 0.1987 | 0.0626 | 0.1361 | 3.4978 | 0.64 |
| 262 | $3240+83.710$ | $3244+29.990$ | 0.0656 | 4.673 | 0.2225 | 0.0725 | 0.1500 | 3.3930 | 0.62 |
| 264 | $3244+29.990$ | $3248+03.710$ | 0.0708 | 4.244 | 0.2021 | 0.0661 | 0.1360 | 2.8553 | 0.60 |
| 267 | $3279+26.650$ | $3281+21.530$ | 0.0369 | 2.081 | 0.0991 | 0.0280 | 0.0711 | 2.6844 | 0.64 |
| 269 | $3281+21.530$ | $3283+26.650$ | 0.0388 | 2.276 | 0.1084 | 0.0306 | 0.0778 | 2.7902 | 0.64 |
| 270 | $3281+21.530$ | $3283+51.530$ | 0.0436 | 2.637 | 0.1256 | 0.0414 | 0.0841 | 2.8827 | 0.67 |
| 271 | $3599+99.950$ | $3603+79.950$ | 0.0720 | 4.213 | 0.2006 | 0.0616 | 0.1390 | 2.7878 | 0.64 |
| 272 | $3598+16.800$ | $3603+79.950$ | 0.1067 | 5.579 | 0.2656 | 0.0848 | 0.1808 | 2.4906 | 0.57 |
| 274 | 3603+79.950 | $3606+16.800$ | 0.0449 | 1.899 | 0.0904 | 0.0290 | 0.0614 | 2.0163 | 0.56 |
| 277 | $3624+73.190$ | $3627+05.090$ | 0.0439 | 1.921 | 0.0915 | 0.0284 | 0.0631 | 2.0828 | 0.66 |
| 279 | 3627+05.090 | $3628+43.190$ | 0.0262 | 1.199 | 0.0571 | 0.0177 | 0.0394 | 2.1828 | 0.66 |
| 280 | 3627+05.090 | $3633+05.090$ | 0.1136 | 4.075 | 0.1941 | 0.0467 | 0.1473 | 1.7077 | 0.52 |


| Segment Number/Intersection Name/Cross Road | $\underset{\text { (Sta. ft) }}{\text { Start Location }}$ | End Location (Sta. ft) | Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted Total <br> Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO <br> Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes/millio n veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 281 | 3659+77.630 | $3662+27.630$ | 0.0473 | 2.242 | 0.1068 | 0.0348 | 0.0719 | 2.2546 | 0.68 |
| 282 | $3661+76.010$ | 3662+27.630 | 0.0098 | 0.334 | 0.0159 | 0.0029 | 0.0130 | 1.6283 | 0.49 |
| 284 | $3662+27.630$ | $3667+36.010$ | 0.0963 | 3.276 | 0.1560 | 0.0288 | 0.1272 | 1.6202 | 0.49 |
| 287 | 3690+73.620 | 3695+53.620 | 0.0909 | 3.224 | 0.1535 | 0.0285 | 0.1250 | 1.6889 | 0.51 |
| 289 | $3699+52.710$ | $3703+22.710$ | 0.0701 | 3.212 | 0.1530 | 0.0474 | 0.1056 | 2.1828 | 0.66 |
| 290 | 3917+83.470 | 3923+33.470 | 0.1042 | 3.861 | 0.1838 | 0.0461 | 0.1378 | 1.7648 | 0.53 |
| 291 | 3917+65.300 | 3923+33.470 | 0.1076 | 4.823 | 0.2297 | 0.0676 | 0.1621 | 2.1345 | 0.64 |
| 293 | 3923+33.470 | $3924+35.300$ | 0.0193 | 0.841 | 0.0401 | 0.0118 | 0.0283 | 2.0775 | 0.65 |
| 296 | $3943+28.330$ | $3945+80.010$ | 0.0477 | 2.078 | 0.0990 | 0.0300 | 0.0690 | 2.0760 | 0.65 |
| 298 | $3945+80.010$ | 3947+88.330 | 0.0395 | 1.761 | 0.0839 | 0.0254 | 0.0585 | 2.1256 | 0.65 |
| 299 | 3945+80.010 | 3949+10.010 | 0.0625 | 2.663 | 0.1268 | 0.0318 | 0.0950 | 2.0293 | 0.62 |
| Total |  |  | 10.4300 | 2,590.173 | 123.3416 | 37.7055 | 85.6360 | 11.8256 |  |

Note: Travel Crash Rates/Million Vehicle Miles for Speed Change Lanes reflect AADTs that are half of the Freeway Segment AADTs based on the assumption of 50/50 directional distribution.

Table 7. Predicted Crash Frequencies and Rates by Horizontal Design Element (Section 1)

| Title | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted Total <br> Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Predicted PDO } \\ & \text { Crash } \\ & \text { Frequency } \\ & \text { (crashes/yr) } \end{aligned}$ | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes/millio n veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tangent | $1000+00.000$ | $1409+23.502$ | 7.7507 | 1,379.620 | 65.6962 | 21.5222 | 44.1740 | 8.4762 | 0.67 |
| Simple Curve 1 | $1409+23.502$ | $1421+10.395$ | 0.2248 | 46.446 | 2.2117 | 0.7054 | 1.5064 | 9.8391 | 0.57 |
| Tangent | $1421+10.395$ | 1561+19.905 | 2.6533 | 829.249 | 39.4880 | 11.8245 | 27.6636 | 14.8825 | 0.92 |
| Simple Curve 2 | $1561+19.905$ | $1566+61.681$ | 0.1026 | 43.136 | 2.0541 | 0.5740 | 1.4801 | 20.0184 | 0.75 |
| Tangent | $1566+61.681$ | $1602+83.668$ | 0.6860 | 287.215 | 13.6769 | 4.0389 | 9.6380 | 19.9377 | 0.82 |
| Simple Curve 3 | 1602+83.668 | $1618+07.981$ | 0.2887 | 105.703 | 5.0335 | 1.4820 | 3.5515 | 17.4353 | 0.66 |
| Tangent | $1618+07.981$ | 1719+40.788 | 1.9191 | 589.436 | 28.0684 | 9.2013 | 18.8671 | 14.6259 | 0.58 |
| Simple Curve 4 | $1719+40.788$ | $1737+48.636$ | 0.3424 | 90.658 | 4.3170 | 1.4169 | 2.9001 | 12.6083 | 0.57 |
| Tangent | $1737+48.636$ | $1772+70.380$ | 0.6670 | 220.792 | 10.5139 | 3.4782 | 7.0357 | 15.7630 | 0.57 |
| Simple Curve 5 | $1772+70.380$ | 1776+88.158 | 0.0791 | 39.477 | 1.8798 | 0.6124 | 1.2674 | 23.7579 | 0.64 |
| Simple Curve 6 | $1776+88.158$ | $1799+26.404$ | 0.4239 | 270.723 | 12.8916 | 4.1425 | 8.7491 | 30.4111 | 0.73 |
| Simple Curve 7 | $1799+26.404$ | $1803+44.182$ | 0.0791 | 60.282 | 2.8706 | 0.9053 | 1.9653 | 36.2793 | 1.03 |
| Tangent | 1803+44.182 | 1812+87.343 | 0.1786 | 95.790 | 4.5614 | 1.4262 | 3.1353 | 25.5358 | 0.63 |
| Simple Curve 8 | $1812+87.343$ | 1830+64.062 | 0.3365 | 180.448 | 8.5928 | 2.6866 | 5.9062 | 25.5358 | 0.63 |
| Tangent | 1830+64.062 | 1846+79.699 | 0.3060 | 164.089 | 7.8137 | 2.4430 | 5.3707 | 25.5358 | 0.63 |
| Simple Curve 9 | 1846+79.699 | $1854+83.526$ | 0.1522 | 81.639 | 3.8876 | 1.2155 | 2.6721 | 25.5358 | 0.63 |
| Tangent | $1854+83.526$ | 1893+55.838 | 0.7334 | 537.827 | 25.6108 | 7.7560 | 17.8548 | 34.9210 | 0.86 |
| Simple Curve 10 | 1893+55.838 | 1909+05.868 | 0.2936 | 200.584 | 9.5516 | 2.8359 | 6.7157 | 32.5366 | 0.70 |
| Tangent | 1909+05.868 | 1914+34.235 | 0.1001 | 68.374 | 3.2559 | 0.9667 | 2.2892 | 32.5366 | 0.70 |
| Simple Curve 11 | $1914+34.235$ | 1925+74.417 | 0.2159 | 147.547 | 7.0261 | 2.0861 | 4.9400 | 32.5366 | 0.70 |
| Tangent | 1925+74.417 | 1932+04.692 | 0.1194 | 81.562 | 3.8839 | 1.1531 | 2.7307 | 32.5366 | 0.70 |
| Simple Curve 12 | 1932+04.692 | 1941+63.531 | 0.1816 | 148.332 | 7.0634 | 2.0999 | 4.9635 | 38.8958 | 0.98 |
| Tangent | $1941+63.531$ | 1944+36.167 | 0.0516 | 40.548 | 1.9309 | 0.5886 | 1.3422 | 37.3942 | 0.95 |
| Simple Curve 13 | $1944+36.167$ | 1948+05.795 | 0.0700 | 49.431 | 2.3538 | 0.7194 | 1.6344 | 33.6237 | 0.79 |
| Tangent | 1948+05.795 | 1960+08.580 | 0.2278 | 144.840 | 6.8971 | 2.0915 | 4.8057 | 30.2771 | 0.65 |


| Title | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted Total Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO <br> Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes $/ \mathrm{mi} / \mathbf{y r}$ ) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes/millio n veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Simple Curve 14 | 1960+08.580 | 1965+01.283 | 0.0933 | 77.809 | 3.7052 | 1.1242 | 2.5810 | 39.7061 | 1.13 |
| Tangent | 1965+01.283 | 1975+74.400 | 0.2032 | 173.158 | 8.2456 | 2.4177 | 5.8279 | 40.5705 | 1.06 |
| Simple Curve 15 | 1975+74.400 | 1987+72.055 | 0.2268 | 209.240 | 9.9638 | 2.8893 | 7.0744 | 43.9265 | 1.02 |
| Simple Curve 16 | 1987+72.055 | 1994+08.228 | 0.1205 | 131.040 | 6.2400 | 1.8217 | 4.4183 | 51.7895 | 1.27 |
| Simple Curve 17 | 1994+08.228 | 2008+79.931 | 0.2787 | 327.999 | 15.6190 | 4.4061 | 11.2129 | 56.0360 | 1.31 |
| Simple Curve 18 | 2008+79.931 | $2010+30.922$ | 0.0286 | 22.668 | 1.0794 | 0.2933 | 0.7861 | 37.7469 | 0.78 |
| Simple Curve 19 | 2010+30.922 | $2021+45.567$ | 0.2111 | 167.341 | 7.9686 | 2.1655 | 5.8031 | 37.7469 | 0.78 |
| Tangent | $2021+45.567$ | 2026+31.406 | 0.0920 | 72.939 | 3.4733 | 0.9439 | 2.5294 | 37.7469 | 0.78 |
| Simple Curve 20 | 2026+31.406 | 2036+97.557 | 0.2019 | 160.061 | 7.6220 | 2.0713 | 5.5506 | 37.7469 | 0.78 |
| Tangent | 2036+97.557 | 2043+28.631 | 0.1195 | 94.743 | 4.5116 | 1.2261 | 3.2855 | 37.7469 | 0.78 |
| Simple Curve 21 | $2043+28.631$ | 2053+94.781 | 0.2019 | 207.694 | 9.8902 | 2.8766 | 7.0136 | 48.9801 | 1.23 |
| Tangent | 2053+94.781 | $2118+32.023$ | 1.2192 | 1,051.827 | 50.0870 | 14.5907 | 35.4963 | 41.0827 | 1.03 |
| Simple Curve 22 | $2118+32.023$ | $2120+32.013$ | 0.0379 | 39.543 | 1.8830 | 0.5440 | 1.3390 | 49.7134 | 0.76 |
| Simple Curve 23 | $2120+32.013$ | $2122+97.150$ | 0.0502 | 52.424 | 2.4964 | 0.7212 | 1.7751 | 49.7134 | 0.76 |
| Simple Curve 24 | 2122+97.150 | 2131+09.403 | 0.1538 | 160.602 | 7.6477 | 2.2095 | 5.4382 | 49.7134 | 0.76 |
| Simple Curve 25 | $2131+09.403$ | $2132+62.803$ | 0.0291 | 30.331 | 1.4443 | 0.4173 | 1.0270 | 49.7134 | 0.76 |
| Simple Curve 26 | $2132+62.803$ | 2135+26.639 | 0.0500 | 38.424 | 1.8297 | 0.4947 | 1.3350 | 36.6171 |  |
| Tangent | $2135+26.639$ | $2163+57.275$ | 0.5361 | 459.495 | 21.8807 | 6.2954 | 15.5853 | 40.8142 |  |
| Simple Curve 27 | $2163+57.275$ | $2170+59.314$ | 0.1330 | 108.639 | 5.1733 | 1.4763 | 3.6970 | 38.9081 | 1.28 |
| Tangent | $2170+59.314$ | $2174+50.136$ | 0.0740 | 60.238 | 2.8685 | 0.8329 | 2.0356 | 38.7530 | 0.88 |
| Simple Curve 28 | $2174+50.136$ | 2181+54.565 | 0.1334 | 106.456 | 5.0693 | 1.4818 | 3.5875 | 37.9967 | 0.72 |
| Tangent | $2181+54.565$ | $2243+49.277$ | 1.1732 | 933.842 | 44.4687 | 12.8023 | 31.6664 | 37.9024 | 1.43 |
| Simple Curve 29 | $2243+49.277$ | $2245+32.759$ | 0.0348 | 35.033 | 1.6683 | 0.4970 | 1.1713 | 48.0069 | 1.71 |
| Tangent | $2245+32.759$ | 2249+27.518 | 0.0748 | 79.193 | 3.7711 | 1.0320 | 2.7391 | 50.4392 | 1.07 |
| Simple Curve 30 | $2249+27.518$ | $2251+57.465$ | 0.0436 | 46.370 | 2.2081 | 0.5988 | 1.6093 | 50.7024 | 1.01 |
| Simple Curve 31 | $2251+57.465$ | $2261+54.922$ | 0.1889 | 273.993 | 13.0473 | 3.6100 | 9.4373 | 69.0654 | 1.51 |
| Simple Curve 32 | $2261+54.922$ | $2263+91.306$ | 0.0448 | 49.228 | 2.3442 | 0.6500 | 1.6941 | 52.3612 | 0.84 |
| Tangent | $2263+91.306$ | $2275+61.181$ | 0.2216 | 233.844 | 11.1354 | 3.1601 | 7.9753 | 50.2576 | 1.14 |
| Simple Curve 33 | $2275+61.181$ | 2277+47.707 | 0.0353 | 34.356 | 1.6360 | 0.4512 | 1.1848 | 46.3100 | 0.98 |
| Simple Curve 34 | 2277+47.707 | $2290+05.115$ | 0.2381 | 301.565 | 14.3602 | 4.0404 | 10.3199 | 60.3002 | 1.30 |
| Simple Curve 35 | 2290+05.115 | $2291+91.641$ | 0.0353 | 47.039 | 2.2400 | 0.6574 | 1.5826 | 63.4070 | 1.44 |
| Tangent | $2291+91.641$ | 2297+39.982 | 0.1039 | 128.756 | 6.1312 | 1.7854 | 4.3458 | 59.0378 | 1.29 |
| Simple Curve 36 | 2297+39.982 | $2303+83.624$ | 0.1219 | 112.040 | 5.3352 | 1.4923 | 3.8430 | 43.7666 | 0.80 |
| Tangent | 2303+83.624 | $2318+47.152$ | 0.2772 | 254.759 | 12.1314 | 3.3931 | 8.7382 | 43.7666 | 0.80 |
| Simple Curve 37 | $2318+47.152$ | 2319+51.135 | 0.0197 | 18.401 | 0.8762 | 0.2452 | 0.6310 | 44.4928 | 0.81 |
| Simple Curve 38 | 2319+51.135 | 2331+24.292 | 0.2222 | 279.006 | 13.2860 | 3.7848 | 9.5012 | 59.7959 | 0.88 |
| Simple Curve 39 | $2331+24.292$ | 2332+28.275 | 0.0197 | 23.735 | 1.1302 | 0.3234 | 0.8068 | 57.3898 | 0.83 |
| Tangent | $2332+28.275$ | $2425+50.523$ | 1.7656 | 1,498.312 | 71.3482 | 21.0779 | 50.2703 | 40.4107 | 0.80 |
| Simple Curve 40 | $2425+50.523$ | 2433+04.127 | 0.1427 | 105.113 | 5.0054 | 1.4957 | 3.5096 | 35.0692 | 0.68 |
| Tangent | $2433+04.127$ | 2601+34.280 | 3.1875 | 2,477.163 | 117.9601 | 33.8816 | 84.0786 | 37.0068 | 0.95 |
| Simple Curve 41 | $2601+34.280$ | $2613+82.583$ | 0.2364 | 108.198 | 5.1523 | 1.5227 | 3.6296 | 21.7928 | 0.67 |
| Tangent | $2613+82.583$ | $2763+45.367$ | 2.8339 | 1,273.072 | 60.6225 | 18.9514 | 41.6711 | 21.3922 | 0.68 |
| Simple Curve 42 | $2763+45.367$ | $2768+12.454$ | 0.0885 | 30.358 | 1.4456 | 0.5093 | 0.9363 | 16.3413 | 0.53 |
| Tangent | $2768+12.454$ | $2966+00.096$ | 3.7477 | 981.450 | 46.7357 | 15.5866 | 31.1491 | 12.4706 | 0.67 |
| Simple Curve 43 | $2966+00.096$ | 2976+37.562 | 0.1965 | 18.051 | 0.8596 | 0.3082 | 0.5514 | 4.3746 | 0.50 |
| Tangent | $2976+37.562$ | $3656+26.983$ | 12.8768 | 1,260.352 | 60.0167 | 21.2389 | 38.7778 | 4.6608 | 0.55 |
| Simple Curve 44 | $3656+26.983$ | $3668+38.707$ | 0.2295 | 18.105 | 0.8622 | 0.2876 | 0.5746 | 3.7568 | 0.91 |
| Simple Curve 45 | $3668+38.707$ | $3683+98.876$ | 0.2955 | 20.497 | 0.9760 | 0.3641 | 0.6119 | 3.3031 | 0.50 |
| Simple Curve 46 | $3683+98.876$ | $3696+25.301$ | 0.2323 | 17.832 | 0.8491 | 0.2900 | 0.5592 | 3.6557 | 0.72 |


| Title | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted Total Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO <br> Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted <br> Crash Rate (crashes $/ \mathrm{mi} / \mathbf{y r}$ ) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes/millio n veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tangent | $3696+25.301$ | $3884+30.225$ | 3.5615 | 240.396 | 11.4474 | 4.2675 | 7.1799 | 3.2142 | 0.51 |
| Simple Curve 47 | $3884+30.225$ | 3904+19.402 | 0.3767 | 25.167 | 1.1984 | 0.4477 | 0.7507 | 3.1810 | 0.50 |
| Tangent | 3904+19.402 | $4035+90.691$ | 2.4946 | 177.519 | 8.4533 | 3.0947 | 5.3586 | 3.3887 | 0.59 |

Table 8. Predicted Crash Frequencies by Year (Section 1)

| Year | Total Crashes | FI Crashes | Percent FI (\%) | PDO Crashes | Percent PDO (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 806.93 | 253.12 | 0.314 | 553.82 | 0.686 |
| 2023 | 824.94 | 257.90 | 0.313 | 567.04 | 0.687 |
| 2024 | 843.15 | 262.73 | 0.312 | 580.42 | 0.688 |
| 2025 | 861.52 | 267.57 | 0.311 | 593.95 | 0.689 |
| 2026 | 880.07 | 272.44 | 0.310 | 607.62 | 0.690 |
| 2027 | 898.77 | 277.34 | 0.309 | 621.43 | 0.691 |
| 2028 | 917.62 | 282.25 | 0.308 | 635.37 | 0.692 |
| 2029 | 936.63 | 287.19 | 0.307 | 649.44 | 0.693 |
| 2030 | 955.79 | 292.15 | 0.306 | 663.64 | 0.694 |
| 2031 | 975.10 | 297.13 | 0.305 | 677.98 | 0.695 |
| 2032 | 994.57 | 302.12 | 0.304 | 692.45 | 0.696 |
| 2033 | 1,014.18 | 307.14 | 0.303 | 707.04 | 0.697 |
| 2034 | 1,033.95 | 312.18 | 0.302 | 721.77 | 0.698 |
| 2035 | 1,053.86 | 317.24 | 0.301 | 736.62 | 0.699 |
| 2036 | 1,073.93 | 322.32 | 0.300 | 751.61 | 0.700 |
| 2037 | 1,094.14 | 327.42 | 0.299 | 766.73 | 0.701 |
| 2038 | 1,114.51 | 332.54 | 0.298 | 781.98 | 0.702 |
| 2039 | 1,135.02 | 337.67 | 0.297 | 797.35 | 0.703 |
| 2040 | 1,155.69 | 342.83 | 0.297 | 812.86 | 0.703 |
| 2041 | 1,176.50 | 348.00 | 0.296 | 828.50 | 0.704 |
| 2042 | 1,197.46 | 353.20 | 0.295 | 844.26 | 0.705 |
| Total | 20,944.35 | 6,352.48 | 0.303 | 14,591.88 | 0.697 |
| Average | 997.35 | 302.50 | 0.303 | 694.85 | 0.697 |

Note: Fatal and Injury Crashes and Property Damage Only Crashes do not necessarily sum up to Total Crashes because the distribution of these three crashes had been derived independently.
Note: Fatal and Injury Crashes and Property Damage Only Crashes do not necessarily sum up to Total Crashes because the distribution of these three crashes had been derived independently.

Note: Fatal and Injury Crashes and Property Damage Only Crashes do not necessarily sum up to Total Crashes because the distribution of these three crashes had been derived independently.

Table 9. Predicted Crash Severity by Freeway Segment (Section 1)

| Seg. No. | Fatal (K) Crashes (crashes) | Incapacitating Injury (A) Crashes (crashes) | Non-Incapacitating Injury (B) Crashes (crashes) | Possible Injury (C) <br> Crashes (crashes) | No Injury (O) Crashes (crashes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.0107 | 0.0275 | 0.1928 | 0.3544 | 1.0950 |
| 3 | 0.0019 | 0.0048 | 0.0339 | 0.0622 | 0.1900 |
| 5 | 0.2319 | 0.5946 | 4.1662 | 7.6568 | 23.4402 |
| 6 | 0.2864 | 0.7344 | 5.1456 | 9.4568 | 30.0126 |
| 7 | 0.7215 | 1.8497 | 12.9610 | 23.8205 | 76.2588 |
| 8 | 0.0434 | 0.1112 | 0.7794 | 1.4324 | 4.5131 |
| 9 | 0.4209 | 1.0791 | 7.5611 | 13.8963 | 45.8432 |
| 11 | 0.5558 | 1.4249 | 9.9842 | 18.3496 | 60.8549 |
| 15 | 0.0182 | 0.0466 | 0.3264 | 0.5999 | 1.9488 |
| 17 | 0.4817 | 1.2350 | 8.6533 | 15.9035 | 52.0157 |
| 18 | 0.1391 | 0.3566 | 2.4985 | 4.5919 | 15.4242 |
| 20 | 2.7492 | 7.0484 | 49.3879 | 90.7679 | 317.1158 |
| 24 | 0.0146 | 0.0375 | 0.2625 | 0.4825 | 1.6241 |
| 26 | 0.7396 | 1.8961 | 13.2860 | 24.4177 | 80.2949 |
| 27 | 0.0133 | 0.0341 | 0.2387 | 0.4387 | 1.4381 |
| 29 | 0.1513 | 0.3879 | 2.7177 | 4.9947 | 17.0202 |
| 32 | 0.0115 | 0.0295 | 0.2069 | 0.3803 | 1.3450 |
| 34 | 0.3484 | 0.8932 | 6.2589 | 11.5029 | 41.2386 |
| 38 | 0.3143 | 0.8057 | 5.6458 | 10.3761 | 36.5038 |
| 40 | 1.1009 | 2.8478 | 19.3899 | 34.4592 | 123.4292 |
| 41 | -0.0002 | -0.0005 | -0.0031 | -0.0050 | -0.0171 |
| 45 | -0.6042 | -1.5011 | -10.1312 | -16.4318 | -59.7522 |
| 50 | -0.0002 | -0.0005 | -0.0036 | -0.0059 | -0.0211 |
| 54 | 2.1666 | 5.5549 | 38.9227 | 71.5344 | 276.1658 |
| 55 | 0.2537 | 0.6504 | 4.5574 | 8.3758 | 34.0009 |
| 57 | 1.1949 | 3.0882 | 21.0923 | 37.6221 | 162.4320 |
| 61 | 0.0145 | 0.0371 | 0.2603 | 0.4783 | 1.9690 |
| 63 | 1.7450 | 4.5230 | 30.6045 | 53.9957 | 221.5220 |
| 64 | 0.1638 | 0.4248 | 2.8689 | 5.0507 | 16.8086 |
| 65 | 1.0968 | 2.8120 | 19.7034 | 36.2120 | 123.5691 |
| 66 | 3.4206 | 8.8202 | 60.6815 | 109.1618 | 372.6848 |
| 67 | 1.0012 | 2.5758 | 17.8471 | 32.3723 | 108.1627 |
| 68 | 2.2312 | 5.9242 | 37.1120 | 59.8320 | 221.9742 |
| 70 | 0.0277 | 0.0736 | 0.4611 | 0.7434 | 2.6968 |
| 71 | 3.5326 | 9.2089 | 61.1785 | 105.6447 | 394.7541 |
| 72 | 0.1639 | 0.4201 | 2.9438 | 5.4103 | 20.2397 |
| 74 | 5.6630 | 14.7466 | 98.3090 | 170.4557 | 684.7876 |
| 77 | 0.5829 | 1.5294 | 9.9492 | 16.7631 | 67.4662 |
| 79 | 1.2024 | 3.1153 | 21.1082 | 37.2998 | 144.1299 |
| 80 | 0.4543 | 1.1748 | 8.0054 | 14.2401 | 55.2023 |
| 82 | 1.3136 | 3.4410 | 22.5113 | 38.1806 | 161.1680 |
| 85 | 0.9035 | 2.3988 | 15.0274 | 24.2273 | 105.2574 |
| 86 | 0.0736 | 0.1954 | 1.2243 | 1.9738 | 8.5497 |
| 88 | 1.6711 | 4.4370 | 27.7957 | 44.8122 | 202.1763 |


| Seg. No. | Fatal (K) Crashes (crashes) | Incapacitating Injury (A) Crashes (crashes) | Non-Incapacitating Injury (B) Crashes (crashes) | Possible Injury (C) <br> Crashes (crashes) | No Injury (O) Crashes (crashes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 92 | 0.0244 | 0.0647 | 0.4053 | 0.6535 | 2.8899 |
| 94 | 3.1775 | 8.3511 | 54.0538 | 90.5422 | 418.3759 |
| 95 | 0.0482 | 0.1280 | 0.8020 | 1.2930 | 5.5312 |
| 97 | 0.3568 | 0.9474 | 5.9347 | 9.5680 | 42.4264 |
| 99 | 0.1160 | 0.3079 | 1.9288 | 3.1096 | 13.2748 |
| 101 | 1.3711 | 3.5292 | 24.4183 | 44.2185 | 178.5163 |
| 104 | 0.4213 | 1.0801 | 7.5683 | 13.9095 | 55.5244 |
| 106 | 2.1216 | 5.4394 | 38.1133 | 70.0467 | 278.0211 |
| 108 | -0.3085 | -0.7665 | -5.1729 | -8.3900 | -35.0381 |
| 112 |  |  |  |  | 0.0000 |
| 115 | 2.4280 | 6.3792 | 41.3322 | 69.3151 | 294.0099 |
| 118 |  |  |  |  | 0.0000 |
| 121 | 0.0693 | 0.1777 | 1.2453 | 2.2887 | 9.2748 |
| 123 | 1.3453 | 3.4492 | 24.1685 | 44.4182 | 177.5629 |
| 124 | 0.2579 | 0.6611 | 4.6322 | 8.5134 | 32.4083 |
| 125 | 0.6314 | 1.6517 | 10.8486 | 18.4852 | 74.3096 |
| 127 | 1.0691 | 2.7979 | 18.3586 | 31.2463 | 129.4523 |
| 130 | -0.0006 | -0.0016 | -0.0107 | -0.0174 | -0.0718 |
| 134 | -1.1200 | -2.7825 | -18.7791 | -30.4579 | -117.9856 |
| 139 | -0.0238 | -0.0592 | -0.3994 | -0.6478 | -2.6768 |
| 144 | 0.1497 | 0.3839 | 2.6897 | 4.9433 | 19.7402 |
| 147 | 1.1597 | 2.9733 | 20.8336 | 38.2892 | 151.7549 |
| 148 | 0.3027 | 0.7761 | 5.4378 | 9.9938 | 41.4686 |
| 150 | 0.2686 | 0.6887 | 4.8260 | 8.8695 | 35.7442 |
| 153 | 0.4754 | 1.2189 | 8.5406 | 15.6963 | 67.4988 |
| 155 | 0.5486 | 1.4066 | 9.8561 | 18.1141 | 78.3023 |
| 157 | 0.2437 | 0.6376 | 4.1868 | 7.1322 | 32.2191 |
| 160 | 1.4070 | 3.6874 | 24.0841 | 40.7704 | 187.9992 |
| 163 | 0.0257 | 0.0682 | 0.4271 | 0.6885 | 3.3434 |
| 165 | 1.1070 | 2.8913 | 19.0931 | 32.7393 | 145.5058 |
| 166 | 0.4331 | 1.1103 | 7.7801 | 14.2987 | 60.5946 |
| 169 | 0.9827 | 2.5980 | 16.5018 | 27.0377 | 123.7319 |
| 171 | 0.6774 | 1.7987 | 11.2679 | 18.1661 | 83.3527 |
| 172 | 2.8394 | 7.3640 | 49.7340 | 87.5521 | 379.8241 |
| 174 | 0.7170 | 1.9038 | 11.9267 | 19.2282 | 85.5262 |
| 175 | 2.3647 | 6.1559 | 41.0758 | 71.2957 | 301.5665 |
| 176 | 0.0585 | 0.1500 | 1.0509 | 1.9313 | 7.6670 |
| 177 | 1.8850 | 4.8329 | 33.8636 | 62.2364 | 259.6945 |
| 180 | 0.0256 | 0.0657 | 0.4605 | 0.8463 | 3.4198 |
| 182 | 2.6362 | 6.7588 | 47.3587 | 87.0384 | 341.4996 |
| 184 | 0.0243 | 0.0622 | 0.4357 | 0.8008 | 3.1783 |
| 186 | 0.7772 | 1.9925 | 13.9613 | 25.6590 | 96.2246 |
| 189 | 0.7915 | 2.0293 | 14.2189 | 26.1323 | 96.2143 |
| 190 | 0.2348 | 0.6141 | 4.0381 | 6.8893 | 26.1596 |
| 191 | 1.3017 | 3.3806 | 22.7317 | 39.8126 | 160.0198 |
| 192 | 0.4634 | 1.1881 | 8.3250 | 15.3001 | 61.3081 |
| 194 | 1.4016 | 3.5934 | 25.1787 | 46.2748 | 188.2364 |
| 197 | 0.1400 | 0.3590 | 2.5156 | 4.6232 | 18.3647 |
| 198 | 2.0429 | 5.2377 | 36.7005 | 67.4502 | 296.9785 |
| 199 | 0.1964 | 0.5034 | 3.5275 | 6.4831 | 28.9828 |
| 201 | 0.9294 | 2.3827 | 16.6956 | 30.6842 | 139.0498 |


| Seg. No. | Fatal (K) Crashes (crashes) | Incapacitating Injury (A) Crashes (crashes) | Non-Incapacitating Injury (B) Crashes (crashes) | Possible Injury (C) Crashes (crashes) | No Injury (O) Crashes (crashes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 206 | 0.0937 | 0.2401 | 1.6827 | 3.0926 | 13.8149 |
| 208 | 1.6214 | 4.1570 | 29.1281 | 53.5332 | 231.6239 |
| 209 | 0.3454 | 0.8856 | 6.2056 | 11.4050 | 43.9941 |
| 210 | 1.4747 | 3.7807 | 26.4914 | 48.6874 | 191.2601 |
| 213 | 0.1330 | 0.3410 | 2.3897 | 4.3919 | 19.2441 |
| 215 | 0.9416 | 2.4141 | 16.9158 | 31.0887 | 132.8834 |
| 217 | 0.3449 | 0.8842 | 6.1958 | 11.3870 | 46.3598 |
| 219 | 1.2499 | 3.2685 | 21.4968 | 36.6875 | 149.4654 |
| 221 | 0.0137 | 0.0352 | 0.2469 | 0.4538 | 1.7417 |
| 222 | 0.0095 | 0.0244 | 0.1711 | 0.3144 | 1.2404 |
| 223 | 2.1489 | 5.5093 | 38.6035 | 70.9477 | 278.9163 |
| 225 | 0.0519 | 0.1330 | 0.9319 | 1.7128 | 6.3965 |
| 226 | 1.0760 | 2.7586 | 19.3290 | 35.5240 | 139.3805 |
| 228 | 1.1449 | 2.9354 | 20.5679 | 37.8008 | 142.8496 |
| 230 | 0.2998 | 0.7687 | 5.3862 | 9.8990 | 30.0558 |
| 231 | 0.7080 | 1.8151 | 12.7181 | 23.3740 | 71.1944 |
| 232 | 0.7828 | 2.0070 | 14.0631 | 25.8460 | 81.2086 |
| 233 | 0.4422 | 1.1527 | 7.6577 | 13.2231 | 41.3146 |
| 234 | 0.0731 | 0.1874 | 1.3131 | 2.4133 | 7.3988 |
| 236 | 0.4959 | 1.2714 | 8.9086 | 16.3728 | 50.1880 |
| 237 | 0.6099 | 1.5637 | 10.9566 | 20.1367 | 62.0943 |
| 240 | 0.3458 | 0.8867 | 6.2128 | 11.4182 | 34.8752 |
| 242 | 0.1178 | 0.3019 | 2.1157 | 3.8883 | 11.5134 |
| 243 | 0.4450 | 1.1410 | 7.9946 | 14.6929 | 41.5871 |
| 244 | 0.6469 | 1.6585 | 11.6211 | 21.3579 | 63.6639 |
| 246 | 0.1626 | 0.4169 | 2.9209 | 5.3683 | 15.8110 |
| 247 | 1.1070 | 2.8382 | 19.8871 | 36.5497 | 137.0469 |
| 248 | 0.0037 | 0.0095 | 0.0667 | 0.1226 | 0.4561 |
| 250 | 0.9108 | 2.3351 | 16.3620 | 30.0709 | 112.7592 |
| 254 | 0.3490 | 0.8947 | 6.2691 | 11.5217 | 39.1794 |
| 256 | 0.9709 | 2.5000 | 17.2745 | 31.2345 | 92.9954 |
| 257 | 0.0680 | 0.1743 | 1.2216 | 2.2451 | 6.7019 |
| 259 | 2.7680 | 7.0966 | 49.7254 | 91.3882 | 284.3048 |
| 263 | 0.0248 | 0.0636 | 0.4458 | 0.8194 | 2.4251 |
| 265 | 0.3263 | 0.8365 | 5.8613 | 10.7722 | 31.1883 |
| 266 | 0.0121 | 0.0310 | 0.2171 | 0.3991 | 1.1382 |
| 268 | 3.5850 | 9.1913 | 64.4026 | 118.3628 | 348.5663 |
| 273 | 0.0123 | 0.0316 | 0.2216 | 0.4073 | 1.1312 |
| 275 | 0.1503 | 0.3854 | 2.7006 | 4.9633 | 13.5179 |
| 276 | 0.0110 | 0.0281 | 0.1968 | 0.3616 | 0.9660 |
| 278 | 0.2954 | 0.7614 | 5.2465 | 9.4550 | 25.8859 |
| 283 | 0.0308 | 0.0819 | 0.5128 | 0.8267 | 2.3507 |
| 285 | 0.2432 | 0.6458 | 4.0457 | 6.5225 | 19.2530 |
| 286 | 0.0685 | 0.1787 | 1.1859 | 2.0446 | 5.6741 |
| 288 | 1.9661 | 5.0569 | 35.0701 | 63.6823 | 177.3829 |
| 292 | 0.0050 | 0.0128 | 0.0900 | 0.1654 | 0.4422 |
| 294 | 0.1570 | 0.4025 | 2.8205 | 5.1837 | 14.1992 |
| 295 | 0.0122 | 0.0312 | 0.2186 | 0.4017 | 1.0709 |
| 297 | 0.7696 | 1.9731 | 13.8254 | 25.4092 | 70.0840 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 12,637.3041 |

Table 10. Predicted Crash Severity by Speed Change Lane (Speed Change)

| Seg. No. | Fatal (K) Crashes (crashes) | Incapacitating Injury (A) Crashes (crashes) | Non-Incapacitating Injury (B) Crashes (crashes) | Possible Injury (C) <br> Crashes (crashes) | No Injury (O) Crashes (crashes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 0.0099 | 0.0254 | 0.1782 | 0.3276 | 1.1336 |
| 4 | 0.0019 | 0.0050 | 0.0349 | 0.0641 | 0.2210 |
| 10 | 0.0294 | 0.0755 | 0.5289 | 0.9720 | 3.4938 |
| 12 | 0.0532 | 0.1363 | 0.9551 | 1.7554 | 7.3149 |
| 13 | 0.0329 | 0.0844 | 0.5916 | 1.0873 | 3.9906 |
| 14 | 0.0260 | 0.0667 | 0.4670 | 0.8584 | 3.3545 |
| 16 | 0.0192 | 0.0493 | 0.3457 | 0.6354 | 2.4778 |
| 19 | 0.0918 | 0.2352 | 1.6484 | 3.0294 | 10.0278 |
| 21 | 0.0368 | 0.0944 | 0.6615 | 1.2157 | 4.4542 |
| 22 | 0.0335 | 0.0859 | 0.6018 | 1.1059 | 3.9513 |
| 23 | 0.0736 | 0.1887 | 1.3220 | 2.4296 | 8.5583 |
| 25 | 0.0155 | 0.0399 | 0.2793 | 0.5134 | 1.8020 |
| 28 | 0.0131 | 0.0336 | 0.2352 | 0.4323 | 1.5654 |
| 30 | 0.0197 | 0.0505 | 0.3537 | 0.6500 | 2.3629 |
| 31 | 0.0917 | 0.2350 | 1.6467 | 3.0264 | 9.7790 |
| 33 | 0.0099 | 0.0254 | 0.1779 | 0.3269 | 1.2601 |
| 35 | 0.0419 | 0.1075 | 0.7533 | 1.3844 | 5.3426 |
| 36 | 0.1381 | 0.3540 | 2.4806 | 4.5589 | 14.7289 |
| 37 | 0.0963 | 0.2468 | 1.7294 | 3.1785 | 10.7361 |
| 39 | 0.0289 | 0.0741 | 0.5191 | 0.9540 | 3.2068 |
| 42 | 0.0048 | 0.0122 | 0.0855 | 0.1572 | 0.6793 |
| 43 | 0.0004 | 0.0010 | 0.0072 | 0.0132 | 0.0565 |
| 44 | 0.0047 | 0.0121 | 0.0850 | 0.1562 | 0.5555 |
| 46 | 0.2069 | 0.5306 | 3.7177 | 6.8325 | 29.7113 |
| 47 | 0.2808 | 0.7198 | 5.0436 | 9.2694 | 27.6801 |
| 48 | 0.2082 | 0.5338 | 3.7404 | 6.8744 | 29.7113 |
| 49 | 0.2306 | 0.5911 | 4.1419 | 7.6121 | 27.3154 |
| 51 | 0.0244 | 0.0627 | 0.4392 | 0.8071 | 3.5022 |
| 52 | 0.0006 | 0.0015 | 0.0107 | 0.0198 | 0.0588 |
| 53 | 0.0270 | 0.0693 | 0.4854 | 0.8922 | 3.1915 |
| 56 | 0.2335 | 0.5987 | 4.1951 | 7.7099 | 22.2292 |
| 58 | 0.0637 | 0.1633 | 1.1442 | 2.1028 | 7.7964 |
| 59 | 0.0603 | 0.1546 | 1.0836 | 1.9915 | 7.2766 |
| 60 | 0.1316 | 0.3375 | 2.3649 | 4.3463 | 13.1746 |
| 62 | 0.0217 | 0.0556 | 0.3894 | 0.7156 | 2.1606 |
| 69 | 0.0763 | 0.2025 | 1.2686 | 2.0452 | 8.4665 |
| 73 | 0.0705 | 0.1808 | 1.2667 | 2.3281 | 8.1472 |
| 75 | 0.3144 | 0.8060 | 5.6477 | 10.3796 | 33.9293 |
| 76 | 0.1551 | 0.4117 | 2.5791 | 4.1581 | 17.5298 |
| 78 | 0.0664 | 0.1728 | 1.1533 | 2.0022 | 6.6252 |
| 81 | 0.1325 | 0.3519 | 2.2044 | 3.5539 | 14.1627 |
| 83 | 0.1257 | 0.3222 | 2.2576 | 4.1492 | 16.4207 |
| 84 | 0.0879 | 0.2333 | 1.4614 | 2.3561 | 9.1143 |
| 87 | 0.0538 | 0.1429 | 0.8952 | 1.4433 | 5.4522 |


| Seg. No. | Fatal (K) Crashes (crashes) | Incapacitating Injury (A) Crashes (crashes) | Non-Incapacitating Injury (B) Crashes (crashes) | Possible Injury (C) Crashes (crashes) | No Injury (O) Crashes (crashes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89 | 0.0364 | 0.0966 | 0.6052 | 0.9757 | 3.6914 |
| 90 | 0.1790 | 0.4752 | 2.9769 | 4.7994 | 18.4545 |
| 91 | 0.0889 | 0.2361 | 1.4789 | 2.3844 | 9.8974 |
| 93 | 0.0174 | 0.0461 | 0.2889 | 0.4658 | 1.9299 |
| 96 | 0.0369 | 0.0981 | 0.6144 | 0.9905 | 3.8878 |
| 98 | 0.0641 | 0.1702 | 1.0662 | 1.7189 | 6.7672 |
| 100 | 0.0837 | 0.2223 | 1.3927 | 2.2452 | 8.8562 |
| 102 | 0.1733 | 0.4573 | 2.9243 | 4.8293 | 18.6971 |
| 103 | 0.1594 | 0.4086 | 2.8634 | 5.2625 | 22.9493 |
| 105 | 0.0957 | 0.2453 | 1.7190 | 3.1594 | 11.0364 |
| 107 | 0.0007 | 0.0019 | 0.0135 | 0.0247 | 0.1104 |
| 109 | 0.4016 | 1.0296 | 7.2140 | 13.2583 | 48.5605 |
| 110 | 0.1908 | 0.4893 | 3.4284 | 6.3009 | 26.2366 |
| 111 | 0.4131 | 1.0591 | 7.4208 | 13.6384 | 60.9518 |
| 113 | 0.1359 | 0.3483 | 2.4406 | 4.4855 | 16.4108 |
| 114 | 0.1407 | 0.3608 | 2.5281 | 4.6463 | 20.7495 |
| 116 | 0.0007 | 0.0018 | 0.0129 | 0.0237 | 0.0867 |
| 117 | 0.0019 | 0.0051 | 0.0316 | 0.0510 | 0.2617 |
| 119 | 0.3319 | 0.8592 | 5.8372 | 10.3474 | 45.7268 |
| 120 | 0.2583 | 0.6688 | 4.5435 | 8.0542 | 39.1254 |
| 122 | 0.0022 | 0.0057 | 0.0397 | 0.0729 | 0.3155 |
| 126 | 0.4405 | 1.1523 | 7.5684 | 12.8959 | 60.1083 |
| 128 | 0.0042 | 0.0107 | 0.0748 | 0.1375 | 0.6038 |
| 129 | 0.0009 | 0.0022 | 0.0157 | 0.0288 | 0.1276 |
| 131 | 0.1113 | 0.2853 | 1.9993 | 3.6744 | 13.7229 |
| 132 | 0.0004 | 0.0011 | 0.0074 | 0.0137 | 0.0518 |
| 133 | 0.1020 | 0.2614 | 1.8319 | 3.3668 | 14.9269 |
| 135 | 0.2771 | 0.7104 | 4.9778 | 9.1485 | 36.2656 |
| 136 | 0.3313 | 0.8494 | 5.9518 | 10.9385 | 47.7601 |
| 137 | 0.2827 | 0.7249 | 5.0794 | 9.3352 | 37.5807 |
| 138 | 0.3259 | 0.8356 | 5.8550 | 10.7606 | 47.7601 |
| 140 | 0.0243 | 0.0624 | 0.4370 | 0.8032 | 2.9991 |
| 141 | 0.0004 | 0.0010 | 0.0068 | 0.0124 | 0.0542 |
| 142 | 0.0223 | 0.0572 | 0.4009 | 0.7368 | 3.2662 |
| 143 | 0.0164 | 0.0420 | 0.2940 | 0.5403 | 1.9556 |
| 145 | 0.0010 | 0.0025 | 0.0177 | 0.0325 | 0.1213 |
| 146 | 0.1413 | 0.3622 | 2.5377 | 4.6639 | 16.8759 |
| 149 | 0.1410 | 0.3614 | 2.5323 | 4.6540 | 18.4267 |
| 151 | 0.3689 | 0.9458 | 6.6270 | 12.1795 | 38.2893 |
| 152 | 0.1481 | 0.3796 | 2.6597 | 4.8882 | 19.1738 |
| 154 | 0.0042 | 0.0109 | 0.0761 | 0.1399 | 0.4143 |
| 156 | 0.1463 | 0.3751 | 2.6283 | 4.8305 | 18.9402 |
| 158 | 0.1700 | 0.4358 | 3.0534 | 5.6117 | 19.5527 |
| 159 | 0.2577 | 0.6710 | 4.4771 | 7.7706 | 28.0128 |
| 161 | 0.3126 | 0.8299 | 5.1988 | 8.3816 | 37.0000 |
| 162 | 0.1121 | 0.2976 | 1.8640 | 3.0052 | 12.6287 |
| 164 | 0.0170 | 0.0450 | 0.2819 | 0.4545 | 1.9081 |
| 167 | 0.1366 | 0.3501 | 2.4531 | 4.5084 | 17.5659 |
| 168 | 0.0828 | 0.2124 | 1.4883 | 2.7353 | 9.0339 |
| 170 | 0.2833 | 0.7521 | 4.7117 | 7.5962 | 30.8028 |
| 173 | 0.3444 | 0.8950 | 6.0029 | 10.4817 | 36.9566 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Seg. No. | Fatal (K) Crashes (crashes) | Incapacitating Injury (A) Crashes (crashes) | Non-Incapacitating Injury (B) Crashes (crashes) | Possible Injury (C) <br> Crashes (crashes) | No Injury (O) Crashes (crashes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 178 | 0.1146 | 0.2938 | 2.0587 | 3.7837 | 14.2952 |
| 179 | 0.1779 | 0.4562 | 3.1967 | 5.8750 | 18.2419 |
| 181 | 0.0281 | 0.0722 | 0.5056 | 0.9293 | 2.8747 |
| 183 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0003 | 0.0006 | 0.0022 |
| 185 | 0.0204 | 0.0524 | 0.3673 | 0.6750 | 2.4064 |
| 187 | 0.1382 | 0.3542 | 2.4818 | 4.5613 | 17.2785 |
| 188 | 0.0953 | 0.2444 | 1.7122 | 3.1468 | 11.4472 |
| 193 | 0.1318 | 0.3380 | 2.3683 | 4.3526 | 17.2523 |
| 195 | 0.1998 | 0.5123 | 3.5895 | 6.5969 | 23.0813 |
| 196 | 0.2676 | 0.6861 | 4.8077 | 8.8359 | 38.0037 |
| 200 | 0.2324 | 0.5959 | 4.1752 | 7.6735 | 25.1727 |
| 202 | 0.0059 | 0.0151 | 0.1055 | 0.1939 | 0.6374 |
| 203 | 0.0718 | 0.1840 | 1.2891 | 2.3692 | 7.7887 |
| 204 | 0.0906 | 0.2323 | 1.6277 | 2.9915 | 10.8176 |
| 205 | 0.1686 | 0.4321 | 3.0280 | 5.5651 | 16.5366 |
| 207 | 0.1188 | 0.3045 | 2.1336 | 3.9213 | 11.6247 |
| 211 | 0.0899 | 0.2304 | 1.6146 | 2.9675 | 10.8192 |
| 212 | 0.0688 | 0.1765 | 1.2369 | 2.2732 | 7.7386 |
| 214 | 0.1575 | 0.4037 | 2.8290 | 5.1992 | 16.6556 |
| 216 | 0.2118 | 0.5430 | 3.8051 | 6.9932 | 29.8131 |
| 218 | 0.1655 | 0.4243 | 2.9728 | 5.4636 | 16.1228 |
| 220 | 0.1524 | 0.3908 | 2.7381 | 5.0323 | 16.7770 |
| 224 | 0.1302 | 0.3337 | 2.3382 | 4.2972 | 13.6807 |
| 227 | 0.0614 | 0.1573 | 1.1025 | 2.0263 | 7.2037 |
| 229 | 0.0939 | 0.2407 | 1.6864 | 3.0994 | 9.8617 |
| 235 | 0.0472 | 0.1210 | 0.8478 | 1.5581 | 5.6079 |
| 238 | 0.0331 | 0.0850 | 0.5953 | 1.0940 | 3.3704 |
| 239 | 0.0390 | 0.1001 | 0.7012 | 1.2887 | 4.3183 |
| 241 | 0.0525 | 0.1346 | 0.9431 | 1.7334 | 5.2820 |
| 245 | 0.0375 | 0.0961 | 0.6730 | 1.2369 | 3.8257 |
| 249 | 0.0027 | 0.0069 | 0.0484 | 0.0889 | 0.4379 |
| 251 | 0.0767 | 0.1967 | 1.3781 | 2.5327 | 12.4742 |
| 252 | 0.0346 | 0.0888 | 0.6224 | 1.1439 | 3.8437 |
| 253 | 0.2205 | 0.5653 | 3.9611 | 7.2799 | 19.3507 |
| 255 | 0.0296 | 0.0759 | 0.5316 | 0.9769 | 3.4369 |
| 258 | 0.0169 | 0.0433 | 0.3034 | 0.5576 | 1.8422 |
| 260 | 0.0692 | 0.1774 | 1.2429 | 2.2844 | 8.2645 |
| 261 | 0.0241 | 0.0618 | 0.4329 | 0.7956 | 2.8591 |
| 262 | 0.0279 | 0.0716 | 0.5015 | 0.9217 | 3.1503 |
| 264 | 0.0255 | 0.0653 | 0.4573 | 0.8405 | 2.8555 |
| 267 | 0.0108 | 0.0277 | 0.1938 | 0.3561 | 1.4924 |
| 269 | 0.0118 | 0.0302 | 0.2118 | 0.3892 | 1.6333 |
| 270 | 0.0160 | 0.0409 | 0.2866 | 0.5267 | 1.7668 |
| 271 | 0.0237 | 0.0608 | 0.4262 | 0.7834 | 2.9191 |
| 272 | 0.0327 | 0.0837 | 0.5867 | 1.0783 | 3.7970 |
| 274 | 0.0112 | 0.0287 | 0.2008 | 0.3690 | 1.2898 |
| 277 | 0.0109 | 0.0280 | 0.1962 | 0.3605 | 1.3254 |
| 279 | 0.0068 | 0.0175 | 0.1223 | 0.2248 | 0.8276 |
| 280 | 0.0180 | 0.0461 | 0.3233 | 0.5942 | 3.0934 |
| 281 | 0.0155 | 0.0412 | 0.2581 | 0.4161 | 1.5109 |
| 282 | 0.0013 | 0.0035 | 0.0218 | 0.0351 | 0.2727 |


| Seg. No. | Fatal (K) Crashes (crashes) | Incapacitating Injury (A) Crashes (crashes) | Non-Incapacitating Injury (B) Crashes (crashes) | Possible Injury (C) <br> Crashes (crashes) | No Injury (O) Crashes (crashes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 284 | 0.0128 | 0.0340 | 0.2133 | 0.3438 | 2.6721 |
| 287 | 0.0127 | 0.0338 | 0.2117 | 0.3413 | 2.6248 |
| 289 | 0.0182 | 0.0468 | 0.3277 | 0.6022 | 2.2172 |
| 290 | 0.0177 | 0.0455 | 0.3185 | 0.5854 | 2.8934 |
| 291 | 0.0260 | 0.0667 | 0.4672 | 0.8587 | 3.4047 |
| 293 | 0.0045 | 0.0116 | 0.0816 | 0.1499 | 0.5938 |
| 296 | 0.0115 | 0.0296 | 0.2075 | 0.3813 | 1.4482 |
| 298 | 0.0098 | 0.0251 | 0.1757 | 0.3230 | 1.2276 |
| 299 | 0.0122 | 0.0314 | 0.2200 | 0.4043 | 1.9956 |
| Total | 14.8790 | 38.3853 | 263.7901 | 474.7622 | 1,798.3565 |

Table 11. Predicted Freeway Segment Crash Type Distribution (Section 1)

| Element Type | Crash Type | FI Crashes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent FI } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | PDO <br> Crashes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { PDO (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Total Crashes | Percent <br> Total (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway Segment | Collision with Animal | 9.37 | 0.1 | 117.62 | 0.6 | 126.99 | 0.7 |
| Highway Segment | Collision with Fixed Object | 1,692.03 | 9.2 | 3,827.99 | 20.9 | 5,520.02 | 30.1 |
| Highway Segment | Collision with Other Object | 119.52 | 0.7 | 743.14 | 4.1 | 862.66 | 4.7 |
| Highway Segment | Other Single-vehicle Collision | 487.45 | 2.7 | 572.06 | 3.1 | 1,059.51 | 5.8 |
| Highway Segment | Collision with Parked Vehicle | 35.15 | 0.2 | 85.54 | 0.5 | 120.69 | 0.7 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Total Single Vehicle Crashes | 2,343.53 | 12.8 | 5,346.35 | 29.2 | 7,689.88 | 42.0 |
| Highway Segment | Right-Angle Collision | 99.37 | 0.5 | 133.70 | 0.7 | 233.06 | 1.3 |
| Highway Segment | Head-on Collision | 25.64 | 0.1 | 14.86 | 0.1 | 40.50 | 0.2 |
| Highway Segment | Other Multi-vehicle Collision | 99.37 | 0.5 | 178.26 | 1.0 | 277.63 | 1.5 |
| Highway Segment | Rear-end Collision | 2,404.05 | 13.1 | 5,125.01 | 28.0 | 7,529.06 | 41.1 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Sideswipe, Same Direction Collision | 576.97 | 3.1 | 1,975.73 | 10.8 | 2,552.70 | 13.9 |
| Highway Segment | Total Multiple Vehicle Crashes | 3,205.40 | 17.5 | 7,427.55 | 40.5 | 10,632.95 | 58.0 |
| Highway Segment | Total Highway Segment Crashes | 5,548.93 | 30.3 | 12,773.90 | 69.7 | 18,322.83 | 100.0 |
|  | Total Crashes | 5,548.93 | 30.3 | 12,773.90 | 69.7 | 18,322.83 | 100.0 |

Note: Fatal and Injury Crashes and Property Damage Only Crashes do not necessarily sum up to Total Crashes because the distribution of these three crashes had been derived independently.

Table 12. Predicted Exit Speed Change Lane Crash Type Distribution (Speed Change)

| Element Type | $\begin{array}{rl}\text { Crash Type }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}\text { FI } \\ \text { Crashes }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Percent FI } \\ (\%)\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { PDO } \\ \text { Crashes }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Percent } \\ \text { PDO (\%) }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Total } \\ \text { Crashes }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |$)$

Note: Fatal and Injury Crashes and Property Damage Only Crashes do not necessarily sum up to Total Crashes because the distribution of these three crashes had been derived independently.

Table 13. Predicted Entrance Speed Change Lane Crash Type Distribution (Speed Change)

| Element Type | Crash Type | FI Crashes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent FI } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | PDO <br> Crashes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { PDO (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Total <br> Crashes | Percent <br> Total (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway Segment | Collision with Animal | 0.00 | 0.0 | 2.06 | 0.1 | 2.06 | 0.1 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Collision with Fixed Object | 93.62 | 6.2 | 133.05 | 8.8 | 226.67 | 15.0 |
| Highway Segment | Collision with Other Object | 9.17 | 0.6 | 37.13 | 2.5 | 46.30 | 3.1 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Other Single-vehicle Collision | 32.33 | 2.1 | 16.50 | 1.1 | 48.84 | 3.2 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Collision with Parked Vehicle | 1.93 | 0.1 | 3.09 | 0.2 | 5.02 | 0.3 |
| Highway Segment | Total Single Vehicle Crashes | 137.06 | 9.1 | 191.83 | 12.7 | 328.89 | 21.7 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Right-Angle Collision | 9.17 | 0.6 | 16.50 | 1.1 | 25.67 | 1.7 |
| Highway Segment | Head-on Collision | 1.93 | 0.1 | 1.03 | 0.1 | 2.96 | 0.2 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Other Multi-vehicle Collision | 8.20 | 0.5 | 15.47 | 1.0 | 23.67 | 1.6 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Rear-end Collision | 262.05 | 17.3 | 546.62 | 36.1 | 808.67 | 53.4 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Sideswipe, Same Direction Collision | 64.18 | 4.2 | 259.90 | 17.2 | 324.09 | 21.4 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Total Multiple Vehicle Crashes | 345.53 | 22.8 | 839.53 | 55.5 | 1,185.06 | 78.3 |
| Highway Segment | Total Highway Segment Crashes | 482.59 | 31.9 | 1,031.36 | 68.1 | 1,513.95 | 100.0 |
|  | Total Crashes | 482.59 | 31.9 | 1,031.36 | 68.1 | 1,513.95 | 100.0 |

Note: Fatal and Injury Crashes and Property Damage Only Crashes do not necessarily sum up to Total Crashes because the distribution of these three crashes had been derived independently.

## Table 14. Evaluation Message

| Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Message |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1800+10.210 | 1802+00.210 | for segment \#69 (1800+10.210 to 1802+00.210), distance to taper is less than 0.04, adjusted in CMF calculations |
| 1943+40.160 | 1945+10.160 | for segment \#78 ( $1943+40.160$ to $1945+10.160$ ), distance to taper is less than 0.04 , adjusted in CMF calculations |
| 1982+00.120 | 1983+70.120 | for segment \#84 (1982+00.120 to 1983+70.120), distance to taper is less than 0.04, adjusted in CMF calculations |
| 1992+04.960 | 1993+20.390 | for segment \#87 ( $1992+04.960$ to 1993+20.390) , distance to taper is less than 0.04, adjusted in CMF calculations |
| 1993+20.390 | 1993+94.960 | for segment \#89 (1993+20.390 to 1993+94.960), distance to taper is less than 0.04, adjusted in CMF calculations |
| 2004+81.220 | 2006+55.130 | for segment \#91 (2004+81.220 to 2006+55.130), distance to taper is less than 0.04, adjusted in CMF calculations |
| 2006+55.130 | 2006+91.220 | for segment \#93 (2006+55.130 to 2006+91.220), distance to taper is less than 0.04, adjusted in CMF calculations |
| 2272+92.630 | $2274+72.630$ | for segment \#168 (2272+92.630 to 2274+72.630), distance to taper is less than 0.04 , adjusted in CMF calculations |
| $2506+47.600$ | $2508+27.600$ | for segment \#203 (2506+47.600 to $2508+27.600$ ), distance to taper is less than 0.04, adjusted in CMF calculations |
| 2787+05.200 | 2788+65.200 | for segment \#238 (2787+05.200 to 2788+65.200), distance to taper is less than 0.04 , adjusted in CMF calculations |
| 2803+51.170 | 2805+56.170 | for segment \#239 (2803+51.170 to 2805+56.170), distance to taper is less than 0.04, adjusted in CMF calculations |
| 2814+77.790 | 2816+87.790 | for segment \#241 (2814+77.790 to 2816+87.790), distance to taper is less than 0.04 , adjusted in CMF calculations |
| 2850+92.420 | 2852+52.420 | for segment \#245 (2850+92.420 to 2852+52.420), distance to taper is less than 0.04 , adjusted in CMF calculations |
| 2896+24.130 | 2898+34.130 | for segment \#252 (2896+24.130 to 2898+34.130), distance to taper is less than 0.04, adjusted in CMF calculations |
| 1448+14.880 | 1448+51.680 | for segment \#41 (1448+14.880 to 1448+51.680), Freeway Segment of type Five-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Four-lane Freeway and Six-lane Freeway |
| 1461+68.620 | 1463+36.890 | for segment \#50 (1461+68.620 to 1463+36.890), Freeway Segment of type Five-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Four-lane Freeway and Six-lane Freeway |
| 1616+96.040 | 1620+37.170 | for segment \#64 ( $1616+96.040$ to $1620+37.170$ ), Freeway Segment of type Six-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Four-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 1752+45.780 | 1774+96.080 | for segment \#67 ( $1752+45.780$ to $1774+96.080$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 1774+96.080 | 1802+00.210 | for segment \#68 (1774+96.080 to 1802+00.210), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1802+00.210 | 1802+34.860 | for segment \#70 ( $1802+00.210$ to $1802+34.860$ ), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 2006+55.130 | 2006+91.220 | for segment \#92 (2006+55.130 to 2006+91.220), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 2045+17.910 | 2046+03.220 | for segment \#95 (2045+17.910 to 2046+03.220), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 2049+38.400 | 2051+11.970 | for segment \#99 (2049+38.400 to 2051+11.970) , Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| $2156+10.790$ | 2159+38.930 | for segment \#124 ( $2156+10.790$ to $2159+38.930$ ), traffic volume ( $181,350 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2041 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| 2156+10.790 | $2159+38.930$ | for segment \#124 (2156+10.790 to 2159+38.930), traffic volume ( $183,700 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2042 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| 2156+10.790 | 2159+38.930 | for segment \#124 (2156+10.790 to 2159+38.930) , Freeway Segment of type Eight-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| $2159+38.930$ | 2171+54.400 | for segment \#125 (2159+38.930 to 2171+54.400), traffic volume ( $181,740 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2038 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| 2159+38.930 | 2171+54.400 | for segment \#125 (2159+38.930 to 2171+54.400), traffic volume (184,192 vpd) for 2039 exceeds model limit (180,000 vpd) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| 2159+38.930 | 2171+54.400 | for segment \#125 (2159+38.930 to 2171+54.400), traffic volume ( $186,645 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2040 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |


| Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Message |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2159+38.930 | 2171+54.400 | for segment \#125 (2159+38.930 to 2171+54.400), traffic volume ( $189,097 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2041 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| 2159+38.930 | 2171+54.400 | for segment \#125 (2159+38.930 to 2171+54.400), traffic volume ( $191,550 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2042 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| 2159+38.930 | 2171+54.400 | for segment \#125 (2159+38.930 to 2171+54.400), Freeway Segment of type Eight-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 2171+54.400 | 2183+64.830 | for segment \#127 ( $2171+54.400$ to $2183+64.830$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | for segment \#134 ( $2187+07.690$ to $2197+66.440$ ), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 2198+41.760 | 2201+64.630 | for segment \#144 (2198+41.760 to 2201+64.630), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 2201+64.630 | 2216+63.010 | for segment \#147 (2201+64.630 to 2216+63.010) , Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 2216+63.010 | 2221+59.740 | for segment \#148 (2216+63.010 to 2221+59.740), traffic volume ( $181,270 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2038 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| 2216+63.010 | $2221+59.740$ | for segment \#148 (2216+63.010 to 2221+59.740), traffic volume ( $183,715 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2039 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| $2216+63.010$ | 2221+59.740 | for segment \#148 (2216+63.010 to 2221+59.740), traffic volume ( $186,160 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2040 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| 2216+63.010 | 2221+59.740 | for segment \#148 (2216+63.010 to 2221+59.740), traffic volume ( $188,605 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2041 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| 2216+63.010 | 2221+59.740 | for segment \#148 (2216+63.010 to 2221+59.740), traffic volume ( $191,050 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2042 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| 2216+63.010 | 2221+59.740 | for segment \#148 (2216+63.010 to 2221+59.740), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 2221+59.740 | 2230+01.910 | for segment \#150 (2221+59.740 to 2230+01.910), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 2319+47.290 | 2324+20.370 | for segment \#174 (2319+47.290 to 2324+20.370), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 2342+71.190 | 2343+28.110 | for segment \#176 (2342+71.190 to 2343+28.110), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 2402+12.440 | 2414+12.230 | for segment \#186 ( $2402+12.440$ to $2414+12.230$ ), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 2414+12.230 | 2424+35.910 | for segment \#189 (2414+12.230 to $2424+35.910)$, Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 2424+35.910 | 2427+01.170 | for segment \#190 ( $2424+35.910$ to $2427+01.170$ ), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 2471+86.300 | 2473+42.600 | for segment \#197 (2471+86.300 to 2473+42.600) , Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 2545+80.950 | 2550+11.330 | for segment \#209 ( $2545+80.950$ to $2550+11.330$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| $2550+11.330$ | 2569+42.420 | for segment \#210 ( $2550+11.330$ to $2569+42.420$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 2716+03.470 | 2723+97.650 | for segment \#230 (2716+03.470 to 2723+97.650), Freeway Segment of type Eight-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| $2758+30.970$ | 2768+12.430 | for segment \#233 (2758+30.970 to 2768+12.430), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 2821+10.420 | 2835+32.750 | for segment \#243 (2821+10.420 to 2835+32.750), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 2852+52.420 | $2856+90.300$ | for segment \#246 (2852+52.420 to $2856+90.300$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Four-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |


| Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Message |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1448+14.880 | 1448+51.680 | for segment \#42 ( $1448+14.880$ to $1448+51.680$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Five-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Four-lane Freeway Speed Change and Six-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| $1448+48.620$ | 1448+51.680 | for segment \#43 ( $1448+48.620$ to $1448+51.680$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Five-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Four-lane Freeway Speed Change and Six-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1448+16.890 | 1448+51.680 | for segment \#44 (1448+16.890 to $1448+51.680)$, Speed Change Segment of type Five-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Four-lane Freeway Speed Change and Six-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1461+68.620 | 1463+34.880 | for segment \#51 ( $1461+68.620$ to $1463+34.880$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Five-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Four-lane Freeway Speed Change and Six-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1461+68.620 | 1461+71.680 | for segment \#52 (1461+68.620 to 1461+71.680), Speed Change Segment of type Five-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Four-lane Freeway Speed Change and Six-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1461+68.620 | 1463+36.890 | for segment \#53 (1461+68.620 to 1463+36.890), Speed Change Segment of type Five-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Four-lane Freeway Speed Change and Six-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1800+10.210 | 1802+00.210 | for segment \#69 ( $1800+10.210$ to $1802+00.210$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2006+55.130 | 2006+91.220 | for segment \#93 (2006+55.130 to 2006+91.220), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2045+17.910 | 2046+03.220 | for segment \#96 (2045+17.910 to 2046+03.220), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2049+38.400 | 2051+11.970 | for segment \#100 (2049+38.400 to 2051+11.970) , Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2159+38.930 | 2171+54.400 | for segment\#126 ( $2159+38.930$ to 2171+54.400 ), traffic volume ( $181,740 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2038 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6SC |
| 2159+38.930 | 2171+54.400 | for segment \#126 ( $2159+38.930$ to 2171+54.400 ), traffic volume ( $184,192 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2039 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6SC |
| 2159+38.930 | 2171+54.400 | for segment \#126 ( $2159+38.930$ to 2171+54.400 ), traffic volume ( $186,645 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2040 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6SC |
| 2159+38.930 | 2171+54.400 | for segment \#126 (2159+38.930 to 2171+54.400 ), traffic volume ( $189,097 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2041 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6SC |
| 2159+38.930 | 2171+54.400 |  |
| 2159+38.930 | 2171+54.400 | for segment \#126 ( $2159+38.930$ to $2171+54.400$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2171+54.400 | 2171+68.930 | for segment \#128 (2171+54.400 to 2171+68.930), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2183+61.760 | 2183+64.830 | for segment \#129 ( $2183+61.760$ to 2183+64.830) , Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | for segment \#135 ( $2187+07.690$ to 2197+66.440) , Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | for segment \#136 ( $2187+07.690$ to $2197+66.440$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | for segment \#137 ( $2187+07.690$ to 2197+66.440) , Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2187+07.690 | 2197+66.440 | for segment \#138 ( $2187+07.690$ to $2197+66.440$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| $2198+41.760$ | 2198+44.830 | for segment \#145 ( $2198+41.760$ to 2198+44.830) , Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2198+41.760 | 2201+64.630 | for segment \#146 (2198+41.760 to 2201+64.630), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| $2216+63.010$ | 2220+53.010 |  |
| 2216+63.010 | 2220+53.010 | for segment \#149 (2216+63.010 to 2220+53.010), traffic volume ( $183,715 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2039 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6SC |


| Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Message |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2216+63.010 | 2220+53.010 | for segment \#149 (2216+63.010 to 2220+53.010), traffic volume ( $186,160 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2040 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| 2216+63.010 | 2220+53.010 | for segment \#149 (2216+63.010 to 2220+53.010), traffic volume ( $188,605 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2041 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6SC |
| 2216+63.010 | 2220+53.010 | for segment \#149 (2216+63.010 to 2220+53.010), traffic volume ( $191,050 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2042 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6SC |
| 2216+63.010 | 2220+53.010 | for segment \#149 (2216+63.010 to 2220+53.010) , Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2221+59.740 | 2230+01.910 | for segment \#151 (2221+59.740 to 2230+01.910), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| $2226+41.910$ | 2230+01.910 | for segment \#152 (2226+41.910 to 2230+01.910), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2402+12.440 | 2406+30.900 | for segment \#187 (2402+12.440 to 2406+30.900) , Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2411+57.230 | 2414+12.230 | for segment \#188 ( $2411+57.230$ to $2414+12.230$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| $2550+11.330$ | 2552+71.330 | for segment \#211 ( $2550+11.330$ to $2552+71.330$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 2567+70.470 | 2569+42.420 | for segment \#212 ( $2567+70.470$ to $2569+42.420$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
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## Report Overview

Report Generated: Sep 17, 2019 12:45 PM
Report Template: System: Multi-Page, 508 Compliant [System] (mlcpm4, Jun 18, 2019 9:17 AM)

Evaluation Date: Mon Feb 18 10:09:31 CST 2019
IHSDM Version: v14.0.0 (Sep 26, 2018)
Crash Prediction Module: v9.0.0 (Sep 26, 2018)

User Name: chmeyer
Organization Name:
Phone:
E-Mail:

Project Title: Reimagine I-10 Proposed
Project Comment: Created Wed Jan 16 13:52:06 CST 2019
Project Unit System: U.S. Customary

Highway Title: Alignment I10P
Highway Comment: Imported from I10P.xml
Highway Version: 1

Evaluation Title: Evaluation 8
Evaluation Comment: Created Mon Feb 18 09:50:39 CST 2019

Minimum Location: 10+00.000
Maximum Location: 3044+67.123
Policy for Superelevation: AASHTO 2011 U.S. Customary
Calibration: HSM Configuration
Crash Distribution: HSM Configuration
Model/CMF: HSM Configuration
Empirical-Bayes Analysis: None
First Year of Analysis: 2022
Last Year of Analysis: 2042

## Section Types

## Section 1 Evaluation

Section: Section 1
Evaluation Start Location: 10+00.000
Evaluation End Location: 3044+67.123
Functional Class: Freeway
Type of Alignment: Divided, Multilane
Model Category: Freeway Segment
Calibration Factor: FI_EN=1.0; FI_EX=1.0; FI_MV=1.0; FI_SV=1.0; PDO_EN=1.0; PDO_EX=1.0; PDO_MV=1.0;
PDO_SV=1.0;


Figure 1. Crash Prediction Summary (Section 1)

Table 1. Evaluation Freeway - Homogeneous Segments (Section 1)

| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Start Location } \\ \text { (Sta. ft) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \text { ft) } \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 10+00.000 | 10+06.360 | 6.36 | 0.0012 | 2022: 28,450; 2023: 28,937; 2024: 29,425; 2025: 29,912; 2026: 30,400; 2027: 30,887; 2028: 31,375; 2029: 31,862; 2030: 32,350 2031: 32,837; 2032: 33,325; 2033: 33,812; 2034: 34,300; 2035: 34,787; 2036: 35,275; 2037: 35,762; 2038: 36,250; 2039: 36,737; 2040: 37,225; 2041: 37,712; 2042: 38,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 3 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 10+06.360 | 11+02.460 | 96.10 | 0.0182 | 2022: 25,800; 2023: 26,242; 2024: 26,685; 2025: 27,127; 2026: 27,570; 2027: 28,012; 2028: 28,455; 2029: 28,897; 2030: 29,340; 2031: 29,782; 2032: 30,225; 2033: 30,667; 2034: 31,110; 2035: 31,552; 2036: 31,995; 2037: 32,437; 2038: 32,880; 2039: 33,322; 2040: 33,765; 2041: 34,207; 2042: 34,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 4 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 11+02.460 | 24+17.550 | 1,315.09 | 0.2491 | 2022: 23,750; 2023: 24,157; 2024: 24,565; 2025: 24,972; 2026: 25,380; 2027: 25,787; 2028: 26, 195; 2029: 26,602; 2030: 27,010; 2031: 27,417; 2032: 27,825; 2033: 28,232; 2034: 28,640; 2035: 29,047; 2036: 29,455; 2037: 29,862; 2038: 30,270; 2039: 30,677; 2040: 31,085; 2041: 31,492; 2042: 31,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 6 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 24+17.550 | $31+58.860$ | 741.31 | 0.1404 | 2022: 23,400; 2023: 23,802; 2024: 24,205; 2025: 24,607; 2026: 25,010; 2027: 25,412; 2028: 25,815; 2029: 26,217; 2030: 26,620; 2031: 27,022; 2032: 27,425; 2033: 27,827; 2034: 28,230; 2035: 28,632; 2036: 29,035; 2037: 29,437; 2038: 29,840; 2039: 30,242; 2040: 30,645; 2041: 31,047; 2042: 31,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 8 | 6 F | Urban | 31+58.860 | $88+50.570$ | 5,691.71 | 1.0780 | 2022: 22,600; 2023: 22,990; 2024: 23,380; 2025: 23,770; 2026: 24,160; 2027: 24,550; 2028: 24,940; 2029: 25,330; 2030: 25,720; 2031: 26,110; 2032: 26,500; 2033: 26,890; 2034: 27,280; 2035: 27,670; 2036: 28,060; 2037: 28,450; 2038: 28,840; 2039: 29,230; 2040: 29,620; 2041: 30,010; 2042: 30,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 9 | 7 F | Urban | $88+50.570$ | 92+73.870 | 423.30 | 0.0802 | 2022: 24,850 ; 2023: 25,277; 2024: 25,705; 2025: 26,132; 2026: 26.560; 2027: 26,987; 2028: 27,415; 2029: 27,842; 2030: 28,270; 2031: 28,697 ; 2032: 29,125; 2033: 29,552; 2034: 29,980; 2035: 30,407; 2036: 30,835; 2037: 31,262; 2038: 31,690; 2039: 32,117; 2040: 32,545; 2041: 32,972; 2042: 33,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 10 | 8 F | Urban | $92+73.870$ | 114+92.280 | 2,218.41 | 0.4202 | 2022: 29,850; 2023: 30,362; 2024: 30,875; 2025: 31,387; 2026: 31,900; 2027: 32,412; 2028: 32,925; 2029: 33,437; 2030: 33,950; 2031: 34,462 ; 2032: 34,975; 2033: 35,487; 2034: 36,000; 2035: 36,512; 2036: 37,025; 2037: 37,537; 2038: 38,050; 2039: 38,562; 2040: 39,075; 2041: 39,587; 2042: 40,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 11 | 7 F | Urban | 114+92.280 | 116+12.410 | 120.13 | 0.0227 | 2022: 28,150; 2023: 28,635; 2024: 29,120; 2025: 29,605; 2026: 30,090; 2027: 30,575; 2028: 31,060; 2029: 31,545; 2030: 32,030; 2031: 32,515; 2032: 33,000; 2033: 33,485; 2034: 33,970; 2035: 34,455; 2036: 34,940; 2037: 35,425; 2038: 35,910; 2039: 36,395; 2040: 36,880; 2041: 37,365; 2042: 37,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 12 | 6 F | Urban | 116+12.410 | 159+52.850 | 4,340.44 | 0.8220 | 2022: 27,.350; 2023: 27,822; 2024: 28,295; 2025: 28,767; 2026: 29,240; 2027: 29,712; 2028: 30,185; 2029: 30,657; 2030: 31,130; 2031: 31,602; 2032: 32,075; 2033: 32,547; 2034: 33,020; 2035: 33,492; 2036: 33,965; 2037: 34,437; 2038: 34,910; 2039: 35,382; 2040: 35,855; 2041: 36,327; 2042: 36,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 13 | 7 F | Urban | 159+52.850 | 160+55.670 | 102.82 | 0.0195 | 2022: 29,600; 2023: 30,110; 2024: 30,620; 2025: 31,130; 2026: 31,640; 2027: 32,150; 2028: 32,660; 2029: 33,170; 2030: 33,680; 2031: 34,$190 ; 2032: 34,700 ; 2033: 35,210 ; 2034: 35,720 ; 2035: 36,230 ; 2036: 36,740 ; 2037: 37,250 ; 2038: 37,760 ; 2039: 38,270$; 2040: 38,780; 2041: 39,290; 2042: 39,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 14 | 8 F | Urban | 160+55.670 | 182+04.980 | 2,149.31 | 0.4071 | 2022: 30,850; 2023: 31,380; 2024: 31,910; 2025: 32,440; 2026: 32,970; 2027: 33,500; 2028: 34,030; 2029: 34,560; 2030: 35,090; 2031: 35,620; 2032: 36,150; 2033: 36,680; 2034: 37,210; 2035: 37,740; 2036: 38,270; 2037: 38,800; 2038: 39,330; 2039: 39,860; 2040: 40,390; 2041: 40,920; 2042: 41,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 15 | 7 F | Urban | 182+04.980 | 190+78.150 | 873.17 | 0.1654 | 2022: 28,$350 ; 2023: 28,837 ; 2024: 29,325 ; 2025: 29,812 ; 2026: 30,300 ; 2027: 30,787 ; 2028: 31,275 ; 2029: 31,762 ; 2030: 32,250$; 2031: 32,737 ; 2032: 33,$225 ; 2033: 33,712 ; 2034: 34,200 ; 2035: 34,687 ; 2036: 35,175 ; 2037: 35,662 ; 2038: 36,150 ; 2039: 36,637$; 2040: 37,125; 2041: 37,612; 2042: 38,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 16 | 6 F | Urban | 190+78.150 | 234+73.270 | 4,395.12 | 0.8324 | 2022: 25,700; 2023: 26,142; 2024: 26,585; 2025: 27,027; 2026: 27,470; 2027: 27,912; 2028: 28,355; 2029: 28,797; 2030: 29,240; 2031: 29,682; 2032: 30,$125 ; 2033: 30,567 ; 2034: 31,010 ; 2035: 31,452 ; 2036: 31,895 ; 2037: 32,337 ; 2038: 32,780 ; 2039: 33,222$; 2040: 33,665; 2041: 34,107; 2042: 34,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 17 | 7 F | Urban | 234+73.270 | 235+38.500 | 65.23 | 0.0123 | 2022: 27,950; 2023: 28,430; 2024: 28,910; 2025: 29,390; 2026: 29,870; 2027: 30,350; 2028: 30,830; 2029: 31,310; 2030: 31,790; 2031: 32,270; 2032: 32,750; 2033: 33,230; 2034: 33,710; 2035: 34,190; 2036: 34,670; 2037: 35,150; 2038: 35,630; 2039: 36,110; 2040: 36,590; 2041: 37,070; 2042: 37,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 18 | 8 F | Urban | 235+38.500 | 256+53.490 | 2,114.99 | 0.4006 | 2022: 30,150; 2023: 30,667; 2024: 31,185; 2025: 31,702; 2026: 32,220; 2027: 32,737; 2028: 33,255; 2029: 33,772; 2030: 34,290; 2031: 34,807; 2032: 35,325; 2033: 35,842; 2034: 36,360; 2035: 36,877; 2036: 37,395; 2037: 37,912; 2038: 38,430; 2039: 38,947; 2040: 39,465; 2041: 39,982; 2042: 40,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 19 | 6 F | Urban | 256+53.490 | 320+43.950 | 6,390.46 | 1.2103 | 2022: 25,600; 2023: 26,042; 2024: 26,485; 2025: 26,927; 2026: 27,370; 2027: 27,812; 2028: 28,255; 2029: 28,697; 2030: 29,140; 2031: 29,582; 2032: 30,$025 ; 2033: 30,467$; 2034: 30,910; 2035: 31,352; 2036: 31,795; 2037: 32,237; 2038: 32,680; 2039: 33,122; 2040: 33,565; 2041: 34,007; 2042: 34,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 20 | 6 F | Urban | 320+43.950 | 333+03.670 | 1,259.72 | 0.2386 | 2022: 27,800; 2023: 28,280; 2024: 28,760; 2025: 29,240; 2026: 29,720; 2027: 30,200; 2028: 30,680; 2029: 31,160; 2030: 31,640; 2031: 32,120; 2032: 32,600; 2033: 33,080; 2034: 33,560; 2035: 34,040; 2036: 34,520; 2037: 35,000; 2038: 35,480; 2039: 35,960; 2040: 36,440; 2041: 36,920; 2042: 37,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 22 | 6 F | Urban | $333+03.670$ | 376+84.690 | 4,381.02 | 0.8297 | 2022: 30,050; 2023: 30,567; 2024: 31,085; 2025: 31,602; 2026: 32,120; 2027: 32,637; 2028: 33,155; 2029: 33,672; 2030: 34,190; 2031: 34,707; 2032: 35,225; 2033: 35,742; 2034: 36,260; 2035: 36,777; 2036: 37,295; 2037: 37,812; 2038: 38,330; 2039: 38,847; 2040: 39,365; 2041: 39,882; 2042: 40,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 24 | 7 F | Urban | $376+84.690$ | 377+09. 150 | 24.46 | 0.0046 | 2022: 34,350; 2023: 34,940; 2024: 35,530; 2025: 36,120; 2026: 36,710; 2027: 37,300; 2028: 37,890; 2029: 38,480; 2030: 39,070; 2031: 39,660; 2032: 40,250; 2033: 40,840; 2034: 41,430; 2035: 42,020; 2036: 42,610; 2037: 43,200; 2038: 43,790; 2039: 44,380; 2040: 44,970; 2041: 45,560; 2042: 46,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Start Location } \\ (\text { Sta. } \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | 8 F | Urban | 377+09.150 | 401+43.300 | 2,434.15 | 0.4610 | 2022: 37,450; 2023: 38,095; 2024: 38,740; 2025: 39,385; 2026: 40,030; 2027: 40,675; 2028: 41,320; 2029: 41,965; 2030: 42,610; 2031: 43,255; 2032: 43,900; 2033: 44,545; 2034: 45,190; 2035: 45,835; 2036: 46,480; 2037: 47,125; 2038: 47,770; 2039: 48,415; 2040: 49,060; 2041: 49,705; 2042: 50,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 26 | 7 F | Urban | $401+43.300$ | $410+45.320$ | 902.02 | 0.1708 | 2022: 33,850; 2023: 34,435; 2024: 35,020; 2025: 35,605; 2026: 36,190; 2027: 36,775; 2028: 37,360; 2029: 37,945; 2030: 38,530; 2031: 39,115; 2032: 39,700; 2033: 40,285; 2034: 40,870; 2035: 41,455; 2036: 42,040; 2037: 42,625; 2038: 43,210; 2039: 43,795; 2040: 44,380; 2041: 44,965; 2042: 45,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 27 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 410+45.320 | $430+10.320$ | 1,965.00 | 0.3722 | 2022: 29,200; 2023: 29,702; 2024: 30,205; 2025: 30,707; 2026: 31,210; 2027: 31,712; 2028: 32,215; 2029: 32,717; 2030: 33,220; 2031: 33,$722 ; 2032: 34,225 ; 2033: 34,727$; 2034: 35,230; 2035: 35,732; 2036: 36,235; 2037: 36,737; 2038: 37,240; 2039: 37,742; 2040: 38,245; 2041: 38,747; 2042: 39,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 28 | 7 F | Urban | $430+10.320$ | $431+12.710$ | 102.39 | 0.0194 | 2022: 34,100; 2023: 34,685; 2024: 35,270; 2025: 35,855; 2026: 36,440; 2027: 37,025; 2028: 37,610; 2029: 38,195; 2030: 38,780; 2031: 39,365; 2032: 39,950; 2033: 40,535; 2034: 41,120; 2035: 41,705; 2036: 42,290; 2037: 42,875; 2038: 43,460; 2039: 44,045; 2040: 44,630; 2041: 45,215; 2042: 45,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 29 | 8 F | Urban | $431+12.710$ | 444+62.420 | 1,349.71 | 0.2556 | 2022: 39,400; 2023: 40,077; 2024: 40,755; 2025: 41,432; 2026: 42,110; 2027: 42,787; 2028: 43,465; 2029: 44,142; 2030: 44,820; 2031: 45,497; 2032: 46,175; 2033: 46,852; 2034: 47,530; 2035: 48,207; 2036: 48,885; 2037: 49,562; 2038: 50,240; 2039: 50,917; 2040: 51,595; 2041: 52,272; 2042: 52,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 30 | 7 F | Urban | 444+62.420 | 446+92.250 | 229.83 | 0.0435 | 2022: 35,900; 2023: 36,517; 2024: 37,135; 2025: 37,752; 2026: 38,370; 2027: 38,987; 2028: 39,605; 2029: 40,222; 2030: 40,840; 2031: 41,457; 2032: 42,075; 2033: 42,692; 2034: 43,310; 2035: 43,927; 2036: 44,545; 2037: 45,162; 2038: 45,780; 2039: 46,397; 2040: 47,015; 2041: 47,632; 2042: 48,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 31 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 446+92.250 | 466+93.140 | 2,000.89 | 0.3790 | 2022: 30,900; 2023: 31,430; 2024: 31,960; 2025: 32,490; 2026: 33,020; 2027: 33,550; 2028: 34,080; 2029: 34,610; 2030: 35,140; 2031: 35,670; 2032: 36,200; 2033: 36,730; 2034: 37,260; 2035: 37,790; 2036: 38,320; 2037: 38,850; 2038: 39,380; 2039: 39,910; 2040: 40,440; 2041: 40,970; 2042: 41,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 32 | 7 F | Urban | $466+93.140$ | 473+45.480 | 652.34 | 0.1235 | 2022: 36,500; 2023: 37,127; 2024: 37,755; 2025: 38,382; 2026: 39,010; 2027: 39,637; 2028: 40,265; 2029: 40,892; 2030: 41,520; 2031: 42,147; 2032: 42,775; 2033: 43,402; 2034: 44,030; 2035: 44,657; 2036: 45,285; 2037: 45,912; 2038: 46,540; 2039: 47,167; 2040: 47,795; 2041: 48,422; 2042: 49,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 33 | 7 F | Urban | 473+45.480 | 487+68.410 | 1,422.93 | 0.2695 | 2022: 42,750; 2023: 43,485; 2024: 44,220; 2025: 44,955; 2026: 45,690; 2027: 46,425; 2028: 47,160; 2029: 47,895; 2030: 48,630; 2031: 49,365; 2032: 50,100; 2033: 50,835; 2034: 51,570; 2035: 52,305; 2036: 53,040; 2037: 53,775; 2038: 54,510; 2039: 55,245; 2040: 55,980; 2041: 56,715; 2042: 57,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 34 | 7 F | Urban | 487+68.410 | 494+75.370 | 706.96 | 0.1339 | 2022: 49,600; 2023: 50,452; 2024: 51,305; 2025: 52.157; 2026: 53,010; 2027: 53,862; 2028: 54,715; 2029: 55,567; 2030: 56,420; 2031: 57,272; 2032: 58,125; 2033: 58,977; 2034: 59,830; 2035: 60,682; 2036: 61,535; 2037: 62,387; 2038: 63,240; 2039: 64,092; 2040: 64,945; 2041: 65,797; 2042: 66,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 36 | 8 F | Urban | 494+75.370 | 518+49.370 | 2,374.00 | 0.4496 | 2022: 54,700; 2023: 55,640; 2024: 56,580; 2025: 57.520; 2026: 58,460; 2027: 59,400; 2028: 60,340; 2029: 61,280; 2030: 62,220; 2031: 63,160; 2032: 64,100; 2033: 65,040; 2034: 65,980; 2035: 66,920; 2036: 67,860; 2037: 68,800; 2038: 69,740; 2039: 70,680; 2040: 71,620; 2041: 72,560; 2042: 73,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 38 | 7 F | Urban | 518+49.370 | 522+06.730 | 357.36 | 0.0677 | 2022: 47,.900; 2023: 48,722; 2024: 49,545; 2025: 50,367; 2026: 51,190; 2027: 52.012; 2028: 52,835; 2029: 53,657; 2030: 54,480; 2031: 55,302; 2032: 56,125; 2033: 56,947; 2034: 57,770; 2035: 58,592; 2036: 59,415; 2037: 60,237; 2038: 61,060; 2039: 61,882; 2040: 62,705; 2041: 63,527; 2042: 64,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 39 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 522+06.730 | 585+36.090 | 6,329.36 | 1.1987 | 2022: 41,350; 2023: 42,060; 2024: 42,770; 2025: 43,480; 2026: 44,190; 2027: 44,900; 2028: 45,610; 2029: 46,320; 2030: 47,030; 2031: 47,740; 2032: 48,450; 2033: 49,160; 2034: 49,870; 2035: 50,580; 2036: 51,290; 2037: 52,000; 2038: 52,710; 2039: 53,420; 2040: 54,130; 2041: 54,840; 2042: 55,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 40 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 585+36.090 | 590+45.470 | 509.38 | 0.0965 | 2022: 51,550; 2023: 52,435; 2024: 53,320; 2025: 54,205; 2026: 55,090; 2027: 55,975; 2028: 56,860; 2029: 57,745; 2030: 58,630 2031: 59,515; 2032: 60,400; 2033: 61,285; 2034: 62,170; 2035: 63,055; 2036: 63,940; 2037: 64,825; 2038: 65,710; 2039: 66,595; 2040: 67,480; 2041: 68,365; 2042: 69,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 42 | 7 F | Urban | 590+45.470 | 624+72.020 | 3,426.55 | 0.6490 | 2022: 61,450; 2023: 62.507; 2024: 63.565; 2025: 64,622; 2026: 65.,680; 2027: 66,737; 2028: 67,795; 2029: 68,852; 2030: 69.910; 2031: 70,967; 2032: 72,025; 2033: 73,082; 2034: 74,140; 2035: 75,197; 2036: 76,255; 2037: 77,312; 2038: 78,370; 2039: 79,427; 2040: 80,485; 2041: 81,542; 2042: 82,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 44 | 7 F | Urban | $624+72.020$ | 628+07.980 | 335.96 | 0.0636 | 2022: 73,050; 2023: 74,305; 2024: 75,560; 2025: 76,815; 2026: 78.070; 2027: 79,325; 2028: 80.580; 2029: 81,835; 2030: 83.090; 2031: 84,345; 2032: 85,600; 2033: 86,855; 2034: 88,110; 2035: 89,365; 2036: 90,620; 2037: 91,875; 2038: 93,130; 2039: 94,385; 2040: 95,640; 2041: 96,895; 2042: 98,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 46 | 8 F | Urban | 628+07.980 | 651+65.010 | 2,357.03 | 0.4464 | 2022: 82,100; 2023: 83,510; 2024: 84,920; 2025: 86,330; 2026: 87,740; 2027: 89,150; 2028: 90,560; 2029: 91,970; 2030: 93,380; 2031: 94,790; 2032: 96,200; 2033: 97,610; 2034: 99,020; 2035: 100,430; 2036: 101,840; 2037: 103,250; 2038: 104,660; 2039: 106,070; 2040: 107,480; 2041: 108,890; 2042: 110,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 49 | 7 F | Urban | 651+65.010 | $660+88.730$ | 923.72 | 0.1749 | 2022: 64,500; 2023: 65,607; 2024: 66,715; 2025: 67,822; 2026: 68,930; 2027: 70,037; 2028: 71,145; 2029: 72,252; 2030: 73,360; 2031: 74,467; 2032: 75,575; 2033: 76,682; 2034: 77,790; 2035: 78,897; 2036: 80,005; 2037: 81,112; 2038: 82,220; 2039: 83,327; 2040: 84,435; 2041: 85,542; 2042: 86,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 50 | 7 F | Urban | 660+88.730 | 667+93.530 | 704.80 | 0.1335 | 2022: 50,800; 2023: 51,672; 2024: 52,545; 2025: 53,417; 2026: 54,290; 2027: 55,162; 2028: 56,035; 2029: 56,907; 2030: 57,780; 2031: 58,652; 2032: 59,525; 2033: 60,397; 2034: 61,270; 2035: 62,142; 2036: 63,015; 2037: 63,887; 2038: 64,760; 2039: 65,632; 2040: 66,505; 2041: 67,377; 2042: 68,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 51 | 6 F | Urban | 667+93.530 | 761+78.560 | 9,385.03 | 1.7775 | 2022: 50,800; 2023: 51,672; 2024: 52,545; 2025: 53,417; 2026: 54,290; 2027: 55,162; 2028: 56,035; 2029: 56,907; 2030: 57,780; 2031: 58,652; 2032: 59,525; 2033: 60,397; 2034: 61,270; 2035: 62,142; 2036: 63,015; 2037: 63,887; 2038: 64,760; 2039: 65,632; 2040: 66,505; 2041: 67,377; 2042: 68,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Start Location } \\ (\text { Sta. } \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52 | 7 F | Urban | 761+78.560 | 773+07.600 | 1,129.04 | 0.2138 | 2022: 73,000; 2023: 74,255; 2024: 75,510; 2025: 76,765; 2026: 78,020; 2027: 79,275; 2028: 80,530; 2029: 81,785; 2030: 83,040; 2031: 84,295; 2032: 85,550; 2033: 86,805; 2034: 88,060; 2035: 89,315; 2036: 90,570; 2037: 91,825; 2038: 93,080; 2039: 94,335; 2040: 95,590; 2041: 96,845; 2042: 98,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 54 | 9 F | Urban | 773+07.600 | $806+52.740$ | 3,345.14 | 0.6335 | 2022: 99,850; 2023: 101,567; 2024: 103,285; 2025: 105,002; 2026: 106,720; 2027: 108,437; 2028: 110,155; 2029: 111,872; 2030: 113,590; 2031: 115,307; 2032: 117,025; 2033: 118,742; 2034: 120,460; 2035: 122,177; 2036: 123,895; 2037: 125,612; 2038: 127,330; 2039: 129,047; 2040: 130,765; 2041: 132,482; 2042: 134,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 56 | 9 F | Urban | $806+52.740$ | 807+42.600 | 89.86 | 0.0170 | 2022: 97,300; 2023: 98,975; 2024: 100,650; 2025: 102,325; 2026: 104,000; 2027: 105,675; 2028: 107,350; 2029: 109,025; 2030: 110,700; 2031: 112,375; 2032: 114,050; 2033: 115,725; 2034: 117,400; 2035: 119,075; 2036: 120,750; 2037: 122,425; 2038: 124,100; 2039: 125,775; 2040: 127,450; 2041: 129,125; 2042: 130,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 58 | 9 F | Urban | 807+42.600 | 813+44.180 | 601.58 | 0.1139 | 2022: 94,200; 2023: 95,822; 2024: 97,445; 2025: 99,067; 2026: 100,690; 2027: 102,312; 2028: 103,935; 2029: 105,557; 2030: 107,180; 2031: 108,802; 2032: 110,425 ; 2033: 112,047; 2034: 113,670; 2035: 115,292; 2036: 116,915; 2037: 118,537; 2038: 120,160; 2039: 121,782; 2040: 123,405; 2041: 125,027; 2042: 126,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 59 | 8 F | Urban | 813+44.180 | 872+94.110 | 5,949.93 | 1.1269 | 2022: 94,200; 2023: 95,822; 2024: 97,445; 2025: 99,067; 2026: 100,690; 2027: 102,312; 2028: 103,935; 2029: 105,557; 2030; 107,180; 2031: 108,802; 2032: 110,425; 2033: 112,047; 2034: 113,670; 2035: 115,292; 2036: 116,915; 2037: 118,537; 2038: 120,160; 2039: 121,782; 2040: 123,405; 2041: 125,027; 2042: 126,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 60 | 9 F | Urban | 872+94.110 | 873+42.940 | 48.83 | 0.0092 | 2022: 94,200; 2023: 95,822; 2024: 97,445; 2025: 99,067; 2026: 100,690; 2027: 102,312; 2028: 103,935; 2029: 105,557; 2030: 107,180; 2031: 108,802; 2032: 110,425; 2033: 112,047; 2034: 113,670; 2035: 115,292; 2036: 116,915; 2037: 118,537; 2038: 120,160; 2039: 121,782; 2040: 123,405; 2041: 125,027; 2042: 126,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 61 | 10F | Urban | 873+42.940 | 879+94.370 | 651.43 | 0.1234 | 2022: 106,300; 2023: 108,127; 2024: 109.955; 2025: 111,782; 2026: 113,610; 2027: 115,437; 2028: 117,265; 2029: 119,092; 2030: 120,920; 2031: 122,747; 2032: 124,575; 2033: 126,402; 2034: 128,230; 2035: 130,057; 2036: 131,885; 2037: 133,712; 2038: 135,540; 2039: 137,367; 2040: 139,195; 2041: 141,022; 2042: 142,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 62 | 10F | Urban | 879+94.370 | $921+17.280$ | 4,122.91 | 0.7809 | 2022: 116,450; 2023: 118,452; 2024: 120,455; 2025: 122,457; 2026: 124,460; 2027: 126,462; 2028: 128,465; 2029: 130,467; 2030: 132,470; 2031: 134,472; 2032: 136,475; 2033: 138,477; 2034: 140,480; 2035: 142,482; 2036: 144,485; 2037: 146,487; 2038: 148,490; 2039: 150,492; 2040: 152,495; 2041: 154,497; 2042: 156,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 64 | 9 F | Urban | $921+17.280$ | $946+88.890$ | 2,571.61 | 0.4870 | 2022: 105,950; 2023: 107,770; 2024: 109,590; 2025: 111,410; 2026: 113,230; 2027: 115,050; 2028: 116,870; 2029: 118,690; 2030: 120,510; 2031: 122,.330; 2032: 124,150; 2033: 125,970; 2034: 127,790; 2035: 129,610; 2036: 131,430; 2037: 133,250; 2038: 135,070; 2039: 136,890; 2040: 138,710; 2041: 140,530; 2042: 142,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 66 | 9 F | Urban | $946+88.890$ | 983+35.310 | 3,646.42 | 0.6906 | 2022: 100,100; 2023: 101,822; 2024: 103,545; 2025: 105,267; 2026: 106,990; 2027: 108,712; 2028: 110,435; 2029: 112,157; 2030: 113,$880 ; 2031: 115,602 ; 2032: 117,325 ; 2033: 119,047 ; 2034: 120,770 ; 2035: 122,492 ; 2036: 124,215 ; 2037: 125,937$; 2038: 127,660; 2039: 129,382; 2040: 131,105; 2041: 132,827; 2042: 134,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 67 | 9 F | Urban | 983+35.310 | 986+82.810 | 347.50 | 0.0658 | 2022: 111,200; 2023: 113.115; 2024: 115,030; 2025: 116.945; 2026: 118,860; 2027: 120,775; 2028: 122,690; 2029: 124,605; 2030: 126,520; 2031: 128,435; 2032: 130,350; 2033: 132,265; 2034: 134,180; 2035: 136,095; 2036: 138,010; 2037: 139,925; 2038: 141,840; 2039: 143,755; 2040: 145,670; 2041: 147,585; 2042: 149,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 69 | 8 F | Urban | 986+82.810 | 1021+08.260 | 3,425.45 | 0.6488 | 2022: 100,800; 2023: 102,535; 2024: 104,270; 2025: 106,005; 2026: 107,740; 2027: 109.475; 2028: 111,210; 2029: 112,945; 2030: 114,680; 2031: 116,415; 2032: 118,150; 2033: 119,885; 2034: 121,620; 2035: 123,355; 2036: 125,090; 2037: 126,825; 2038: 128,560; 2039: 130,295; 2040: 132,030; 2041: 133,765; 2042: 135,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 71 | 8 F | Urban | 1021+08.260 | 1053+94.350 | 3,286.09 | 0.6224 | 2022: 111,500; 2023: 113.420; 2024: 115,340; 2025: 117,260; 2026: 119,180; 2027: 121,100; 2028: 123,020; 2029: 124.,940; 2030: 126,860; 2031: 128,780; 2032: 130,700; 2033: 132,620; 2034: 134,540; 2035: 136,460; 2036: 138,380; 2037: 140,300; 2038: 142,220; 2039: 144,140; 2040: 146,060; 2041: 147,980; 2042: 149,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 75 | ${ }^{8 F}$ | Urban | 1053+94.350 | 1058+21.360 | 427.01 | 0.0809 | 2022: 103,500; 2023: 105,280; 2024: 107,060; 2025: 108,840; 2026: 110,620; 2027: 112,400; 2028: 114,180; 2029: 115,960; 2030: 117,740; 2031: 119.520; 2032: 121,300; 2033: 123,080; 2034: 124,860; 2035: 126,640; 2036: 128,420; 2037: 130,200; 2038: 131,980; 2039: 133,760; 2040: 135,540; 2041: 137,320; 2042: 139,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 77 | 8 F | Urban | 1058+21.360 | 1075+52.580 | 1,731.22 | 0.3279 | 2022: 100,250; 2023: 101,972; 2024: 103,695; 2025: 105,417; 2026: 107,140; 2027: 108,862; 2028: 110,585; 2029: 112,307; 2030: 114,030; 2031: 115,752; 2032: 117,475; 2033: 119,197; 2034: 120,920; 2035: 122,642; 2036: 124,365; 2037: 126,087; 2038: 127,810; 2039: 129,532; 2040: 131,255; 2041: 132,977; 2042: 134,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 78 | 9 F | Urban | 1075+52.580 | 1079+97.540 | 444.96 | 0.0843 | 2022: 122.700; 2023: 124,810; 2024: 126,920; 2025: 129,030; 2026: 131,140; 2027: 133.,250; 2028: 135.360; 2029: 137,470; 2030: 139,580; 2031: 141,690; 2032: 143,800; 2033: 145,910; 2034: 148,020; 2035: 150,130; 2036: 152,240; 2037: 154,350; 2038: 156,460; 2039: 158,570; 2040: 160,680; 2041: 162,790; 2042: 164,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 80 | 10F | Urban | 1079+97.540 | 1116+60.530 | 3,662.99 | 0.6937 | 2022: 146,650; 2023: 149,172; 2024: 151,695; 2025: 154,217; 2026: 156,740; 2027: 159,262; 2028: 161,785; 2029: 164,307; 2030: 166,830; 2031: 169,352; 2032: 171,875; 2033: 174,397; 2034: 176,920; 2035: 179,442; 2036: 181,965; 2037: 184,487; 2038: 187,010; 2039: 189,532; 2040: 192,055; 2041: 194,577; 2042: 197,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 83 | 6 F | Urban | 1116+60.530 | $1118+47.190$ | 186.66 | 0.0353 | 2022: 156,.55; 2023: 159,242; 2024: 161,935; 2025: 164,627; 2026: 167,320; 2027: 170,012; 2028: 172,705; 2029: 175,.397; 2030: 178,090; 2031: 180,782; 2032: 183,475; 2033: 186,167; 2034: 188,860; 2035: 191,552; 2036: 194,245; 2037: 196,937; 2038: 199,630; 2039: 202,322; 2040: 205,015; 2041: 207,707; 2042: 210,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 86 | 10F | Urban | $1118+47.190$ | 1139+16.750 | 2,069.56 | 0.3920 | 2022: 150,000 ; 2023: 152,$580 ; 2024: 155,160 ; 2025$ : 157,$740 ; 2026$ : 160,$320 ; 2027$ : 162,$900 ; 2028: 165,480 ; 2029: 168,060$; 2030: 170,640; 2031: 173,220; 2032: 175,800; 2033: 178,380; 2034: 180,960; 2035: 183,540; 2036: 186,120; 2037: 188,700; 2038: 191,280; 2039: 193,860; 2040: 196,440; 2041: 199,020; 2042: 201,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 88 | 10F | Urban | 1139+16.750 | 1149+08.590 | 991.84 | 0.1878 | 2022: 159.800; 2023: 162.550; 2024: 165,300; 2025: 168,050; 2026: 170,800; 2027: 173.,550; 2028: 176,300; 2029: 179,050; 2030: 181,800; 2031: 184,550; 2032: 187,300; 2033: 190,050; 2034: 192,800; 2035: 195,550; 2036: 198,300; 2037: 201,050; 2038: 203,800; 2039: 206,550; 2040: 209,300; 2041: 212,050; 2042: 214,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Start Location } \\ (\text { Sta. } \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 91 | 10F | Urban | 1149+08.590 | 1168+08.900 | 1,900.31 | 0.3599 | 2022: 155,500 ; 2023: 158,177 ; 2024: 160,855; 2025: 163,532; 2026: 166,210; 2027: 168,887; 2028: 171,565; 2029: 174,242; 2030: 176,920; 2031: 179,597; 2032: 182,275; 2033: 184,952; 2034: 187,630; 2035: 190,307; 2036: 192,985; 2037: 195,662; 2038: 198,340; 2039: 201,017; 2040: 203,695; 2041: 206,372; 2042: 209,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 92 | 10F | Urban | $1168+08.900$ | 1173+14.860 | 505.96 | 0.0958 | 2022: 135,750; 2023: 138,087; 2024: 140,425; 2025: 142,762; 2026: 145,100; 2027: 147,437; 2028: 149,775; 2029: 152,112; 2030: 154,450; 2031: 156,787; 2032: 159,125; 2033: 161,462; 2034: 163,800; 2035: 166,137; 2036: 168,475; 2037: 170,812; 2038: 173,150; 2039: 175,487; 2040: 177,825; 2041: 180,162; 2042: 182,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 93 | 9 F | Urban | 1173+14.860 | 1184+67.050 | 1,152.19 | 0.2182 | 2022: 117,100; 2023: 119,115; 2024: 121,130; 2025: 123,145; 2026: 125,160; 2027: 127,175; 2028: 129,190; 2029: 131,205; 2030: 133,220; 2031: 135,235; 2032: 137,250; 2033: 139,265; 2034: 141,280; 2035: 143,295; 2036: 145,310; 2037: 147,325; 2038: 149,340; 2039: 151,355; 2040: 153,370; 2041: 155,385; 2042: 157,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 94 | 8 F | Urban | 1184+67.050 | 1189+27.220 | 460.17 | 0.0872 | 2022: 102,650; 2023: 104,417; 2024: 106,185; 2025: 107,952; 2026: 109,720; 2027: 111,487; 2028: 113,255; 2029: 115,022; 2030: 116,790; 2031: 118,557; 2032: 120,325; 2033: 122,092; 2034: 123,860; 2035: 125,627; 2036: 127,395; 2037: 129,162; 2038: 130,930; 2039: 132,697; 2040: 134,465; 2041: 136,232; 2042: 138,000 $\qquad$ | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 95 | 7 F | Urban | 1189+27.220 | 1229+20.230 | 3,993.01 | 0.7562 | 2022: 96,100; 2023: 97,755; 2024: 99,410; 2025: 101,065; 2026: 102,720; 2027: 104,375; 2028: 106,030; 2029: 107,685; 2030 109,$340 ; 2031: 110,995 ; 2032: 112,650 ; 2033$ : 114,$305 ; 2034: 115,960 ; 2035: 117,615 ; 2036: 119,270 ; 2037: 120,925 ; 2038$ : 122,580; 2039: 124,235; 2040: 125,890; 2041: 127,545; 2042: 129,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 97 | 7 F | Urban | 1229+20.230 | 1246+54.550 | 1,734.32 | 0.3285 | 2022: 89,150; 2023: 90,685; 2024: 92,220; 2025: 93,755; 2026: 95,290; 2027: 96,825; 2028: 98,360; 2029: 99,895; 2030: 101,430; 2031: 102,965; 2032: 104,500; 2033: 106,035; 2034: 107,570; 2035: 109,105; 2036: 110,640; 2037: 112,175; 2038 : 113,710; 2039: 115,245; 2040: 116,780; 2041: 118,315; 2042: 119,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 99 | 7 F | Urban | 1246+54.550 | 1257+20.070 | 1,065.52 | 0.2018 | 2022: 76,500; 2023: 77,817; 2024: 79,135; 2025: 80,452; 2026: 81,770; 2027: 83,087; 2028: 84,405; 2029: 85,722; 2030: 87,040; 2031: 88,357; 2032: 89,675; 2033: 90,992; 2034: 92,310; 2035: 93,627; 2036: 94,945; 2037: 96,262; 2038: 97,580; 2039: 98,897; 2040: 100,215; 2041: 101,532; 2042: 102,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 100 | ${ }^{8 F}$ | Urban | 1257+20.070 | 1268+72.230 | 1,152.16 | 0.2182 | 2022: 94,150; 2023: 95,770; 2024: 97,390; 2025: 99,010; 2026: 100,630; 2027: 102,250; 2028: 103,870; 2029: 105,490; 2030; 107,110; 2031: 108,730; 2032: 110,350; 2033: 111,970; 2034: 113,590; 2035: 115,210; 2036: 116,830; 2037: 118,450; 2038: 120,070; 2039: 121,690; 2040: 123,310; 2041: 124,930; 2042: 126,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 101 | 10F | Urban | 1268+72.230 | 1281+75.860 | 1,303.63 | 0.2469 | 2022: 133,200; 2023: 135,492; 2024: 137,785; 2025: 140,077; 2026: 142,370; 2027: 144,662; 2028: 146,955; 2029: 149,247; 2030: 151,540; 2031: 153,832; 2032: 156,125; 2033: 158,417; 2034: 160,710; 2035: 163,002; 2036: 165,295; 2037: 167,587; 2038: 169,880; 2039: 172,172; 2040: 174,465; 2041: 176,757; 2042: 179,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 102 | 10F | Urban | 1281+75.860 | 1315+93.800 | 3,417.94 | 0.6473 | 2022: 143,350; 2023: 145,817 ; 2024: 148,285; 2025: 150,752; 2026: 153,220; 2027: 155,687 ; 2028: 158,155; 2029: 160,622; 2030: 163,090; 2031: 165,557; 2032: 168,025; 2033: 170,492; 2034: 172,960; 2035: 175,427; 2036: 177,895; 2037: 180,362; 2038: 182,830; 2039: 185,297; 2040: 187,765; 2041: 190,232; 2042: 192,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 106 | 10F | Urban | 1315+93.800 | 1318+49.560 | 255.76 | 0.0484 | 2022: 134,300; 2023: 136,612; 2024: 138,925; 2025: 141,237; 2026: 143,550; 2027: 145,862; 2028: 148,175; 2029: 150,487; 2030: 152,800; 2031: 155,112 ; 2032: 157,425 ; 2033: 159,737; 2034: 162,050; 2035: 164,362; 2036: 166,675; 2037: 168,987; 2038: 171,300; 2039: 173,612; 2040: 175,925; 2041: 178,237; 2042: 180,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 108 | 10F | Urban | 1318+49.560 | 1352+31.030 | 3,381.47 | 0.6404 | 2022: 126,250; 2023: 128,422; 2024: 130,595; 2025: 132,767; 2026: 134,940; 2027: 137,112; 2028: 139,285; 2029: 141,457; 2030: 143,630 ; 2031: 145,802 ; 2032: 147,975; 2033: 150,147; 2034: 152,320; 2035: 154,492; 2036: 156,665; 2037: 158,837; 2038: 161,010; 2039: 163,182; 2040: 165,355; 2041: 167,527; 2042: 169,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 109 | 10F | Urban | 1352+31.030 | 1355+24.530 | 293.50 | 0.0556 | 2022: 133,900; 2023: 136,205; 2024: 138,510; 2025: 140,815; 2026: 143,120; 2027: 145,425; 2028: 147,730; 2029: 150,035; 2030: 152,340; 2031: 154,645; 2032: 156,950; 2033: 159,255; 2034: 161,560; 2035: 163,865; 2036: 166,170; 2037: 168,475; 2038: 170,780; 2039: 173,085; 2040: 175,390; 2041: 177,695; 2042: 180,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 111 | 10F | Urban | 1355+24.530 | 1384+38.980 | 2,914.45 | 0.5520 | 2022: 144,300; 2023: 146,782; 2024: 149,265; 2025: 151,747; 2026: 154,230; 2027: 156,712; 2028: 159,195; 2029: 161,677; 2030: 164,160; 2031: 166,642; 2032: 169, 125; 2033: 171,607; 2034: 174,090; 2035: 176,572; 2036: 179,055; 2037: 181,537; 2038: 184,020; 2039: 186,502; 2040: 188,985; 2041: 191,467; 2042: 193,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 114 | 9 F | Urban | 1384+38.980 | 1388+36.180 | 397.20 | 0.0752 | 2022: 116,300; 2023: 118,300; 2024: 120,300; 2025: 122,300; 2026: 124,300; 2027: 126,300; 2028: 128,300; 2029: 130,300; 2030: 132,300; 2031: 134,300; 2032: 136,300; 2033: 138,300; 2034: 140,300; 2035: 142,300; 2036: 144,300; 2037: 146,300; 2038: 148,300; 2039: 150,300; 2040: 152,300; 2041: 154,300; 2042: 156,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 115 | 8 F | Urban | 1388+36.180 | 1407+00.830 | 1,864.65 | 0.3532 | 2022: 86,100; 2023: 87,580; 2024: 89,060; 2025: 90,540; 2026: 92,020; 2027: 93,500; 2028: 94,980; 2029: 96,460; 2030: 97,940; 2031: 99,420; 2032: 100,900; 2033: 102,380; 2034: 103,860; 2035: 105,340; 2036: 106,820; 2037: 108,300; 2038: 109,780; 2039: 111,260; 2040: 112,740; 2041: 114,220; 2042: 115,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 116 | 9 F | Urban | 1407+00.830 | 1407+99.290 | 98.46 | 0.0186 | 2022: 93,750; 2023: 95,362; 2024: 96,975; 2025: 98,587; 2026: 100,200; 2027: 101,812; 2028: 103,425; 2029: 105,037; 2030: 106,650; 2031: 108,262; 2032: 109,875; 2033: 111,487; 2034: 113,100; 2035: 114,712; 2036: 116,325; 2037: 117,937; 2038: 119,550; 2039: 121,162; 2040: 122,775; 2041: 124,387; 2042: 126,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 117 | 9 F | Urban | 1407+99.290 | 1458+80.350 | 5,081.06 | 0.9623 | 2022: 99,800; 2023: 101,517; 2024: 103,235; 2025: 104,952; 2026: 106,670; 2027: 108,387; 2028: 110,105; 2029: 111,822; 2030 113,540; 2031: 115,257 ; 2032: 116,975; 2033: 118,692; 2034: 120,410; 2035: 122,127; 2036: 123,845; 2037: 125,562; 2038: 127,280; 2039: 128,997; 2040: 130,715; 2041: 132,432; 2042: 134,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 119 | 9 F | Urban | 1458+80.350 | 1459+28.940 | 48.59 | 0.0092 | 2022: 108,950; 2023: 110,822; 2024: 112,695; 2025: 114,567; 2026: 116,440; 2027: 118,312; 2028: 120,185; 2029: 122,057; 2030: 123,930; 2031: 125,802; 2032: 127,675; 2033: 129,547; 2034: 131,420; 2035: 133,292; 2036: 135,165; 2037: 137,037; 2038: 138,910; 2039: 140,782; 2040: 142,655; 2041: 144,527; 2042: 146,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 121 | 9 F | Urban | 1459+28.940 | 1485+21.570 | 2,592.63 | 0.4910 | 2022: 115,700; 2023: 117,690; 2024: 119,680; 2025: 121,670; 2026: 123,660; 2027: 125,650; 2028: 127,640; 2029: 129,630; 2030: 131,620; 2031: 133,610; 2032: 135,600; 2033: 137,590; 2034: 139,580; 2035: 141,570; 2036: 143,560; 2037: 145,550; 2038: 147,540; 2039: 149,530; 2040: 151,520; 2041: 153,510; 2042: 155,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Start Location } \\ (\text { Sta. } \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 124 | 10F | Urban | 1485+21.570 | 1493+46.760 | 825.19 | 0.1563 | 2022: 119,200; 2023: 121,250; 2024: 123,300; 2025: 125,350; 2026: 127,400; 2027: 129,450; 2028: 131,500; 2029: 133,550; 2030: 135,600; 2031: 137,650; 2032: 139,700; 2033: 141,750; 2034: 143,800; 2035: 145,850; 2036: 147,900; 2037: 149,950; 2038: 152,000; 2039: 154,050; 2040: 156,100; 2041: 158,150; 2042: 160,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 125 | 10F | Urban | 1493+46.760 | 1516+23.110 | 2,276.35 | 0.4311 | 2022: 122,550; 2023: 124,660; 2024: 126,770; 2025: 128,880; 2026: 130,990; 2027: 133,100; 2028: 135,210; 2029: 137,320; 2030: 139,430; 2031: 141,540; 2032: 143,650; 2033: 145,760; 2034: 147,870; 2035: 149,980; 2036: 152,090; 2037: 154,200; 2038: 156,310; 2039: 158,420; 2040: 160,530; 2041: 162,640; 2042: 164,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 128 | 10F | Urban | 1516+23.110 | 1524+23.110 | 800.00 | 0.1515 | 2022: 115,000; 2023: 116,980; 2024: 118,960; 2025: 120,940; 2026: 122,920; 2027: 124,900; 2028: 126,880; 2029: 128,860; 2030: 130,840; 2031: 132,820; 2032: 134,800; 2033: 136,780; 2034: 138,760; 2035: 140,740; 2036: 142,720; 2037: 144,700; 2038: 146,680; 2039: 148,660; 2040: 150,640; 2041: 152,620; 2042: 154,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 129 | 9 F | Urban | 1524+23.110 | 1548+51.750 | 2,428.64 | 0.4600 | 2022: 103,100; 2023: 104,875; 2024: 106,650; 2025: 108,425; 2026: 110,200; 2027: 111,975; 2028: 113,750; 2029: 115,525; 2030: 117,300; 2031: 119,075; 2032: 120,850; 2033: 122,625; 2034: 124,400; 2035: 126,175; 2036: 127,950; 2037: 129,725; 2038: 131,500; 2039: 133,275; 2040: 135,050; 2041: 136,825; 2042: 138,600 $\qquad$ | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 131 | 8 F | Urban | 1548+51.750 | 1550+07.160 | 155.41 | 0.0294 | 2022: 95,550; 2023: 97,$195 ; 2024: 98,840 ; 2025: 100,485 ; 2026: 102,130 ; 2027: 103,775 ; 2028: 105,420 ; 2029: 107,065 ; 2030$ : 108,710; 2031: 110,$355 ; 2032$ : 112,000; 2033: 113,645; 2034: 115,290; 2035: 116,935; 2036: 118,580; 2037: 120,225; 2038: 121,870; 2039: 123,515; 2040: 125,160; 2041: 126,805; 2042: 128,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 133 | 8 F | Urban | 1550+07.160 | 1567+03.620 | 1,696.46 | 0.3213 | 2022: 87,600; 2023: 89,107; 2024: 90,615; 2025: 92,122; 2026: 93,630; 2027: 95,137; 2028: 96,645; 2029: 98,152; 2030: 99,660; 2031: 101,167 ; 2032: 102,675 ; 2033: 104,182; 2034: 105,690; 2035: 107,197; 2036: 108,705; 2037: 110,212; 2038: 111,720; 2039: 113,227; 2040: 114,735; 2041: 116,242; 2042: 117,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 134 | 9 F | Urban | 1567+03.620 | 1569+20.770 | 217.15 | 0.0411 | 2022: 97,200; 2023: 98,872; 2024: 100,545; 2025: 102,217; 2026: 103,890; 2027: 105,562; 2028: 107,235; 2029: 108,907; 2030: 110,$580 ; 2031: 112,252 ; 2032: 113,925 ; 2033: 115,597 ; 2034: 117,270 ; 2035: 118,942 ; 2036$ : 120,615; 2037: 122,287; 2038: 123,960; 2039: 125,632; 2040: 127,305; 2041: 128,977; 2042: 130,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 135 | 9 F | Urban | 1569+20.770 | 1597+23.110 | 2,802.34 | 0.5308 | 2022: 108,000; 2023: 109,860; 2024: 111,720; 2025: 113,580; 2026: 115,440; 2027: 117,300; 2028: 119,160; 2029: 121,020; 2030: 122,880; 2031: 124,740; 2032: 126,600; 2033: 128,460; 2034: 130,320; 2035: 132,180; 2036: 134,040; 2037: 135,900; 2038: 137,760; 2039: 139,620; 2040: 141,480; 2041: 143,340; 2042: 145,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 139 | 9 F | Urban | 1597+23.110 | 1600+07.160 | 284.05 | 0.0538 | 2022: 94,700; 2023: 96,330; 2024: 97,960; 2025: 99,590; 2026: 101,220; 2027: 102,850; 2028: 104,480; 2029: 106,110; 2030: 107,740; 2031: 109.370; 2032: 111,000; 2033: 112,630; 2034: 114,260; 2035: 115,890; 2036: 117.,520; 2037: 119, 150; 2038: 120,780; 2039: 122,410; 2040: 124,040; 2041: 125,670; 2042: 127,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 141 | 9 F | Urban | 1600+07.160 | 1622+13.430 | 2,206.27 | 0.4178 | 2022: 84,550; 2023: 86,002; 2024: 87,455; 2025: 88,907; 2026: 90,360; 2027: 91,812; 2028: 93,265; 2029: 94,717; 2030: 96,170; 2031: 97,622; 2032: 99,075; 2033: 100,527; 2034: 101,980; 2035: 103,432; 2036: 104,885; 2037: 106,337; 2038: 107,790; 2039: 109,242; 2040: 110,695; 2041: 112,147; 2042: 113,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 143 | 8 F | Urban | 1622+13.430 | 1622+60.330 | 46.90 | 0.0089 | 2022: 63,500; 2023: 64,592; 2024: 65,685; 2025: 66,777; 2026: 67,870; 2027: 68,962; 2028: 70,055; 2029: 71,147; 2030: 72,240; 2031: 73,332; 2032: 74,425; 2033: 75,517; 2034: 76,610; 2035: 77,702; 2036: 78,795; 2037: 79,887; 2038: 80,980; 2039: 82,072; 2040: 83,165; 2041: 84,257; 2042: 85,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 144 | 7 F | Urban | 1622+60.330 | 1693+03.680 | 7,043.35 | 1.3340 | 2022: 50,750; 2023: 51,622; 2024: 52,495; 2025: 53,367; 2026: 54,240; 2027: 55,112; 2028: 55,985; 2029: 56,857; 2030: 57,730; 2031: 58,602; 2032: 59,475; 2033: 60,347; 2034: 61,220; 2035: 62,092; 2036: 62,965; 2037: 63,837; 2038: 64,710; 2039: 65,582; 2040: 66,455; 2041: 67,327; 2042: 68,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 145 | 7 F | Urban | 1693+03.680 | 1695+79.250 | 275.57 | 0.0522 | 2022: 57,350; 2023: 58,337; 2024: 59,325; 2025: 60.312; 2026: 61,300; 2027: 62,287; 2028: 63,275; 2029: 64,262; 2030: 65,250; 2031: 66,237; 2032: 67,225; 2033: 68,212; 2034: 69,200; 2035: 70,187; 2036: 71,175; 2037: 72,162; 2038: 73,150; 2039: 74,137; 2040: 75,125; 2041: 76,112; 2042: 77,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 147 | ${ }^{8 F}$ | Urban | 1695+79.250 | 1758+35.390 | 6,256.14 | 1.1849 | 2022: 70,400; 2023: 71,612; 2024: 72,825; 2025: 74,037; 2026: 75,250; 2027: 76,462; 2028: 77,675; 2029: 78,887; 2030: 80,100; 2031: 81,312; 2032: 82,525; 2033: 83,737; 2034: 84,950; 2035: 86,162; 2036: 87,375; 2037: 88,587; 2038: 89,800; 2039: 91,012; 2040: 92,225; 2041: 93,437; 2042: 94,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 149 | 7 F | Urban | 1758+35.390 | 1765+64.940 | 729.55 | 0.1382 | 2022: 63,350; 2023: 64,440; 2024: 65,530; 2025: 66,620; 2026: 67,710; 2027: 68, 800; 2028: 69, 890; 2029: 70,980; 2030: 72,070; 2031: 73,160; 2032: 74,250; 2033: 75,340; 2034: 76,430; 2035: 77,520; 2036: 78,610; 2037: 79,700; 2038: 80,790; 2039: 81,880; 2040: 82,970; 2041: 84,060; 2042: 85,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 151 | 8 F | Urban | 1765+64.940 | 1767+60.210 | 195.27 | 0.0370 | 2022: 63,350; 2023: 64,440; 2024: 65,530; 2025: 66,620; 2026: 67,710; 2027: 68,800; 2028: 69,890; 2029: 70,980; 2030: 72,070; 2031: 73,160; 2032: 74,250; 2033: 75,340; 2034: 76,430; 2035: 77,520; 2036: 78,610; 2037: 79,700; 2038: 80,790; 2039: 81,880; 2040: 82,.970; 2041: 84,060; 2042: 85,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 153 | 8 F | Urban | 1767+60.210 | 1781+96.430 | 1,436.22 | 0.2720 | 2022: 52,.150; 2023: 53,045; 2024: 53,.940; 2025: 54,835; 2026: 55,730; 2027: 56,625; 2028: 57,.520; 2029: 58,415; 2030: 59,310; 2031: 60,205; 2032: 61,100; 2033: 61,995; 2034: 62,890; 2035: 63,785; 2036: 64,680; 2037: 65,575; 2038: 66,470; 2039: 67,365; 2040: 68,260; 2041: 69, 155; 2042: 70,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 154 | 8 F | Urban | 1781+96.430 | 1799+13.770 | 1,717.34 | 0.3252 | 2022: 53,050; 2023: 53,962; 2024: 54,875; 2025: 55,787; 2026: 56,700; 2027: 57,612; 2028: 58,525; 2029: 59,437; 2030: 60,350; 2031: 61,262; 2032: 62,175; 2033: 63,087; 2034: 64,000; 2035: 64,912; 2036: 65,825; 2037: 66,737; 2038: 67,650; 2039: 68,562; 2040: 69,475; 2041: 70,387; 2042: 71,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 156 | ${ }^{8 F}$ | Urban | 1799+13.770 | 1823+66.040 | 2,452.27 | 0.4644 | 2022: 58,850; 2023: 59,862; 2024: 60,875; 2025: 61,887; 2026: 62,900; 2027: 63,912; 2028: 64,925; 2029: 65,937; 2030: 66,950; 2031: 67,962; 2032: 68,975; 2033: 69,987; 2034: 71,000; 2035: 72,012; 2036: 73,025; 2037: 74,037; 2038: 75,050; 2039: 76,062; 2040: 77,075; 2041: 78,087; 2042: 79,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 159 | 7 F | Urban | 1823+66.040 | 1829+76.930 | 610.89 | 0.1157 | 2022: 50,200; 2023: 51,062; 2024: 51,925; 2025: 52,787; 2026: 53,650; 2027: 54,512; 2028: 55,375; 2029: 56,237; 2030: 57,100; 2031: 57,962; 2032: 58,825; 2033: 59,687; 2034: 60,550; 2035: 61,412; 2036: 62,275; 2037: 63,137; 2038: 64,000; 2039: 64,862; 2040: 65,725; 2041: 66,587; 2042: 67,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | Start Location (Sta. ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | Median Width (ft | Type | Effective Median Width (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 161 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 1829+76.930 | 1848+64.940 | 1,888.01 | 0.3576 | 2022: 27,550; 2023: 28,022; 2024: 28,495; 2025: 28,967; 2026: 29,440; 2027: 29,912; 2028: 30,385; 2029: 30,857; 2030: 31,330; 2031: 31,802; 2032: 32,275; 2033: 32,747; 2034: 33,220; 2035: 33,692; 2036: 34,165; 2037: 34,637; 2038: 35,110; 2039: 35,582; 2040: 36,055; 2041: 36,527; 2042: 37,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 162 | 8 F | Urban | 1848+64.940 | 1848+81.480 | 16.54 | 0.0031 | 2022: 34,500; 2023: 35,092; 2024: 35,685; 2025: 36,277; 2026: 36,870; 2027: 37,462; 2028: 38,055; 2029: 38,647; 2030: 39,240; 2031: 39,832; 2032: 40,425; 2033: 41,017; 2034: 41,610; 2035: 42,202; 2036: 42,795; 2037: 43,387; 2038: 43,980; 2039: 44,572; 2040: 45,165; 2041: 45,757; 2042: 46,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 163 | 10F | Urban | $1848+81.480$ | 1868+54.350 | 1,972.87 | 0.3736 | 2022: 46,300; 2023: 47,097; 2024: 47,895; 2025: 48,692; 2026: 49,490; 2027: 50,287; 2028: 51,085; 2029: 51,882; 2030: 52,680; 2031: 53,477; 2032: 54,275; 2033: 55,072; 2034: 55,870; 2035: 56,667; 2036: 57,465; 2037: 58,262; 2038: 59,060; 2039: 59,857; 2040: 60,655; 2041: 61,452; 2042: 62,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 164 | 10F | Urban | 1868+54.350 | 1873+54.400 | 500.05 | 0.0947 | 2022: 48,150; 2023: 48,977; 2024: 49,805; 2025: 50,632; 2026: 51,460; 2027: 52,287; 2028: 53,115; 2029: 53,942; 2030: 54,770; 2031: 55,.597; 2032: 56,425; 2033: 57,252; 2034: 58,080; 2035: 58,907; 2036: 59,735; 2037: 60,562; 2038: 61,390; 2039: 62,217; 2040: 63,045; 2041: 63,872; 2042: 64,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 166 | 10F | Urban | 1873+54.400 | 1905+16.110 | 3,161.71 | 0.5988 | 2022: 51,700; 2023: 52,587; 2024: 53,475; 2025: 54,362; 2026: 55,250; 2027: 56,137; 2028: 57,025; 2029: 57,912; 2030: 58,800; 2031: 59,687; 2032: 60,575; 2033: 61,462; 2034: 62,350; 2035: 63,237; 2036: 64,125; 2037: 65,012; 2038: 65,900; 2039: 66,787; 2040: 67,675; 2041: 68,562; 2042: 69,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 169 | 8 F | Urban | 1905+16.110 | 1999+18.010 | 9,401.90 | 1.7807 | 2022: 18,850; 2023: 19,175; 2024: 19,500; 2025: 19,825; 2026: 20,150; 2027: 20,475; 2028: 20,800; 2029: 21,125; 2030: 21,450; 2031: 21,775 ; 2032: 22,100; 2033: 22,425; 2034: 22,750; 2035: 23,075; 2036: 23,400; 2037: 23,725; 2038: 24,050; 2039: 24,375; 2040: 24,700; 2041: 25,025; 2042: 25,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 170 | 8 F | Urban | 1999+18.010 | 2001+13.770 | 195.76 | 0.0371 | 2022: 19,800; 2023: 20,140; 2024: 20,480; 2025: 20,820; 2026: 21,160; 2027: 21,500; 2028: 21,840; 2029: 22,180; 2030: 22,520; 2031: 22,860; 2032: 23,200; 2033: 23,540; 2034: 23,880; 2035: 24,220; 2036: 24,560; 2037: 24,900; 2038: 25,240; 2039: 25,580; 2040: 25,920; 2041: 26,260; 2042: 26,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 172 | 8 F | Urban | 2001+13.770 | 2027+95.160 | 2,681.39 | 0.5078 | 2022: 20,400; 2023: 20,750; 2024: 21,100; 2025: 21,450; 2026: 21,800; 2027: 22,150; 2028: 22,500; 2029: 22,850; 2030: 23,200; 2031: 23,550; 2032: 23,900; 2033: 24,250; 2034: 24,600; 2035: 24,950; 2036: 25,300; 2037: 25,650; 2038: 26,000; 2039: 26,350; 2040: 26,700; 2041: 27,050; 2042: 27,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 175 | 7 F | Urban | 2027+95.160 | 2037+89.330 | 994.17 | 0.1883 | 2022: 18,650; 2023: 18.970; 2024: 19,290; 2025: 19.610; 2026: 19,930; 2027: 20,250; 2028: 20.570; 2029: 20,890; 2030: 21,210; 2031: 21,530 ; 2032: 21,850 ; 2033: 22,170; 2034: 22,490; 2035: 22,810; 2036: 23,130; 2037: 23,450; 2038: 23,770; 2039: 24,090; 2040: 24,410; 2041: 24,730; 2042: 25,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 176 | 6 F | Urban | 2037+89.330 | $2126+91.660$ | 8,902.33 | 1.6861 | 2022: 16,900; 2023: 17,192; 2024: 17,485; 2025: 17,777; 2026: 18.070; 2027: 18.362; 2028: 18,655; 2029: 18,947; 2030: 19,240; 2031: 19,532; 2032: 19,825; 2033: 20,117; 2034: 20,410; 2035: 20,702; 2036: 20,995; 2037: 21,287; 2038: 21,580; 2039: 21,872; 2040: 22,165; 2041: 22,457; 2042: 22,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 177 | 7 F | Urban | $2126+91.660$ | 2127+16.900 | 25.24 | 0.0048 | 2022: 18,300; 2023: 18,617; 2024: 18,935; 2025: 19,252; 2026: 19,570; 2027: 19,887; 2028: 20,205; 2029: 20.522; 2030: 20,840; 2031: 21,157; 2032: 21,475; 2033: 21,792; 2034: 22,110; 2035: 22,427; 2036: 22,745; 2037: 23,062; 2038: 23,380; 2039: 23,697; 2040: 24,015; 2041: 24,332; 2042: 24,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 178 | 8 F | Urban | 2127+16.900 | 2163+05.440 | 3,588.54 | 0.6796 | 2022: 19,500; 2023: 19,837; 2024: 20,175; 2025: 20,512; 2026: 20,850; 2027: 21,187; 2028: 21,525; 2029: 21,862; 2030: 22,200; 2031: 22,537; 2032: 22,875; 2033: 23,212; 2034: 23,550; 2035: 23,$887 ; 2036: 24,225 ; 2037: 24,562 ; 2038: 24,900 ; 2039: 25,237$; 2040: 25,575; 2041: 25,912; 2042: 26,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 179 | 7 F | Urban | $2163+05.440$ | $2163+09.560$ | 4.12 | 0.0008 | 2022: 17,750; 2023: 18.057; 2024: 18,365; 2025: 18,672; 2026: 18,980; 2027: 19,287; 2028: 19,595; 2029: 19,902; 2030: 20,210; 2031: 20,517; 2032: 20,825; 2033: 21,132; 2034: 21,440; 2035: 21,747; 2036: 22,055; 2037: 22,362; 2038: 22,670; 2039: 22,977; 2040: 23,285; 2041: 23,592; 2042: 23,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 180 | ${ }^{6} \mathrm{~F}$ | Urban | 2163+09.560 | 2241+33.280 | 7,823.72 | 1.4818 | 2022: 16,000; 2023: 16,277; 2024: 16,555; 2025: 16,832; 2026: 17,110; 2027: 17,387; 2028: 17,665; 2029: 17,942; 2030: 18,220; 2031: 18,497; 2032: 18,775; 2033: 19,052; 2034: 19,330; 2035: 19,607; 2036: 19,885; 2037: 20,162; 2038: 20,440; 2039: 20,717; 2040: 20,995; 2041: 21,272; 2042: 21,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 181 | 6 F | Urban | 2241+33.280 | 2301+70.080 | 6,036.80 | 1.1433 | 2022: 18,650; 2023: 18,970; 2024: 19,290; 2025: 19,610; 2026: 19,930; 2027: 20,250; 2028: 20,570; 2029: 20,890; 2030: 21,210; 2031: 21,530; 2032: 21,850; 2033: 22,170; 2034: 22,490; 2035: 22,810; 2036: 23,130; 2037: 23,450; 2038: 23,770; 2039: 24,090; 2040: 24,410; 2041: 24,730; 2042: 25,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 184 | 8 F | Urban | 2301+70.080 | 2577+64.980 | 27,594.90 | 5.2263 | 2022: 20,250; 2023: 20,597; 2024: 20,945; 2025: 21,292; 2026: 21,640; 2027: 21,987; 2028: 22,335; 2029: 22,682; 2030: 23,030; 2031: 23,377; 2032: 23,725; 2033: 24,072; 2034: 24,420; 2035: 24,767; 2036: 25,115; 2037: 25,462; 2038: 25,810; 2039: 26,157; 2040: 26,505; 2041: 26,852; 2042: 27,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 185 | 7 F | Urban | 2577+64.980 | 2578+84.390 | 119.41 | 0.0226 | 2022: 17,000; 2023: 17,290; 2024: 17.580; 2025: 17,870; 2026: 18,160; 2027: 18,450; 2028: 18,740; 2029: 19,030; 2030: 19,320; 2031: 19,610; 2032: 19,900; 2033: 20,190; 2034: 20,480; 2035: 20,770; 2036: 21,060; 2037: 21,350; 2038: 21,640; 2039: 21,930; 2040: 22,220; 2041: 22,510; 2042: 22,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 186 | ${ }^{6} \mathrm{~F}$ | Urban | 2578+84.390 | 2652+16.980 | 7,332.59 | 1.3887 | 2022: 14,100; 2023: 14,340; 2024: 14.580; 2025: 14,820; 2026: 15,060; 2027: 15,300; 2028: 15,540; 2029: 15,780; 2030: 16,020; 2031: 16,260; 2032: 16,500; 2033: 16,740; 2034: 16,980; 2035: 17,220; 2036: 17,460; 2037: 17,700; 2038: 17,940; 2039: 18,180; 2040: 18,420; 2041: 18,660; 2042: 18,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 187 | 7 F | Urban | 2652+16.980 | 2653+16.980 | 100.00 | 0.0189 | 2022: 14,850; 2023: 15,105 ; 2024: 15,360; 2025: 15,615; 2026: 15,870; 2027: 16,125; 2028: 16,380; 2029: 16,635; 2030: 16,890; 2031: 17,145; 2032: 17,400 ; 2033: 17,655; 2034: 17,910; 2035: 18,165; 2036: 18,420; 2037: 18,675; 2038: 18,930; 2039: 19,185; 2040: 19,440; 2041: 19,695; 2042: 19,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 188 | 8 F | Urban | 2653+16.980 | 2905+85.060 | 25,268.08 | 4.7856 | 2022: 15,$500 ; 2023: 15,767 ; 2024: 16,035 ; 2025: 16,302 ; 2026: 16,570 ; 2027: 16,837 ; 2028: 17,105 ; 2029: 17,372 ; 2030: 17,640$; 2031: 17,907; 2032: 18,175; 2033: 18,442; 2034: 18,710; 2035: 18,977; 2036: 19,245; 2037: 19,512; 2038: 19,780; 2039: 20,047; 2040: 20,315; 2041: 20,582; 2042: 20,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Area Type | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Start Location } \\ (\text { Sta. } \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | End Location (Sta. <br> ft) | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type | Effective Median Width (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 189 | 7 F | Urban | 2905+85.060 | 2919+19.840 | 1,334.78 | 0.2528 | 2022: 14,900; 2023: 15,157; 2024: 15,415; 2025: 15,672; 2026: 15,930; 2027: 16,187; 2028: 16,445; 2029: 16,702; 2030: 16,960; 2031: 17,217; 2032: 17,475; 2033: 17,732; 2034: 17,990; 2035: 18,247; 2036: 18,505; 2037: 18,762; 2038: 19,020; 2039: 19,277; 2040: 19,535; 2041: 19,792; 2042: 20,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 190 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2919+19.840 | 2954+65.120 | 3,545.28 | 0.6714 | 2022: 14,450; 2023: 14,700; 2024: 14,950; 2025: 15,200; 2026: 15,450; 2027: 15,700; 2028: 15,950; 2029: 16,200; 2030: 16,450; 2031: 16,700; 2032: 16,950; 2033: 17,200; 2034: 17,450; 2035: 17,700; 2036: 17,950; 2037: 18,200; 2038: 18,450; 2039: 18,700; 2040: 18,950; 2041: 19,200; 2042: 19,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 191 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2954+65.120 | 2956+02.250 | 137.13 | 0.0260 | 2022: 14,850; 2023: 15,105; 2024: 15,360; 2025: 15,615; 2026: 15,870; 2027: 16.125; 2028: 16.380; 2029: 16,635; 2030: 16,890; 2031: 17,145; 2032: 17,400; 2033: 17,655; 2034: 17,910; 2035: 18,165; 2036: 18,420; 2037: 18,675; 2038: 18,930; 2039: 19,185; 2040: 19,440; 2041: 19,695; 2042: 19,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 193 | ${ }^{6 F}$ | Urban | 2956+02.250 | 2983+64.940 | 2,762.69 | 0.5232 | 2022: 15,250; 2023: 15.510; 2024: 15,770; 2025: 16,030; 2026: 16.290; 2027: 16.550; 2028: 16.810; 2029: 17,070; 2030: 17,330; 2031: 17,590; 2032: 17,850; 2033: 18,110; 2034: 18,370; 2035: 18,630; 2036: 18,890; 2037: 19,150; 2038: 19,410; 2039: 19,670; 2040: 19,930; 2041: 20,190; 2042: 20,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 196 | 4 F | Urban | 2983+64.940 | 3044+67.123 | 6,102.18 | 1.1557 | 2022: 15,250; 2023: 15,510; 2024: 15,770; 2025: 16,030; 2026: 16,290; 2027: 16,550; 2028: 16,810; 2029: 17,070; 2030: 17,330; 2031: 17,590; 2032: 17,850; 2033: 18,110; 2034: 18,370; 2035: 18,630; 2036: 18,890; 2037: 19,150; 2038: 19,410; 2039: 19,670; 2040: 19,930; 2041: 20,190; 2042: 20,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |

Table 2. Evaluation Freeway - Speed Change Lanes (Speed Change)

| Seg. No. | Type | Ramp Type | Start Location (Sta. ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Type | Effective Median Width (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 6SC | Entrance | 10+00.000 | 10+06.360 | 6.36 | 0.0012 | 2022: 28,450; 2023: 28,937; 2024: 29,425; 2025: 29,912; 2026: 30,400; 2027: 30,887; 2028: 31,375; 2029: 31,862; 2030: 32,350; 2031: 32,837; 2032: 33,325; 2033: 33,812; 2034: 34,300; 2035: 34,787; 2036: 35,275; 2037: 35,762; 2038: 36,250; 2039: 36,737; 2040: 37,225; 2041: 37,712; 2042: 38,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 5 | ${ }^{6 S C}$ | Entrance | 24+08.860 | 24+17.550 | 8.69 | 0.0016 | 2022: 23,750; 2023: 24,157; 2024: 24,565; 2025: 24,972; 2026: 25,380; 2027: 25,787; 2028: 26,195; 2029: 26,602; 2030: 27,010; 2031: 27,417; 2032: 27,825; 2033: 28,232; 2034: 28,640; 2035: 29,047; 2036: 29,455; 2037: 29,862; 2038: 30,270; 2039: 30,677;, 2040: 31,085; 2041: 31,492; 2042: 31,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 7 | 6SC | Entrance | 24+17.550 | 31+58.860 | 741.31 | 0.1404 | 2022: 23,400; 2023: 23,802; 2024: 24,205; 2025: 24,607; 2026: 25,010; 2027: 25,412; 2028: 25,815; 2029: 26,217; 2030: 26,620; 2031: 27,022; 2032: 27,$425 ; 2033: 27,827 ; 2034: 28,230 ; 2035: 28,632 ; 2036: 29,035 ; 2037: 29,437 ; 2038: 29,840 ; 2039: 30,242 ;$ 2040: 30,645; 2041: 31,047; 2042: 31,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 21 | 6SC | Entrance | 320+43.950 | 327+93.950 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 27,800; 2023: 28,280; 2024: 28,760; 2025: 29,240; 2026: 29,720; 2027: 30,200; 2028: 30,680; 2029: 31,160; 2030: 31,640; 2031: 32,120; 2032: 32,600; 2033: 33,080; 2034: 33,560; 2035: 34,040; 2036: 34,520; 2037: 35,000; 2038: 35,480; 2039: 35,960; 2040: 36,440; 2041: 36,920; 2042: 37,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 23 | 6SC | Exit | 333+03.670 | 340+53.670 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 30,050; 2023: 30,567; 2024: 31,085; 2025: 31,602; 2026: 32,120; 2027: 32,637; 2028: 33,155; 2029: 33,672; 2030: 34,190; 2031: 34,707; 2032: 35,225; 2033: 35,742; 2034: 36,260; 2035: 36,777; 2036: 37,295; 2037: 37,812; 2038: 38,330; 2039: 38,847; 2040: 39,365; 2041: 39,882; 2042: 40,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 35 | 7SC | Entrance | 487+68.410 | 494+75.370 | 706.96 | 0.1339 | 2022: 49,600; 2023: 50,452; 2024: 51,305; 2025: 52,157; 2026: 53,010; 2027: 53,862; 2028: 54,715; 2029: 55,567; 2030: 56,420; 2031: 57,272; 2032: 58,125; 2033: 58,977; 2034: 59,830; 2035: 60,682; 2036: 61,535; 2037: 62,387; 2038: 63,240; 2039: 64,092; 2040: 64,945; 2041: 65,797; 2042: 66,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 37 | 8SC | Entrance | 494+75.370 | $495+18.410$ | 43.04 | 0.0081 | 2022: 54,700; 2023: 55,640; 2024: 56.580; 2025: 57.520; 2026: 58.460; 2027: 59.400; 2028: 60,340; 2029: 61,280; 2030: 62,220; 2031: 63,160; 2032: 64,100; 2033: 65,040; 2034: 65,980; 2035: 66,920; 2036: 67,860; 2037: 68,800; 2038: 69,740; 2039: 70,680; 2040: 71,620; 2041: 72,560; 2042: 73,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 41 | 6SC | Entrance | 585+36.090 | 590+45.470 | 509.38 | 0.0965 | 2022: 51,550; 2023: 52,435; 2024: 53,320; 2025: 54,205; 2026: 55,090; 2027: 55,975; 2028: 56,860; 2029: 57,745; 2030: 58,630; 2031: 59,515; 2032: 60,400; 2033: 61,285; 2034: 62,170; 2035: 63,055; 2036: 63,940; 2037: 64,825; 2038: 65,710; 2039: 66,595; 2040: 67,480; 2041: 68,365; 2042: 69,250 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 43 | 7SC | Entrance | 590+45.470 | 592+86.090 | 240.62 | 0.0456 | 2022: 61,450; 2023: 62.507; 2024: 63,565; 2025: 64,622; 2026: 65,680; 2027: 66,737; 2028: 67,795; 2029: 68,852; 2030: 69,910; 2031: 70,967; 2032: 72,025; 2033: 73,082; 2034: 74,140; 2035: 75,197; 2036: 76,255; 2037: 77,312; 2038: 78,370; 2039: 79,427; 2040: 80,485; 2041: 81,542; 2042: 82,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 45 | 7SC | Exit | 624+72.020 | 628+07.980 | 335.96 | 0.0636 | 2022: 73,050; 2023: 74,305; 2024: 75,560; 2025: 76,815; 2026: 78,070; 2027: 79,325; 2028: 80,580; 2029: 81,835; 2030: 83,090; 2031: 84,345; 2032: 85,600; 2033: 86,855; 2034: 88,110; 2035: 89,365; 2036: 90,620; 2037: 91,875; 2038: 93,130; 2039: 94,385; 2040: 95,640; 2041: 96,895; 2042: 98,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 47 | 8SC | Exit | 628+07.980 | $632+22.020$ | 414.04 | 0.0784 | 2022: 82,$100 ; 2023: 83,510 ; 2024: 84,920 ; 2025: 86,330 ; 2026: 87,740 ; 2027: 89,150 ; 2028: 90,560 ; 2029: 91,970 ; 2030: 93,380 ;$ 2031: 94,790; 2032: 96,200; 2033: 97,610; 2034: 99,020; 2035: 100,430; 2036: 101,840; 2037: 103,250; 2038: 104,660; 2039: 106,070; 2040: 107,480; 2041: 108,890; 2042: 110,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 48 | 8SC | Entrance | 628+07.980 | 635+57.980 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 82,100; 2023: 83,510; 2024: 84,920; 2025: 86,330; 2026: 87,740; 2027: 89,150; 2028: 90,560; 2029: 91,970; 2030: 93,380; 2031: 94,790; 2032: 96,200; 2033: 97,610; 2034: 99,020; 2035: 100,430; 2036: 101,840; 2037: 103,250; 2038: 104,660; 2039: 106,070; 2040: 107,480; 2041: 108,890; 2042: 110,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 53 | 7SC | Exit | 761+78.560 | 769+28.560 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 73,000; 2023: 74,255; 2024: 75,510; 2025: 76,765; 2026: 78,020; 2027: 79,275; 2028: 80,530; 2029: 81,785; 2030: 83,040; 2031: 84,295; 2032: 85,550; 2033: 86,805; 2034: 88,060; 2035: 89,315; 2036: 90,570; 2037: 91,825; 2038: 93,080; 2039: 94,335; 2040: 95,590; 2041: 96,845; 2042: 98,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 55 | 9SC | Entrance | 799+92.600 | 806+52.740 | 660.14 | 0.1250 | 2022: 99,850; 2023: 101,567; 2024: 103,285; 2025: 105,002; 2026: 106,720; 2027: 108,437; 2028: 110,155; 2029: 111,872; 2030: 113,590; 2031: 115,307; 2032: 117,025; 2033: 118,742; 2034: 120,460; 2035: 122,177; 2036: 123,895; 2037: 125,612; 2038 : 127,330; 2039: 129,047; 2040: 130,765; 2041: 132,482; 2042: 134,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 57 | 9SC | Entrance | 806+52.740 | 807+42.600 | 89.86 | 0.0170 | 2022: 97,300; 2023: 98,975; 2024: 100,650; 2025: 102,325; 2026: 104,000; 2027: 105,675; 2028: 107,350; 2029: 109,025; 2030; 110,700; 2031: 112,375; 2032: 114,050; 2033: 115,725; 2034: 117,400; 2035: 119,075; 2036: 120,750; 2037: 122,425; 2038 : 124,100; 2039: 125,775; 2040: 127,450; 2041: 129,125; 2042: 130,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 63 | 10SC | Entrance | 913+67.280 | $921+17.280$ | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 116,450; 2023: 118,452; 2024: 120,455; 2025: 122,457; 2026: 124,460; 2027: 126,462; 2028: 128,465; 2029: 130,467; 2030: 132,470; 2031: 134,472; 2032: 136,475; 2033: 138,477; 2034: 140,480; 2035: 142,482; 2036: 144,485; 2037: 146,487; 2038: 148,490; 2039: 150,492; 2040: 152,495; 2041: 154,497; 2042: 156,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 65 | 9SC | Exit | 939+38.890 | $946+88.890$ | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 105,950; 2023: 107,770; 2024: 109.590; 2025: 111,410; 2026: 113,230; 2027: 115,050; 2028: 116,870; 2029: 118,690; 2030: 120.510; 2031: 122,330; 2032: 124,150; 2033: 125,970; 2034: 127,790; 2035: 129,610; 2036: 131,430; 2037: 133,250; 2038: 135,070; 2039: 136,890; 2040: 138,710; 2041: 140,530; 2042: 142,350 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 68 | 9SC | Exit | 983+35.310 | 986+82.810 | 347.50 | 0.0658 | 2022: 111,200; 2023: 113.115; 2024: 115,030; 2025: 116.945; 2026: 118,860; 2027: 120,775; 2028: 122,690; 2029: 124,605; 2030: 126,520; 2031: 128,435; 2032: 130,350; 2033: 132,265; 2034: 134,180; 2035: 136,095; 2036: 138,010; 2037: 139,925; 2038: 141,840; 2039: 143,755; 2040: 145,670; 2041: 147,585; 2042: 149,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 70 | 8SC | Exit | 986+82.810 | 990+85.310 | 402.50 | 0.0762 | 2022: 100,$800 ; 2023: 102,535 ; 2024: 104,270 ; 2025: 106,005 ; 2026: 107,740 ; 2027: 109,475 ; 2028: 111,210 ; 2029: 112,945 ;$ 2030: 114,680; 2031: 116,415; 2032: 118,150; 2033: 119,885; 2034: 121,620; 2035: 123,355; 2036: 125,090; 2037: 126,825; 2038: 128,560; 2039: 130,295; 2040: 132,030; 2041: 133,765; 2042: 135,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Ramp Type | Start Location (Sta. ft) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ | Type | Effective Median Width (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 72 | ${ }^{\text {8SC }}$ | Entrance | 1021+08.260 | 1028+58.260 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 111,500; 2023: 113,420; 2024: 115,340; 2025: 117,260; 2026: 119,180; 2027: 121,100; 2028: 123,020; 2029: 124,940; 2030: 126,860; 2031: 128,780; 2032: 130,700; 2033: 132,620; 2034: 134,540; 2035: 136,460; 2036: 138,380; 2037: 140,300; 2038: 142,220; 2039: 144,140; 2040: 146,060; 2041: 147,980; 2042: 149,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 73 | 8SC | Exit | 1046+44.350 | 1053+94.350 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 111,500; 2023: 113,420; 2024: 115,340; 2025: 117,260; 2026: 119,180; 2027: 121,100; 2028: 123,020; 2029: 124,940; 2030: 126,860; 2031: 128,780; 2032: 130,700; 2033: 132,620; 2034: 134,540; 2035: 136,460; 2036: 138,380; 2037: 140,300; 2038: 142,220; 2039: 144,140; 2040: 146,060; 2041: 147,980; 2042: 149,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 74 | 8SC | Entrance | 1050+71.360 | 1053+94.350 | 322.99 | 0.0612 | 2022: 111,500; 2023: 113,420; 2024: 115,340; 2025: 117,260; 2026: 119,180; 2027: 121,100; 2028: 123,020; 2029: 124,940; 2030: 126,860; 2031: 128,780; 2032: 130,700; 2033: 132,620; 2034: 134,540; 2035: 136,460; 2036: 138,380; 2037: 140,300; 2038: 142,220; 2039: 144,140; 2040: 146,060; 2041: 147,980; 2042: 149,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 76 | 8SC | Entrance | 1053+94.350 | 1058+21.360 | 427.01 | 0.0809 | 2022: 103,500; 2023: 105,280; 2024: 107,060; 2025: 108, 840; 2026: 110,620; 2027: 112,400; 2028: 114,180; 2029: 115,960; 2030: 117,740; 2031: 119,520; 2032: 121,300; 2033: 123,080; 2034: 124,860; 2035: 126,640; 2036: 128,420; 2037: 130,200; 2038: 131,980; 2039: 133,760; 2040: 135,540; 2041: 137,320; 2042: 139,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 79 | 9SC | Entrance | 1075+52.580 | 1079+97.540 | 444.96 | 0.0843 | 2022: 122,700; 2023: 124.810; 2024: 126,920; 2025: 129,030; 2026: 131,140; 2027: 133,250; 2028: 135.360; 2029: 137,470; 2030: 139,580; 2031: 141,690; 2032: 143,800; 2033: 145,910; 2034: 148,020; 2035: 150,130; 2036: 152,240; 2037: 154,350; 2038: 156,460; 2039: 158.570; 2040: 160,680; 2041: 162,790; 2042: 164,900 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 81 | 10SC | Entrance | 1079+97.540 | 1083+02.580 | 305.04 | 0.0578 | 2022: 146,650; 2023: 149,172; 2024: 151,695; 2025: 154,217; 2026: 156,740; 2027: 159,262; 2028: 161,785; 2029: 164,307; 2030: 166,830; 2031: 169,352; 2032: 171,875; 2033: 174,397; 2034: 176,920; 2035: 179,442; 2036: 181,965; 2037: 184,487; 2038: 187,010; 2039: 189,532; 2040: 192,055; 2041: 194,577; 2042: 197,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 82 | 10SC | Entrance | 1110+97.190 | 1116+60.530 | 563.34 | 0.1067 | 2022: 146,650; 2023: 149,172; 2024: 151,695; 2025: 154,217; 2026: 156,740; 2027: 159,262; 2028: 161,785; 2029: 164,307; 2030: 166,830; 2031: 169,352; 2032: 171,875; 2033: 174,397; 2034: 176,920; 2035: 179,442; 2036: 181,965; 2037: 184,487; 2038: 187,010; 2039: 189,532; 2040: 192,055; 2041: 194,577; 2042: 197,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 84 | 6 SC | Entrance | 1116+60.530 | $1118+47.190$ | 186.66 | 0.0353 | 2022: 156,550; 2023: 159,242; 2024: 161,935; 2025: 164,627; 2026: 167,320; 2027: 170,012; 2028: 172,705; 2029: 175,397; 2030: 178,090; 2031: 180,782; 2032: 183,475; 2033: 186,167; 2034: 188,860; 2035: 191,552; 2036: 194,245; 2037: 196,937; 2038: 199,630; 2039: 202,322; 2040: 205,015; 2041: 207,707; 2042: 210,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 85 | 6 SC | Entrance | 1116+60.530 | 1118+47.190 | 186.66 | 0.0353 | 2022: 156,.550; 2023: 159,242; 2024: 161,935; 2025: 164,627; 2026: 167,320; 2027: 170,012; 2028: 172,705; 2029: 175,397; 2030: 178,090; 2031: 180,782; 2032: 183,475; 2033: 186,167; 2034: 188,860; 2035: 191,552; 2036: 194,245; 2037: 196,937; 2038: 199,630; 2039: 202,322; 2040: 205,015; 2041: 207,707; 2042: 210,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 87 | 10SC | Entrance | 1118+47.190 | 1124+10.530 | 563.34 | 0.1067 | 2022: 150,000 ; 2023: 152,580; 2024: 155,160; 2025: 157,740; 2026: 160,320; 2027: 162,900; 2028: 165,480; 2029: 168,060; 2030: 170,640; 2031: 173,220; 2032: 175,800; 2033: 178,380; 2034: 180,960; 2035: 183,540; 2036: 186,120; 2037: 188,700; 2038: 191,280; 2039: 193,860; 2040: 196,440; 2041: 199,020; 2042: 201,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 89 | 10SC | Exit | 1139+16.750 | 1146+66.750 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 159,800; 2023: 162.550; 2024: 165,.300; 2025: 168,050; 2026: 170,800; 2027: 173.550; 2028: 176,300; 2029: 179,050; 2030: 181,800; 2031: 184,550; 2032: 187,300; 2033: 190,050; 2034: 192,800; 2035: 195,550; 2036: 198,300; 2037: 201,050; 2038: 203,800; 2039: 206,550; 2040: 209,300; 2041: 212,050; 2042: 214,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 90 | 10SC | Exit | 1141+58.590 | 1149+08.590 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 159,800; 2023: 162,550; 2024: 165,300; 2025: 168,050; 2026: 170,800; 2027: 173,550; 2028: 176,300; 2029: 179,050; 2030: 181,800; 2031: 184,550; 2032: 187,300; 2033: 190,050; 2034: 192,800; 2035: 195,550; 2036: 198,300; 2037: 201,050; 2038: 203,800; 2039: 206,550; 2040: 209,300; 2041: 212,050; 2042: 214,800 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 96 | 7SC | Exit | 1221+70.230 | 1229+20.230 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 96,100; 2023: 97,755; 2024: 99,410; 2025: 101,065; 2026: 102,720; 2027: 104,375; 2028: 106,030; 2029: 107,685; 2030 109,340; 2031: 110,995; 2032: 112,650; 2033: 114,305; 2034: 115,960; 2035: 117,615; 2036: 119,270; 2037: 120,925; 2038: 122,580; 2039: 124,$235 ; 2040: 125,890 ; ~ 2041: ~ 127,545 ; ~ 2042: ~ 129,200 ~$ | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 98 | 7SC | Entrance | 1239+04.550 | 1246+54.550 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 89,150; 2023: 90,685; 2024: 92,220; 2025: 93,755; 2026: 95,.290; 2027: 96,825; 2028: 98,360; 2029: 99,895; 2030; 101,430; 2031: 102,965; 2032: 104,500; 2033: 106,035; 2034: 107,570; 2035: 109, 105; 2036: 110,640; 2037: 112,175; 2038: 113,710; 2039: 115,245; 2040: 116,780; 2041: 118,315; 2042: 119,850 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 103 | 10SC | Entrance | 1281+75.860 | 1289+25.860 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 143.350; 2023: 145.817: 2024: 148, 285; 2025: 150.752; 2026: 153,220; 2027: 155.687; 2028: 158.155; 2029: 160.622; 2030: 163,090; 2031: 165,557; 2032: 168,025; 2033: 170,492; 2034: 172,960; 2035: 175,427; 2036: 177,895; 2037: 180,362; 2038: 182,830; 2039: 185,297; 2040: 187,765; 2041: 190,232; 2042: 192,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 4.00 |
| 104 | 10SC | Exit | 1308+43.800 | 1315+93.800 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 143,350; 2023: 145,817; 2024: 148,285; 2025: 150,752; 2026: 153,220; 2027: 155,687; 2028: 158,155; 2029: 160,622; 2030: 163,090; 2031: 165,557; 2032: 168,025; 2033: 170,492; 2034: 172,960; 2035: 175,427; 2036: 177,895; 2037: 180,362; 2038: 182,830; 2039: 185,297; 2040: 187,765; 2041: 190,232; 2042: 192,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 105 | 10SC | Entrance | 1310+99.560 | 1315+93.800 | 494.24 | 0.0936 | 2022: 143,350; 2023: 145,817; 2024: 148,285; 2025: 150,752; 2026: 153,220; 2027: 155,687; 2028: 158,155; 2029: 160,622; 2030: 163,090; 2031: 165,557; 2032: 168,025; 2033: 170,492; 2034: 172,960; 2035: 175,427; 2036: 177,895; 2037: 180,362; 2038: 182,830; 2039: 185,297; 2040: 187,765; 2041: 190,232; 2042: 192,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 107 | 10SC | Entrance | 1315+93.800 | 1318+49.560 | 255.76 | 0.0484 | 2022: 134,300; 2023: 136,612; 2024: 138,925; 2025: 141,237; 2026: 143,550; 2027: 145,862; 2028: 148,175; 2029: 150,487; 2030: 152,800; 2031: 155,112; 2032: 157,425; 2033: 159,737; 2034: 162,050; 2035: 164,362; 2036: 166,675; 2037: 168,987; 2038: 171,300; 2039: 173,612; 2040: 175,925; 2041: 178,237; 2042: 180,550 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 110 | 10SC | Exit | 1352+31.030 | $1355+24.530$ | 293.50 | 0.0556 | 2022: 133.900; 2023: 136,205; 2024: 138,510; 2025: 140,815; 2026: 143,120; 2027: 145,425; 2028: 147,730; 2029: 150,035; 2030: 152,340; 2031: 154,645; 2032: 156,950; 2033: 159,255; 2034: 161,560; 2035: 163,865; 2036: 166,170; 2037: 168,475; 2038: 170,780; 2039: 173,085; 2040: 175,390; 2041: 177,695; 2042: 180,000 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 112 | 10SC | Exit | 1355+24.530 | 1359+81.030 | 456.50 | 0.0865 | 2022: 144,300; 2023: 146,782; 2024: 149,265; 2025: 151,747; 2026: 154,230; 2027: 156,712; 2028: 159,195; 2029: 161,677; 2030: 164,160; 2031: 166,642; 2032: 169,125; 2033: 171,607; 2034: 174,090; 2035: 176,572; 2036: 179,055; 2037: 181,537; 2038: 184,020; 2039: 186,502; 2040: 188,985; 2041: 191,467; 2042: 193,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Ramp Type | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Start Location } \\ (\text { Sta. ft) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \mathrm{ft}) \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\begin{gathered} \text { Median } \\ \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effective Median } \\ \quad \text { Width }(\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 113 | 10SC | Entrance | 1355+24.530 | 1362+74.530 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 144,300; 2023: 146,782; 2024: 149,265; 2025: 151,747; 2026: 154,230; 2027: 156,712; 2028: 159,195; 2029: 161,677; 2030: 164,160; 2031: 166,642; 2032: 169,125; 2033: 171,607; 2034: 174,090; 2035: 176,572; 2036: 179,055; 2037: 181,537; 2038: 184,020; 2039: 186,502; 2040: 188,985; 2041: 191,467; 2042: 193,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 118 | 9SC | Entrance | 1407+99.290 | 1415+49.290 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 99,800; 2023: 101,517; 2024: 103,235; 2025: 104,952; 2026: 106,670; 2027: 108,387; 2028: 110,105; 2029: 111,822; 2030: 113,540; 2031: 115,257 ; 2032: 116,975; 2033: 118,692; 2034: 120,410; 2035: 122, 127; 2036: 123,845; 2037: 125,562; 2038: 127,280; 2039: 128,997; 2040: 130,715; 2041: 132,432; 2042: 134,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 120 | 9SC | Exit | $1458+80.350$ | 1459+28.940 | 48.59 | 0.0092 | 2022: 108,950; 2023: 110,822; 2024: 112,695; 2025: 114,567; 2026: 116,440; 2027: 118,312; 2028: 120,185; 2029: 122,057; 2030: 123,930; 2031: 125,802; 2032: 127,675; 2033: 129,547; 2034: 131,420; 2035: 133,292; 2036: 135,165; 2037: 137,037; 2038: 138,910; 2039: 140,782; 2040: 142,655; 2041: 144,527; 2042: 146,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 122 | 9SC | Exit | 1459+28.940 | $1466+30.350$ | 701.41 | 0.1328 | 2022: 115,700; 2023: 117,690; 2024: 119,680; 2025: 121,670; 2026: 123,660; 2027: 125.650; 2028: 127,640; 2029: 129,630; 2030: 131,620; 2031: 133,610; 2032: 135,600; 2033: 137,590; 2034: 139,580; 2035: 141,570; 2036: 143,560; 2037: 145,550; 2038: 147,540; 2039: 149,530; 2040: 151,520; 2041: 153,510; 2042: 155,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 123 | 9SC | Entrance | 1459+28.940 | 1466+78.940 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 115,700; 2023: 117,690; 2024: 119,680; 2025: 121,670; 2026: 123,660; 2027: 125,650; 2028: 127,640; 2029: 129,630; 2030: 131,620; 2031: 133,610; 2032: 135,600; 2033: 137,590; 2034: 139,580; 2035: 141,570; 2036: 143,560; 2037: 145,550; 2038: 147,540; 2039: 149,530; 2040: 151,520; 2041: 153,510; 2042: 155,500 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 126 | 10SC | Exit | 1493+46.760 | 1500+96.760 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 122,550; 2023: 124,660; 2024: 126,770; 2025: 128,880; 2026: 130,990; 2027: 133,100; 2028: 135,210; 2029: 137,320; 2030: 139,430; 2031: 141,540; 2032: 143,650; 2033: 145,760; 2034: 147,870; 2035: 149,980; 2036: 152,090; 2037: 154,200; 2038: 156,310; 2039: 158,420; 2040: 160,530; 2041: 162,640; 2042: 164,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 127 | 10SC | Exit | 1508+73.110 | 1516+23.110 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 122.550; 2023: 124,660; 2024: 126,770; 2025: 128,880; 2026: 130,990; 2027: 133,100; 2028: 135,210; 2029: 137,320; 2030: 139,430; 2031: 141,540; 2032: 143,650; 2033: 145,760; 2034: 147,870; 2035: 149,980; 2036: 152,090; 2037: 154,200; 2038: 156,310; 2039: 158,420; 2040: 160,530; 2041: 162,640; 2042: 164,750 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 130 | 9SC | Entrance | 1542+57.160 | 1548+51.750 | 594.59 | 0.1126 | 2022: 103,100; 2023: 104,875; 2024: 106,650; 2025: 108,425; 2026: 110,200; 2027: 111,975; 2028: 113,750; 2029: 115,525; 2030: 117,300; 2031: 119,075; 2032: 120,850; 2033: 122,625; 2034: 124,400; 2035: 126,175; 2036: 127,950; 2037: 129,725; 2038: 131,500; 2039: 133,275; 2040: 135,050; 2041: 136,825; 2042: 138,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 132 | ${ }^{\text {8SC }}$ | Entrance | $1548+51.750$ | 1550+07.160 | 155.41 | 0.0294 | 2022: 95,550; 2023: 97,195; 2024: 98,840; 2025: 100,485; 2026: 102,130; 2027: 103,775; 2028: 105,420; 2029: 107,065; 2030: 108,$710 ; 2031: 110,355 ; 2032$ : 112,000; 2033: 113,645; 2034: 115,290; 2035: 116,935; 2036: 118,580; 2037: 120,225; 2038: 121,870; 2039: 123,515; 2040: 125,160; 2041: 126,805; 2042: 128,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 136 | 9SC | Exit | 1569+20.770 | 1576+70.770 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 108,000; 2023: 109,860; 2024: 111,720; 2025: 113.580; 2026: 115,440; 2027: 117,300; 2028: 119,160; 2029: 121,020; 2030: 122,880; 2031: 124,740; 2032: 126,600; 2033: 128,460; 2034: 130,320; 2035: 132,180; 2036: 134,040; 2037: 135,900; 2038: 137,760; 2039: 139,620; 2040: 141,480; 2041: 143,340; 2042: 145,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 137 | 9SC | Exit | 1589+73.110 | 1597+23.110 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 108,000; 2023: 109,860; 2024: 111,720; 2025: 113,580; 2026: 115,440; 2027: 117,300; 2028: 119,160; 2029: 121,020; 2030: 122,880; 2031: 124,740; 2032: 126,600; 2033: 128,460; 2034: 130,320; 2035: 132,180; 2036: 134,040; 2037: 135,900; 2038: 137,760; 2039: 139,620; 2040: 141,480; 2041: 143,340; 2042: 145,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 138 | 9SC | Entrance | 1592+57.160 | 1597+23.110 | 465.95 | 0.0882 | 2022: 108,000; 2023: 109,860; 2024: 111,720; 2025: 113,580; 2026: 115,440; 2027: 117,300; 2028: 119,160; 2029: 121,020; 2030: 122,880; 2031: 124,740; 2032: 126,600; 2033: 128,460; 2034: 130,320; 2035: 132,180; 2036: 134,040; 2037: 135,900; 2038: 137,760; 2039: 139,620; 2040: 141,480; 2041: 143,340; 2042: 145,200 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 140 | 9SC | Entrance | 1597+23.110 | 1600+07.160 | 284.05 | 0.0538 | 2022: 94,700; 2023: 96,330; 2024: 97,960; 2025: 99,590; 2026: 101,220; 2027: 102,850; 2028: 104,480; 2029: 106,110; 2030: 107,740; 2031: 109,370; 2032: 111,000; 2033: 112,630; 2034: 114,260; 2035: 115,890; 2036: 117,520; 2037: 119,150; 2038: 120,780; 2039: 122,410; 2040: 124,040; 2041: 125,670; 2042: 127,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 142 | 9SC | Entrance | 1614+63.430 | 1622+13.430 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 84,550; 2023: 86,002; 2024: 87,455; 2025: 88,907; 2026: 90,360; 2027: 91,812; 2028: 93,265; 2029: 94,717; 2030: 96,170; 2031: 97,622; 2032: 99,075; 2033: 100,527; 2034: 101,980; 2035: 103,432; 2036: 104,885; 2037: 106,337; 2038: 107,790; 2039: 109,242; 2040: 110,695; 2041: 112,147; 2042: 113,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 146 | 7SC | Entrance | 1693+03.680 | 1695+79.250 | 275.57 | 0.0522 | 2022: 57.350; 2023: 58.337; 2024: 59.325; 2025: 60.312; 2026: 61,300; 2027: 62,287; 2028: 63.275; 2029: 64,262; 2030: 65,250; 2031: 66,237; 2032: 67,225; 2033: 68,212; 2034: 69,200; 2035: 70,187; 2036: 71,175; 2037: 72,162; 2038: 73,150; 2039: 74,137; 2040: 75,125; 2041: 76,112; 2042: 77,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 148 | ${ }^{\text {8SC }}$ | Entrance | 1695+79.250 | 1700+53.680 | 474.43 | 0.0898 | 2022: 70,400; 2023: 71,612; 2024: 72,825; 2025: 74,037; 2026: 75,250; 2027: 76.462; 2028: 77,675; 2029: 78.887; 2030: 80,100; 2031: 81,312; 2032: 82,525; 2033: 83,737; 2034: 84,950; 2035: 86,162; 2036: 87,375; 2037: 88,587; 2038: 89,800; 2039: 91,012; 2040: 92,225; 2041: 93,437; 2042: 94,650 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 150 | 7SC | Entrance | 1760+10.210 | 1765+64.940 | 554.73 | 0.1051 | 2022: 63,350; 2023: 64,440; 2024: 65,530; 2025: 66,620; 2026: 67,710; 2027: 68,800; 2028: 69,890; 2029: 70,980; 2030: 72,070; 2031: 73,160; 2032: 74,250; 2033: 75,340; 2034: 76,430; 2035: 77,520; 2036: 78,610; 2037: 79,700; 2038: 80,790; 2039: 81,880; 2040: 82,970; 2041: 84,060; 2042: 85,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 152 | ${ }^{\text {8SC }}$ | Entrance | $1765+64.940$ | 1767+60.210 | 195.27 | 0.0370 | 2022: 63,350; 2023: 64,440; 2024: 65,530; 2025: 66,620; 2026: 67,710; 2027: 68,800; 2028: 69,890; 2029: 70,980; 2030: 72,070; 2031: 73,160; 2032: 74,250; 2033: 75,340; 2034: 76,430; 2035: 77,520; 2036: 78,610; 2037: 79,700; 2038: 80,790; 2039: 81,880; 2040: 82,970; 2041: 84,060; 2042: 85,150 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 155 | ${ }^{\text {8SC }}$ | Entrance | 1781+96.430 | 1789+46.430 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 53.050; 2023: 53.962; 2024: 54,875; 2025: 55,787; 2026: 56,700; 2027: 57.,612; 2028: 58.525; 2029: 59,437; 2030: 60,350; 2031: 61,262; 2032: 62,175; 2033: 63,087; 2034: 64,000; 2035: 64,912; 2036: 65,825; 2037: 66,737; 2038: 67,650; 2039: 68,562; 2040: 69,475; 2041: 70,387; 2042: 71,300 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 157 | ${ }^{\text {8SC }}$ | Exit | 1799+13.770 | 1806663.770 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 58,850; 2023: 59,862; 2024: 60,875; 2025: 61,887; 2026: 62,900; 2027: 63,912; 2028: 64,925; 2029: 65,937; 2030: 66,950; 2031: 67,962; 2032: 68,975; 2033: 69,987; 2034: 71,000; 2035: 72,012; 2036: 73,025; 2037: 74,037; 2038: 75,050; 2039: 76,062; 2040: 77,075; 2041: 78,087; 2042: 79,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |


| Seg. No. | Type | Ramp Type | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Start Location } \\ (\text { Sta. ft) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { End Location (Sta. } \\ \text { ft) } \end{array}$ | Length (ft) | Length(mi) | AADT | $\underset{\text { Width }(\mathrm{ft})}{\text { Medin }}$ | Type | Effective Median Width (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 158 | 8SC | Entrance | 1822+26.930 | 1823+66.040 | 139.11 | 0.0263 | 2022: 58,850; 2023: 59,862; 2024: 60,875; 2025: 61,887; 2026: 62,900; 2027: 63,912; 2028: 64,925; 2029: 65,937; 2030: 66,950; 2031: 67,962; 2032: 68,975; 2033: 69,987; 2034: 71,000; 2035: 72,012; 2036: 73,025; 2037: 74,037; 2038: 75,050; 2039: 76,062; 2040: 77,075; 2041: 78,087; 2042: 79,100 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 160 | 7SC | Entrance | 1823+66.040 | 1829+76.930 | 610.89 | 0.1157 | 2022: 50,200; 2023: 51,062; 2024: 51,925; 2025: 52,787; 2026: 53,650; 2027: 54,512; 2028: 55,375; 2029: 56,237; 2030: 57,100; 2031: 57,962; 2032: 58,825; 2033: 59,687; 2034: 60,550; 2035: 61,412; 2036: 62,275; 2037: 63,137; 2038: 64,000; 2039: 64,862; 2040: 65,725; 2041: 66,587; 2042: 67,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 165 | 10SC | Entrance | 1868+54.350 | 1873+54.400 | 500.05 | 0.0947 | 2022: 48,150; 2023: 48,977; 2024: 49,805; 2025: 50,632; 2026: 51,460; 2027: 52,287; 2028: 53,115; 2029: 53,942; 2030: 54,770; 2031: 55,597; 2032: 56,425; 2033: 57,252; 2034: 58,080; 2035: 58,907; 2036: 59,735; 2037: 60,562; 2038: 61,390; 2039: 62,217; 2040: 63,045; 2041: 63,872; 2042: 64,700 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 167 | 10SC | Entrance | 1873+54.400 | 1876+04.350 | 249.95 | 0.0473 | 2022: 51,700; 2023: 52,587; 2024: 53,475; 2025: 54,362; 2026: 55,250; 2027: 56,137; 2028: 57,025; 2029: 57,912; 2030: 58,800; 2031: 59,687; 2032: 60,575; 2033: 61,462; 2034: 62,350; 2035: 63,237; 2036: 64,125; 2037: 65,012; 2038: 65,900; 2039: 66,787; 2040: 67,675; 2041: 68,562; 2042: 69,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 168 | 10SC | Exit | 1873+54.400 | 1881+04.400 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 51,700; 2023: 52,587; 2024: 53,475; 2025: 54,362; 2026: 55,250; 2027: 56,137; 2028: 57,025; 2029: 57,912; 2030: 58,800; 2031: 59,687; 2032: 60,575; 2033: 61,462; 2034: 62,350; 2035: 63,237; 2036: 64,125; 2037: 65,012; 2038: 65,900; 2039: 66,787; 2040: 67,675; 2041: 68,562; 2042: 69,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 171 | 8SC | Exit | 1999+18.010 | 2001+13.770 | 195.76 | 0.0371 | 2022: 19,800; 2023: 20,140; 2024: 20,480; 2025: 20,820; 2026: 21,160; 2027: 21,500; 2028: 21,840; 2029: 22,180; 2030: 22,520; 2031: 22,860; 2032: 23,200; 2033: 23,540; 2034: 23,880; 2035: 24,220; 2036: 24,560; 2037: 24,900; 2038: 25,240; 2039: 25,580; 2040: 25,920; 2041: 26,260; 2042: 26,600 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 173 | 8SC | Exit | 2001+13.770 | 2006+68.010 | 554.24 | 0.1050 | 2022: 20,400; 2023: 20,750; 2024: 21,100; 2025: 21,450; 2026: 21,800; 2027: 22,150; 2028: 22,500; 2029: 22,850; 2030: 23,200; 2031: 23,550; 2032: 23,900; 2033: 24,250; 2034: 24,600; 2035: 24,950; 2036: 25,300; 2037: 25,650; 2038: 26,000; 2039: 26,350; 2040: 26,700; 2041: 27,050; 2042: 27,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 174 | 8SC | Entrance | 2001+13.770 | 2008+63.770 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 20,400; 2023: 20,750; 2024: 21,100; 2025: 21,450; 2026: 21,800; 2027: 22,150; 2028: 22,500; 2029: 22,850; 2030: 23,200; 2031: 23,550; 2032: 23,900; 2033: 24,250; 2034: 24,600; 2035: 24,950; 2036: 25,300; 2037: 25,650; 2038: 26,000; 2039: 26,350; 2040: 26,700; 2041: 27,050; 2042: 27,400 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 182 | 6SC | Exit | 2241+33.280 | 2248+83.280 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 18,650; 2023: 18,970; 2024: 19,290; 2025: 19,610; 2026: 19,930; 2027: 20,250; 2028: 20,570; 2029: 20,890; 2030: 21,210; 2031: 21,$530 ; 2032: 21,850 ; 2033: 22,170 ; 2034: 22,490 ; 2035: 22,810 ; 2036: 23,130 ; 2037: 23,450 ; 2038: 23,770 ; 2039: 24,090 ;$ 2040: 24,410; 2041: 24,730; 2042: 25,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 183 | 6SC | Entrance | $2241+33.280$ | 2248+83.280 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 18,650; 2023: 18,970; 2024: 19,290; 2025: 19,610; 2026: 19,930; 2027: 20,250; 2028: 20.570; 2029: 20,890; 2030: 21,210; 2031: 21,$530 ; 2032: 21,850 ; 2033: 22,170 ; 2034: 22,490 ; 2035: 22,810 ; 2036: 23,130 ; 2037: 23,450 ; 2038: 23,770 ; 2039: 24,090 ;$ 2040: 24,410; 2041: 24,730; 2042: 25,050 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 192 | 6SC | Exit | 2954+65.120 | 2956+02.250 | 137.13 | 0.0260 | 2022: 14,850; 2023: 15,105; 2024: 15,360; 2025: 15,615; 2026: 15,870; 2027: 16,125; 2028: 16,380; 2029: 16,635; 2030: 16,890; 2031: 17,145; 2032: 17,400; 2033: 17,655; 2034: 17,910; 2035: 18,165; 2036: 18,420; 2037: 18,675; 2038: 18,930; 2039: 19,185; 2040: 19,440; 2041: 19,695; 2042: 19,950 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.0 |
| 194 | 6SC | Exit | 2956+02.250 | 2962+15.120 | 612.87 | 0.1161 | 2022: 15,250; 2023: 15,510; 2024: 15,770; 2025: 16,030; 2026: 16,290; 2027: 16,550; 2028: 16,810; 2029: 17,070; 2030: 17,330; 2031: 17,590; 2032: 17,850; 2033: 18,110; 2034: 18,370; 2035: 18,630; 2036: 18,890; 2037: 19,150; 2038: 19,410; 2039: 19,670; 2040: 19,930; 2041: 20,190; 2042: 20,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |
| 195 | 6SC | Entrance | 2956+02.250 | 2963+52.250 | 750.00 | 0.1421 | 2022: 15,250; 2023: 15,510 ; 2024: 15,770; 2025: 16,030; 2026: 16,290; 2027: 16,550; 2028: 16,810; 2029: 17,070; 2030: 17,330; 2031: 17,590; 2032: 17,850; 2033: 18,110; 2034: 18,370; 2035: 18,630; 2036: 18,890; 2037: 19,150; 2038: 19,410; 2039: 19,670; 2040: 19,930; 2041: 20,190; 2042: 20,450 | 6.00 | Non-Traversable Median | 14.00 |

Table 3. Predicted Freeway Crash Rates and Frequencies (Section 1)

| First Year of Analysis | 2022 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Last Year of Analysis | 2042 |
| Evaluated Length (mi) | 57.4748 |
| Average Future Road AADT (vpd) | 61,679 |
| Predicted Crashes |  |
| Total Crashes | 14,396.52 |
| Fatal and Injury Crashes | 4,943.46 |
| Property-Damage-Only Crashes | 9,453.06 |
| Percent of Total Predicted Crashes |  |
| Percent Fatal and Injury Crashes (\%) | 34 |
| Percent Property-Damage-Only Crashes (\%) | 66 |
| Predicted Crash Rate |  |
| Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | 11.9278 |
| FI Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | 4.0958 |
| PDO Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | 7.8321 |
| Predicted Travel Crash Rate |  |
| Total Travel (million veh-mi) | 27,172.53 |
| Travel Crash Rate (crashes/million veh-mi) | 0.53 |
| Travel FI Crash Rate (crashes/million veh-mi) | 0.18 |
| Travel PDO Crash Rate (crashes/million veh-mi) | 0.35 |

Table 4. Predicted Freeway Speed Change Lane Crash Rates and Frequencies (Speed Change)

| First Year of Analysis | 2022 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Last Year of Analysis | 2042 |
| Evaluated Length (mi) | 7.1035 |
| Average Future Road AADT (vpd) | 51,669 |
| Predicted Crashes |  |
| Total Crashes | 1,500.69 |
| Fatal and Injury Crashes | 452.81 |
| Property-Damage-Only Crashes | 1,047.88 |
| Percent of Total Predicted Crashes |  |
| Percent Fatal and Injury Crashes (\%) | 30 |
| Percent Property-Damage-Only Crashes (\%) | 70 |
| Predicted Crash Rate |  |
| Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | 10.0601 |
| FI Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | 3.0355 |
| PDO Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | 7.0246 |
| Predicted Travel Crash Rate |  |
| Total Travel (million veh-mi) | 2,813.31 |
| Travel Crash Rate (crashes/million veh-mi) | 0.53 |
| Travel FI Crash Rate (crashes/million veh-mi) | 0.16 |
| Travel PDO Crash Rate (crashes/million veh-mi) | 0.37 |

Note: Total Travel and Crash Rates/Million Vehicle Miles for Speed Change Lanes reflect AADTs that are half of the Freeway Segment AADTs based on the assumption of 50/50 directional distribution.

Table 5. Predicted Crash Frequencies and Rates by Freeway Segment/Intersection (Section 1)

| Segment <br> Number/Intersectio n Name/Cross Road | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Effective <br> Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted <br> Total Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI <br> Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO <br> Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes $/ \mathbf{m i} / \mathbf{y r}$ ) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes/millio n veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 10+00.000 | 10+06.360 | 0.0006 | 0.092 | 0.0044 | 0.0017 | 0.0027 | 7.2582 | 0.60 |
| 3 | 10+06.360 | $11+02.460$ | 0.0182 | 2.266 | 0.1079 | 0.0419 | 0.0660 | 5.9281 | 0.54 |
| 4 | 11+02.460 | $24+17.550$ | 0.2482 | 27.108 | 1.2908 | 0.5063 | 0.7845 | 5.1998 | 0.51 |
| 6 | $24+17.550$ | $31+58.860$ | 0.0702 | 7.583 | 0.3611 | 0.1419 | 0.2192 | 5.1439 | 0.51 |
| 8 | $31+58.860$ | $88+50.570$ | 1.0780 | 105.189 | 5.0090 | 1.9596 | 3.0493 | 4.6467 | 0.48 |
| 9 | $88+50.570$ | 92+73.870 | 0.0802 | 8.914 | 0.4245 | 0.1766 | 0.2478 | 5.2947 | 0.50 |


| Segment Number/Intersectio n Name/Cross Road | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Effective Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted <br> Total Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes/millio n veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 92+73.870 | 114+92.280 | 0.4202 | 57.152 | 2.7215 | 1.1057 | 1.6159 | 6.4774 | 0.51 |
| 11 | $114+92.280$ | 116+12.410 | 0.0228 | 3.067 | 0.1460 | 0.0600 | 0.0860 | 6.4184 | 0.53 |
| 12 | 116+12.410 | 159+52.850 | 0.8221 | 98.562 | 4.6934 | 1.7851 | 2.9084 | 5.7094 | 0.49 |
| 13 | 159+52.850 | 160+55.670 | 0.0195 | 2.703 | 0.1287 | 0.0524 | 0.0764 | 6.6098 | 0.52 |
| 14 | 160+55.670 | 182+04.980 | 0.4071 | 57.377 | 2.7322 | 1.1041 | 1.6281 | 6.7120 | 0.51 |
| 15 | 182+04.980 | 190+78.150 | 0.1654 | 20.733 | 0.9873 | 0.4022 | 0.5851 | 5.9701 | 0.49 |
| 16 | 190+78.150 | $234+73.270$ | 0.8324 | 93.198 | 4.4380 | 1.7041 | 2.7339 | 5.3315 | 0.48 |
| 17 | $234+73.270$ | $235+38.500$ | 0.0124 | 1.614 | 0.0769 | 0.0316 | 0.0453 | 6.2220 | 0.52 |
| 18 | $235+38.500$ | $256+53.490$ | 0.4006 | 55.075 | 2.6226 | 1.0633 | 1.5594 | 6.5473 | 0.51 |
| 19 | $256+53.490$ | 320+43.950 | 1.2103 | 135.018 | 6.4295 | 2.4699 | 3.9595 | 5.3122 | 0.48 |
| 20 | $320+43.950$ | $333+03.670$ | 0.1676 | 21.229 | 1.0109 | 0.3856 | 0.6253 | 6.0330 | 0.51 |
| 22 | $333+03.670$ | $376+84.690$ | 0.7587 | 102.189 | 4.8661 | 1.8273 | 3.0388 | 6.4136 | 0.50 |
| 24 | $376+84.690$ | 377+09.150 | 0.0046 | 0.757 | 0.0361 | 0.0143 | 0.0217 | 7.7847 | 0.53 |
| 25 | 377+09.150 | 401+43.300 | 0.4610 | 79.888 | 3.8042 | 1.4886 | 2.3156 | 8.2518 | 0.52 |
| 26 | $401+43.300$ | $410+45.320$ | 0.1708 | 26.029 | 1.2395 | 0.4915 | 0.7480 | 7.2553 | 0.50 |
| 27 | $410+45.320$ | $430+10.320$ | 0.3722 | 49.389 | 2.3518 | 0.8852 | 1.4666 | 6.3194 | 0.51 |
| 28 | $430+10.320$ | $431+12.710$ | 0.0194 | 3.280 | 0.1562 | 0.0621 | 0.0941 | 8.0553 | 0.55 |
| 29 | $431+12.710$ | $444+62.420$ | 0.2556 | 49.577 | 2.3608 | 0.9225 | 1.4383 | 9.2353 | 0.55 |
| 30 | $444+62.420$ | $446+92.250$ | 0.0435 | 7.360 | 0.3505 | 0.1383 | 0.2122 | 8.0519 | 0.52 |
| 31 | $446+92.250$ | $466+93.140$ | 0.3790 | 52.021 | 2.4772 | 0.9246 | 1.5525 | 6.5368 | 0.50 |
| 32 | $466+93.140$ | 473+45.480 | 0.1235 | 20.574 | 0.9797 | 0.3841 | 0.5957 | 7.9299 | 0.51 |
| 33 | $473+45.480$ | 487+68.410 | 0.2695 | 53.043 | 2.5259 | 0.9637 | 1.5622 | 9.3726 | 0.51 |
| 34 | 487+68.410 | 494+75.370 | 0.0669 | 16.025 | 0.7631 | 0.2840 | 0.4791 | 11.3985 | 0.54 |
| 36 | 494+75.370 | $518+49.370$ | 0.4455 | 120.146 | 5.7212 | 2.0927 | 3.6285 | 12.8409 | 0.55 |
| 38 | $518+49.370$ | $522+06.730$ | 0.0677 | 15.836 | 0.7541 | 0.2826 | 0.4715 | 11.1416 | 0.54 |
| 39 | $522+06.730$ | 585+36.090 | 1.1987 | 231.683 | 11.0325 | 3.9161 | 7.1164 | 9.2034 | 0.52 |
| 40 | 585+36.090 | 590+45.470 | 0.0482 | 12.965 | 0.6174 | 0.2112 | 0.4062 | 12.7993 | 0.58 |
| 42 | $590+45.470$ | $624+72.020$ | 0.6262 | 195.077 | 9.2894 | 3.2997 | 5.9896 | 14.8350 | 0.56 |
| 44 | $624+72.020$ | $628+07.980$ | 0.0318 | 13.972 | 0.6653 | 0.2274 | 0.4379 | 20.9127 | 0.67 |
| 46 | $628+07.980$ | 651+65.010 | 0.3362 | 152.408 | 7.2575 | 2.4387 | 4.8188 | 21.5884 | 0.61 |
| 49 | 651+65.010 | $660+88.730$ | 0.1749 | 57.208 | 2.7242 | 0.9623 | 1.7619 | 15.5715 | 0.56 |
| 50 | $660+88.730$ | 667+93.530 | 0.1335 | 31.095 | 1.4807 | 0.5455 | 0.9352 | 11.0927 | 0.51 |
| 51 | $667+93.530$ | 761+78.560 | 1.7775 | 471.122 | 22.4344 | 7.6309 | 14.8034 | 12.6215 | 0.58 |
| 52 | 761+78.560 | 773+07.600 | 0.1428 | 54.305 | 2.5860 | 0.8895 | 1.6964 | 18.1076 | 0.58 |
| 54 | $773+07.600$ | $806+52.740$ | 0.5710 | 342.885 | 16.3278 | 5.4646 | 10.8632 | 28.5934 | 0.67 |
| 56 | $806+52.740$ | 807+42.600 | 0.0085 | 5.943 | 0.2830 | 0.0942 | 0.1888 | 33.2588 | 0.80 |
| 58 | $807+42.600$ | $813+44.180$ | 0.1139 | 59.779 | 2.8466 | 0.9656 | 1.8811 | 24.9844 | 0.62 |
| 59 | $813+44.180$ | 872+94.110 | 1.1269 | 600.433 | 28.5920 | 9.2362 | 19.3558 | 25.3727 | 0.63 |
| 60 | 872+94.110 | 873+42.940 | 0.0092 | 4.179 | 0.1990 | 0.0680 | 0.1310 | 21.5192 | 0.53 |
| 61 | $873+42.940$ | 879+94.370 | 0.1234 | 69.641 | 3.3162 | 1.1036 | 2.2126 | 26.8788 | 0.59 |
| 62 | $879+94.370$ | $921+17.280$ | 0.7098 | 449.113 | 21.3863 | 6.9458 | 14.4405 | 30.1287 | 0.60 |
| 64 | $921+17.280$ | $946+88.890$ | 0.4160 | 235.403 | 11.2097 | 3.7196 | 7.4901 | 26.9447 | 0.59 |
| 66 | $946+88.890$ | 983+35.310 | 0.6906 | 347.294 | 16.5378 | 5.5691 | 10.9687 | 23.9467 | 0.56 |
| 67 | 983+35.310 | 986+82.810 | 0.0329 | 24.026 | 1.1441 | 0.3735 | 0.7706 | 34.7666 | 0.73 |
| 69 | $986+82.810$ | 1021+08.260 | 0.6106 | 470.767 | 22.4175 | 6.9666 | 15.4509 | 36.7112 | 0.85 |
| 71 | 1021+08.260 | 1053+94.350 | 0.4497 | 330.567 | 15.7413 | 4.8712 | 10.8700 | 35.0013 | 0.73 |
| 75 | 1053+94.350 | 1058+21.360 | 0.0404 | 30.936 | 1.4732 | 0.4604 | 1.0128 | 36.4315 | 0.82 |
| 77 | 1058+21.360 | 1075+52.580 | 0.3279 | 193.804 | 9.2287 | 2.9319 | 6.2968 | 28.1465 | 0.66 |
| 78 | 1075+52.580 | 1079+97.540 | 0.0421 | 29.079 | 1.3847 | 0.4445 | 0.9402 | 32.8629 | 0.63 |


| Segment <br> Number/Intersectio <br> n Name/Cross Road | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Effective Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted Total Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Predicted } \\ \text { Travel Crash } \\ \text { Rate } \\ \text { (crashes/millio } \\ \mathbf{n} \text { veh-mi) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80 | 1079+97.540 | 1116+60.530 | 0.6115 | 522.068 | 24.8604 | 7.6164 | 17.2440 | 40.6537 | 0.65 |
| 83 | $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | 0.0000 | 0.000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 86 | 1118+47.190 | 1139+16.750 | 0.3386 | 346.802 | 16.5144 | 4.9557 | 11.5587 | 48.7704 | 0.76 |
| 88 | 1139+16.750 | 1149+08.590 | 0.0458 | 55.818 | 2.6580 | 0.7829 | 1.8751 | 58.0312 | 0.85 |
| 91 | 1149+08.590 | 1168+08.900 | 0.3599 | 336.916 | 16.0436 | 4.8389 | 11.2048 | 44.5772 | 0.67 |
| 92 | $1168+08.900$ | 1173+14.860 | 0.0958 | 76.448 | 3.6404 | 1.1384 | 2.5020 | 37.9898 | 0.65 |
| 93 | 1173+14.860 | 1184+67.050 | 0.2182 | 148.848 | 7.0880 | 2.2939 | 4.7941 | 32.4814 | 0.65 |
| 94 | 1184+67.050 | 1189+27.220 | 0.0872 | 52.899 | 2.5190 | 0.8392 | 1.6798 | 28.9030 | 0.66 |
| 95 | $1189+27.220$ | 1229+20.230 | 0.6852 | 373.252 | 17.7739 | 5.7320 | 12.0419 | 25.9387 | 0.63 |
| 97 | 1229+20.230 | 1246+54.550 | 0.2574 | 127.264 | 6.0602 | 1.9927 | 4.0675 | 23.5395 | 0.62 |
| 99 | $1246+54.550$ | 1257+20.070 | 0.2018 | 78.890 | 3.7567 | 1.2756 | 2.4811 | 18.6156 | 0.57 |
| 100 | 1257+20.070 | 1268+72.230 | 0.2182 | 131.871 | 6.2796 | 2.1200 | 4.1596 | 28.7774 | 0.71 |
| 101 | $1268+72.230$ | 1281+75.860 | 0.2469 | 205.753 | 9.7977 | 3.0509 | 6.7468 | 39.6831 | 0.70 |
| 102 | 1281+75.860 | 1315+93.800 | 0.4585 | 462.083 | 22.0040 | 6.6735 | 15.3305 | 47.9924 | 0.78 |
| 106 | 1315+93.800 | $1318+49.560$ | 0.0242 | 19.823 | 0.9440 | 0.2956 | 0.6483 | 38.9747 | 0.68 |
| 108 | $1318+49.560$ | 1352+31.030 | 0.6404 | 491.565 | 23.4079 | 7.3764 | 16.0315 | 36.5502 | 0.68 |
| 109 | 1352+31.030 | 1355+24.530 | 0.0278 | 22.584 | 1.0754 | 0.3371 | 0.7383 | 38.6935 | 0.68 |
| 111 | $1355+24.530$ | 1384+38.980 | 0.4377 | 373.904 | 17.8050 | 5.4845 | 12.3204 | 40.6759 | 0.66 |
| 114 | $1384+38.980$ | $1388+36.180$ | 0.0752 | 48.060 | 2.2886 | 0.7447 | 1.5438 | 30.4218 | 0.61 |
| 115 | $1388+36.180$ | 1407+00.830 | 0.3532 | 161.578 | 7.6942 | 2.5449 | 5.1493 | 21.7871 | 0.59 |
| 116 | $1407+00.830$ | 1407+99.290 | 0.0186 | 9.410 | 0.4481 | 0.1535 | 0.2946 | 24.0288 | 0.60 |
| 117 | $1407+99.290$ | 1458+80.350 | 0.8913 | 446.927 | 21.2823 | 7.1813 | 14.1010 | 23.8778 | 0.56 |
| 119 | $1458+80.350$ | 1459+28.940 | 0.0046 | 2.861 | 0.1362 | 0.0450 | 0.0912 | 29.6045 | 0.64 |
| 121 | 1459+28.940 | 1485+21.570 | 0.3536 | 219.685 | 10.4612 | 3.4100 | 7.0512 | 29.5861 | 0.60 |
| 124 | $1485+21.570$ | 1493+46.760 | 0.1563 | 104.803 | 4.9906 | 1.6142 | 3.3764 | 31.9325 | 0.63 |
| 125 | $1493+46.760$ | 1516+23.110 | 0.2891 | 199.328 | 9.4918 | 3.0532 | 6.4387 | 32.8344 | 0.63 |
| 128 | $1516+23.110$ | 1524+23.110 | 0.1515 | 94.684 | 4.5088 | 1.4718 | 3.0370 | 29.7579 | 0.60 |
| 129 | 1524+23.110 | 1548+51.750 | 0.4037 | 213.820 | 10.1819 | 3.4142 | 6.7677 | 25.2238 | 0.57 |
| 131 | $1548+51.750$ | 1550+07.160 | 0.0147 | 8.764 | 0.4173 | 0.1352 | 0.2822 | 28.3580 | 0.69 |
| 133 | 1550+07.160 | 1567+03.620 | 0.3213 | 150.512 | 7.1672 | 2.3612 | 4.8061 | 22.3070 | 0.59 |
| 134 | 1567+03.620 | 1569+20.770 | 0.0411 | 21.359 | 1.0171 | 0.3456 | 0.6715 | 24.7309 | 0.59 |
| 135 | 1569+20.770 | 1597+23.110 | 0.3446 | 198.017 | 9.4294 | 3.1308 | 6.2985 | 27.3651 | 0.59 |
| 139 | 1597+23.110 | 1600+07.160 | 0.0269 | 13.380 | 0.6371 | 0.2179 | 0.4192 | 23.6868 | 0.58 |
| 141 | 1600+07.160 | 1622+13.430 | 0.3468 | 143.127 | 6.8156 | 2.3906 | 4.4250 | 19.6510 | 0.54 |
| 143 | 1622+13.430 | 1622+60.330 | 0.0089 | 2.802 | 0.1334 | 0.0496 | 0.0838 | 15.0217 | 0.55 |
| 144 | $1622+60.330$ | 1693+03.680 | 1.3340 | 311.072 | 14.8129 | 5.4572 | 9.3557 | 11.1044 | 0.51 |
| 145 | 1693+03.680 | 1695+79.250 | 0.0261 | 7.714 | 0.3673 | 0.1331 | 0.2342 | 14.0771 | 0.57 |
| 147 | $1695+79.250$ | 1758+35.390 | 1.1399 | 408.674 | 19.4607 | 6.7409 | 12.7198 | 17.0715 | 0.57 |
| 149 | $1758+35.390$ | 1765+64.940 | 0.0856 | 27.103 | 1.2906 | 0.4574 | 0.8332 | 15.0701 | 0.56 |
| 151 | 1765+64.940 | 1767+60.210 | 0.0185 | 6.189 | 0.2947 | 0.1046 | 0.1900 | 15.9366 | 0.59 |
| 153 | 1767+60.210 | 1781+96.430 | 0.2720 | 65.681 | 3.1277 | 1.1465 | 1.9812 | 11.4983 | 0.52 |
| 154 | 1781+96.430 | 1799+13.770 | 0.2542 | 65.523 | 3.1201 | 1.1453 | 1.9748 | 12.2729 | 0.54 |
| 156 | 1799+13.770 | 1823+66.040 | 0.3802 | 111.070 | 5.2891 | 1.9046 | 3.3845 | 13.9095 | 0.55 |
| 159 | 1823+66.040 | 1829+76.930 | 0.0578 | 13.869 | 0.6604 | 0.2449 | 0.4155 | 11.4164 | 0.53 |
| 161 | 1829+76.930 | 1848+64.940 | 0.3576 | 43.163 | 2.0554 | 0.7810 | 1.2744 | 5.7481 | 0.49 |
| 162 | 1848+64.940 | 1848+81.480 | 0.0031 | 0.467 | 0.0222 | 0.0092 | 0.0130 | 7.0984 | 0.48 |
| 163 | $1848+81.480$ | 1868+54.350 | 0.3736 | 73.794 | 3.5140 | 1.3877 | 2.1263 | 9.4045 | 0.47 |
| 164 | $1868+54.350$ | 1873+54.400 | 0.0474 | 10.219 | 0.4866 | 0.1912 | 0.2954 | 10.2761 | 0.50 |
| 166 | 1873+54.400 | 1905+16.110 | 0.5041 | 113.665 | 5.4126 | 2.0985 | 3.3141 | 10.7368 | 0.49 |


| Segment <br> Number/Intersectio <br> n Name/Cross Road | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta ft) (Sta. ft) | Effective <br> Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted <br> Total Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes/millio n veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 169 | 1905+16.110 | 1999+18.010 | 1.7807 | 141.160 | 6.7219 | 2.8719 | 3.8500 | 3.7749 | 0.47 |
| 170 | 1999+18.010 | 2001+13.770 | 0.0185 | 1.671 | 0.0796 | 0.0343 | 0.0453 | 4.2923 | 0.51 |
| 172 | 2001+13.770 | 2027+95.160 | 0.3843 | 34.358 | 1.6361 | 0.6988 | 0.9373 | 4.2570 | 0.49 |
| 175 | 2027+95.160 | 2037+89.330 | 0.1883 | 15.171 | 0.7224 | 0.3111 | 0.4113 | 3.8367 | 0.48 |
| 176 | 2037+89.330 | 2126+91.660 | 1.6860 | 122.019 | 5.8105 | 2.3650 | 3.4454 | 3.4462 | 0.48 |
| 177 | 2126+91.660 | 2127+16.900 | 0.0048 | 0.400 | 0.0191 | 0.0083 | 0.0108 | 3.9856 | 0.51 |
| 178 | 2127+16.900 | 2163+05.440 | 0.6796 | 57.958 | 2.7599 | 1.1846 | 1.5753 | 4.0608 | 0.49 |
| 179 | 2163+05.440 | 2163+09.560 | 0.0008 | 0.063 | 0.0030 | 0.0013 | 0.0017 | 3.8485 | 0.51 |
| 180 | 2163+09.560 | $2241+33.280$ | 1.4818 | 101.567 | 4.8365 | 1.9825 | 2.8540 | 3.2640 | 0.48 |
| 181 | 2241+33.280 | 2301+70.080 | 1.0013 | 81.131 | 3.8634 | 1.5569 | 2.3065 | 3.8584 | 0.48 |
| 184 | 2301+70.080 | 2577+64.980 | 5.2263 | 444.489 | 21.1661 | 8.9725 | 12.1937 | 4.0499 | 0.47 |
| 185 | 2577+64.980 | 2578+84.390 | 0.0226 | 1.710 | 0.0814 | 0.0357 | 0.0458 | 3.6013 | 0.50 |
| 186 | 2578+84.390 | 2652+16.980 | 1.3887 | 83.846 | 3.9926 | 1.6636 | 2.3291 | 2.8750 | 0.48 |
| 187 | 2652+16.980 | 2653+16.980 | 0.0189 | 1.283 | 0.0611 | 0.0273 | 0.0338 | 3.2268 | 0.51 |
| 188 | 2653+16.980 | 2905+85.060 | 4.7856 | 314.525 | 14.9774 | 6.5608 | 8.4166 | 3.1297 | 0.47 |
| 189 | 2905+85.060 | 2919+19.840 | 0.2528 | 16.654 | 0.7930 | 0.3511 | 0.4419 | 3.1370 | 0.49 |
| 190 | 2919+19.840 | 2954+65.120 | 0.6715 | 41.616 | 1.9817 | 0.8229 | 1.1588 | 2.9514 | 0.48 |
| 191 | 2954+65.120 | 2956+02.250 | 0.0130 | 0.918 | 0.0437 | 0.0184 | 0.0253 | 3.3677 | 0.53 |
| 193 | 2956+02.250 | 2983+64.940 | 0.3942 | 26.572 | 1.2653 | 0.5258 | 0.7396 | 3.2101 | 0.49 |
| 196 | 2983+64.940 | 3044+67.123 | 1.1557 | 78.622 | 3.7439 | 1.4504 | 2.2935 | 3.2395 | 0.50 |
| Total |  |  | 53.9231 | 14,396.521 | 685.5486 | 235.4028 | 450.1458 | 12.7135 |  |

Note: Effective Length is the segment length minus the length of the speed change lanes if present.

Table 6. Predicted Crash Frequencies and Rates by Freeway Speed Change Lane (Speed Change)

| Segment <br> Number/Intersection <br> Name/Cross Road | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | $\underset{(\mathrm{mi})}{\text { Length }}$ | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted Total Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Predicted } \\ \text { Travel Crash } \\ \text { Rate } \\ \text { (crashes/millio } \\ \text { n veh-mi) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 10+00.000 | 10+06.360 | 0.0012 | 0.077 | 0.0036 | 0.0011 | 0.0025 | 3.0288 | 0.50 |
| 5 | 24+08.860 | 24+17.550 | 0.0016 | 0.079 | 0.0038 | 0.0010 | 0.0028 | 2.2787 | 0.45 |
| 7 | 24+17.550 | 31+58.860 | 0.1404 | 6.603 | 0.3144 | 0.0814 | 0.2330 | 2.2394 | 0.45 |
| 21 | 320+43.950 | 327+93.950 | 0.1420 | 8.702 | 0.4144 | 0.1236 | 0.2908 | 2.9173 | 0.49 |
| 23 | 333+03.670 | 340+53.670 | 0.1420 | 11.705 | 0.5574 | 0.1634 | 0.3940 | 3.9239 | 0.61 |
| 35 | 487+68.410 | 494+75.370 | 0.1339 | 14.151 | 0.6739 | 0.2216 | 0.4522 | 5.0329 | 0.47 |
| 37 | 494+75.370 | $495+18.410$ | 0.0082 | 0.969 | 0.0461 | 0.0151 | 0.0310 | 5.6606 | 0.48 |
| 41 | 585+36.090 | 590+45.470 | 0.0965 | 13.697 | 0.6523 | 0.2344 | 0.4178 | 6.7610 | 0.61 |
| 43 | 590+45.470 | 592+86.090 | 0.0456 | 6.399 | 0.3047 | 0.1050 | 0.1997 | 6.6861 | 0.51 |
| 45 | 624+72.020 | $628+07.980$ | 0.0636 | 12.687 | 0.6041 | 0.1695 | 0.4346 | 9.4946 | 0.61 |
| 47 | $628+07.980$ | $632+22.020$ | 0.0784 | 16.343 | 0.7782 | 0.2235 | 0.5548 | 9.9244 | 0.56 |
| 48 | $628+07.980$ | $635+57.980$ | 0.1420 | 28.004 | 1.3335 | 0.4487 | 0.8849 | 9.3882 | 0.54 |
| 53 | $761+78.560$ | $769+28.560$ | 0.1420 | 26.564 | 1.2649 | 0.3641 | 0.9008 | 8.9051 | 0.57 |
| 55 | 799+92.600 | $806+52.740$ | 0.1250 | 27.767 | 1.3222 | 0.3431 | 0.9791 | 10.5755 | 0.50 |
| 57 | $806+52.740$ | 807+42.600 | 0.0170 | 3.664 | 0.1745 | 0.0453 | 0.1292 | 10.2527 | 0.49 |


| Segment Number/Intersection Name/Cross Road | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted Total Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes $/ \mathbf{m i} / \mathbf{y r}$ ) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes/millio n veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63 | 913+67.280 | 921+17.280 | 0.1420 | 35.755 | 1.7026 | 0.5491 | 1.1535 | 11.9865 | 0.48 |
| 65 | $939+38.890$ | 946+88.890 | 0.1420 | 38.828 | 1.8489 | 0.5206 | 1.3284 | 13.0164 | 0.57 |
| 68 | 983+35.310 | 986+82.810 | 0.0658 | 19.338 | 0.9208 | 0.2562 | 0.6646 | 13.9916 | 0.59 |
| 70 | 986+82.810 | 990+85.310 | 0.0762 | 24.256 | 1.1551 | 0.3020 | 0.8530 | 15.1522 | 0.70 |
| 72 | 1021+08.260 | 1028+58.260 | 0.1420 | 41.114 | 1.9578 | 0.6665 | 1.2913 | 13.7832 | 0.58 |
| 73 | 1046+44.350 | 1053+94.350 | 0.1420 | 39.955 | 1.9026 | 0.5392 | 1.3634 | 13.3945 | 0.56 |
| 74 | 1050+71.360 | 1053+94.350 | 0.0612 | 16.946 | 0.8070 | 0.2310 | 0.5760 | 13.1917 | 0.55 |
| 76 | 1053+94.350 | $1058+21.360$ | 0.0809 | 21.877 | 1.0417 | 0.2912 | 0.7506 | 12.8812 | 0.58 |
| 79 | 1075+52.580 | 1079+97.540 | 0.0843 | 22.951 | 1.0929 | 0.3938 | 0.6991 | 12.9686 | 0.49 |
| 81 | 1079+97.540 | 1083+02.580 | 0.0578 | 19.488 | 0.9280 | 0.3328 | 0.5952 | 16.0631 | 0.51 |
| 82 | 1110+97.190 | $1116+60.530$ | 0.1067 | 33.195 | 1.5807 | 0.4815 | 1.0993 | 14.8157 | 0.47 |
| 84 | $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | 0.0354 | 19.005 | 0.9050 | 0.3144 | 0.5906 | 25.5996 | 0.77 |
| 85 | $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | 0.0354 | 18.487 | 0.8803 | 0.2897 | 0.5906 | 24.9012 | 0.74 |
| 87 | $1118+47.190$ | $1124+10.530$ | 0.1067 | 34.994 | 1.6664 | 0.5365 | 1.1298 | 15.6183 | 0.49 |
| 89 | $1139+16.750$ | 1146+66.750 | 0.1420 | 59.544 | 2.8354 | 0.7766 | 2.0588 | 19.9613 | 0.58 |
| 90 | $1141+58.590$ | $1149+08.590$ | 0.1420 | 55.874 | 2.6607 | 0.7475 | 1.9131 | 18.7310 | 0.55 |
| 96 | 1221+70.230 | 1229+20.230 | 0.1420 | 34.321 | 1.6343 | 0.4674 | 1.1669 | 11.5056 | 0.56 |
| 98 | 1239+04.550 | 1246+54.550 | 0.1420 | 31.644 | 1.5068 | 0.5283 | 0.9785 | 10.6082 | 0.56 |
| 103 | 1281+75.860 | 1289+25.860 | 0.1420 | 49.358 | 2.3504 | 0.7287 | 1.6217 | 16.5466 | 0.54 |
| 104 | $1308+43.800$ | $1315+93.800$ | 0.1420 | 57.041 | 2.7162 | 0.7294 | 1.9868 | 19.1224 | 0.62 |
| 105 | $1310+99.560$ | $1315+93.800$ | 0.0936 | 32.506 | 1.5479 | 0.4626 | 1.0853 | 16.5366 | 0.54 |
| 107 | $1315+93.800$ | $1318+49.560$ | 0.0484 | 13.735 | 0.6541 | 0.2055 | 0.4486 | 13.5026 | 0.47 |
| 110 | 1352+31.030 | $1355+24.530$ | 0.0556 | 18.208 | 0.8671 | 0.2465 | 0.6206 | 15.5982 | 0.55 |
| 112 | $1355+24.530$ | $1359+81.030$ | 0.0865 | 30.344 | 1.4450 | 0.4101 | 1.0348 | 16.7127 | 0.54 |
| 113 | 1355+24.530 | 1362+74.530 | 0.1420 | 44.609 | 2.1243 | 0.6892 | 1.4351 | 14.9548 | 0.48 |
| 118 | 1407+99.290 | $1415+49.290$ | 0.1420 | 27.696 | 1.3189 | 0.4019 | 0.9169 | 9.2848 | 0.43 |
| 120 | $1458+80.350$ | $1459+28.940$ | 0.0092 | 2.491 | 0.1186 | 0.0339 | 0.0848 | 12.8901 | 0.55 |
| 122 | $1459+28.940$ | $1466+30.350$ | 0.1328 | 38.017 | 1.8103 | 0.5162 | 1.2941 | 13.6275 | 0.55 |
| 123 | $1459+28.940$ | $1466+78.940$ | 0.1420 | 33.301 | 1.5857 | 0.4885 | 1.0972 | 11.1636 | 0.45 |
| 126 | $1493+46.760$ | $1500+96.760$ | 0.1420 | 42.874 | 2.0416 | 0.5814 | 1.4602 | 14.3731 | 0.55 |
| 127 | $1508+73.110$ | $1516+23.110$ | 0.1420 | 42.874 | 2.0416 | 0.5814 | 1.4602 | 14.3731 | 0.55 |
| 130 | 1542+57.160 | $1548+51.750$ | 0.1126 | 23.220 | 1.1057 | 0.3494 | 0.7563 | 9.8188 | 0.45 |
| 132 | 1548+51.750 | 1550+07.160 | 0.0294 | 6.907 | 0.3289 | 0.1083 | 0.2206 | 11.1746 | 0.55 |
| 136 | 1569+20.770 | 1576+70.770 | 0.1420 | 38.151 | 1.8167 | 0.5187 | 1.2980 | 12.7898 | 0.55 |
| 137 | 1589+73.110 | 1597+23.110 | 0.1420 | 38.151 | 1.8167 | 0.5187 | 1.2980 | 12.7898 | 0.55 |
| 138 | 1592+57.160 | 1597+23.110 | 0.0882 | 19.547 | 0.9308 | 0.3037 | 0.6271 | 10.5479 | 0.46 |
| 140 | 1597+23.110 | 1600+07.160 | 0.0538 | 10.175 | 0.4845 | 0.1587 | 0.3258 | 9.0066 | 0.45 |
| 142 | 1614+63.430 | 1622+13.430 | 0.1420 | 25.311 | 1.2053 | 0.4304 | 0.7749 | 8.4851 | 0.47 |
| 146 | 1693+03.680 | 1695+79.250 | 0.0522 | 6.554 | 0.3121 | 0.1018 | 0.2104 | 5.9803 | 0.49 |
| 148 | 1695+79.250 | $1700+53.680$ | 0.0899 | 14.437 | 0.6875 | 0.2228 | 0.4646 | 7.6508 | 0.51 |
| 150 | $1760+10.210$ | 1765+64.940 | 0.1051 | 15.403 | 0.7335 | 0.2557 | 0.4778 | 6.9814 | 0.52 |
| 152 | 1765+64.940 | 1767+60.210 | 0.0370 | 5.422 | 0.2582 | 0.0900 | 0.1682 | 6.9814 | 0.52 |
| 155 | 1781+96.430 | 1789+46.430 | 0.1420 | 14.540 | 0.6924 | 0.1717 | 0.5207 | 4.8743 | 0.43 |
| 157 | 1799+13.770 | 1806+63.770 | 0.1420 | 21.772 | 1.0368 | 0.2998 | 0.7370 | 7.2988 | 0.58 |
| 158 | 1822+26.930 | 1823+66.040 | 0.0263 | 3.719 | 0.1771 | 0.0676 | 0.1096 | 6.7225 | 0.53 |
| 160 | 1823+66.040 | 1829+76.930 | 0.1157 | 13.496 | 0.6427 | 0.2461 | 0.3965 | 5.5546 | 0.52 |
| 165 | 1868+54.350 | 1873+54.400 | 0.0947 | 7.179 | 0.3418 | 0.0897 | 0.2521 | 3.6096 | 0.35 |
| 167 | 1873+54.400 | 1876+04.350 | 0.0473 | 3.908 | 0.1861 | 0.0487 | 0.1374 | 3.9315 | 0.36 |
| 168 | 1873+54.400 | 1881+04.400 | 0.1420 | 19.311 | 0.9196 | 0.2666 | 0.6530 | 6.4739 | 0.59 |


| Segment Number/Intersection Name/Cross Road | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted Total <br> Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO <br> Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes/millio n veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 171 | 1999+18.010 | 2001+13.770 | 0.0371 | 2.078 | 0.0989 | 0.0293 | 0.0697 | 2.6683 | 0.63 |
| 173 | 2001+13.770 | 2006+68.010 | 0.1050 | 6.046 | 0.2879 | 0.0851 | 0.2028 | 2.7426 | 0.63 |
| 174 | $2001+13.770$ | 2008+63.770 | 0.1420 | 4.496 | 0.2141 | 0.0511 | 0.1630 | 1.5073 | 0.35 |
| 182 | $2241+33.280$ | $2248+83.280$ | 0.1420 | 7.531 | 0.3586 | 0.1062 | 0.2524 | 2.5246 | 0.63 |
| 183 | $2241+33.280$ | $2248+83.280$ | 0.1420 | 5.242 | 0.2496 | 0.0708 | 0.1789 | 1.7573 | 0.44 |
| 192 | 2954+65.120 | 2956+02.250 | 0.0260 | 1.116 | 0.0531 | 0.0158 | 0.0373 | 2.0458 | 0.64 |
| 194 | 2956+02.250 | $2962+15.120$ | 0.1161 | 5.106 | 0.2431 | 0.0723 | 0.1709 | 2.0947 | 0.64 |
| 195 | $2956+02.250$ | $2963+52.250$ | 0.1420 | 3.834 | 0.1826 | 0.0427 | 0.1399 | 1.2852 | 0.40 |
| Total |  |  | 7.1035 | 1,500.689 | 71.4614 | 21.5623 | 49.8991 | 10.0601 |  |

Note: Travel Crash Rates/Million Vehicle Miles for Speed Change Lanes reflect AADTs that are half of the Freeway Segment AADTs based on the assumption of 50/50 directional distribution.

Table 7. Predicted Crash Frequencies and Rates by Horizontal Design Element (Section 1)

| Title | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted Total Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI <br> Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO <br> Crash <br> Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes/millio n veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tangent | 10+00.000 | $419+23.502$ | 7.7507 | 954.981 | 45.4753 | 17.5799 | 27.8954 | 5.8673 | 0.52 |
| Simple Curve 1 | $419+23.502$ | $431+10.395$ | 0.2248 | 30.522 | 1.4534 | 0.5503 | 0.9032 | 6.4658 | 0.51 |
| Tangent | $431+10.395$ | 571+19.905 | 2.6533 | 529.621 | 25.2200 | 9.2705 | 15.9495 | 9.5051 | 0.55 |
| Simple Curve 2 | 571+19.905 | 576+61.681 | 0.1026 | 19.831 | 0.9444 | 0.3352 | 0.6091 | 9.2034 | 0.52 |
| Tangent | $576+61.681$ | $612+83.668$ | 0.6860 | 192.492 | 9.1663 | 3.2470 | 5.9192 | 13.3622 | 0.68 |
| Simple Curve 3 | $612+83.668$ | $628+07.981$ | 0.2887 | 94.313 | 4.4911 | 1.5413 | 2.9498 | 15.5564 | 0.72 |
| Tangent | $628+07.981$ | $729+40.788$ | 1.9191 | 593.646 | 28.2689 | 9.6169 | 18.6519 | 14.7303 | 0.65 |
| Simple Curve 4 | $729+40.788$ | $747+48.636$ | 0.3424 | 90.753 | 4.3216 | 1.4700 | 2.8516 | 12.6215 | 0.58 |
| Tangent | 747+48.636 | 782+70.380 | 0.6670 | 251.337 | 11.9684 | 3.9891 | 7.9793 | 17.9438 | 0.73 |
| Simple Curve 5 | $782+70.380$ | $786+88.158$ | 0.0791 | 42.823 | 2.0392 | 0.6825 | 1.3567 | 25.7720 | 0.67 |
| Simple Curve 6 | $786+88.158$ | 809+26.404 | 0.4239 | 257.013 | 12.2387 | 3.9870 | 8.2517 | 28.8710 | 0.84 |
| Simple Curve 7 | 809+26.404 | $813+44.182$ | 0.0791 | 41.514 | 1.9769 | 0.6705 | 1.3063 | 24.9844 | 0.62 |
| Tangent | $813+44.182$ | $822+87.343$ | 0.1786 | 95.178 | 4.5323 | 1.4641 | 3.0682 | 25.3727 | 0.63 |
| Simple Curve 8 | $822+87.343$ | $840+64.062$ | 0.3365 | 179.296 | 8.5379 | 2.7580 | 5.7799 | 25.3727 | 0.63 |
| Tangent | 840+64.062 | $852+95.652$ | 0.2333 | 124.285 | 5.9183 | 1.9118 | 4.0065 | 25.3727 | 0.63 |
| Simple Curve 9 | $852+95.652$ | $860+99.479$ | 0.1522 | 81.118 | 3.8627 | 1.2478 | 2.6149 | 25.3727 | 0.63 |
| Tangent | 860+99.479 | 904+25.932 | 0.8194 | 459.248 | 21.8689 | 7.1225 | 14.7464 | 26.6888 | 0.61 |
| Simple Curve 10 | 904+25.932 | 919+75.962 | 0.2936 | 197.864 | 9.4221 | 3.0570 | 6.3652 | 32.0953 | 0.79 |
| Tangent | 919+75.962 | 924+05.671 | 0.0814 | 48.530 | 2.3110 | 0.7587 | 1.5523 | 28.3956 | 0.76 |
| Simple Curve 11 | 924+05.671 | $935+45.854$ | 0.2159 | 104.371 | 4.9701 | 1.6492 | 3.3209 | 23.0155 | 0.59 |
| Tangent | $935+45.854$ | 940+92.923 | 0.1036 | 58.053 | 2.7644 | 0.8982 | 1.8662 | 26.6804 | 0.76 |
| Simple Curve 12 | 940+92.923 | $952+73.568$ | 0.2236 | 141.094 | 6.7187 | 2.1686 | 4.5501 | 30.0471 | 0.87 |
| Tangent | 952+73.568 | 966+09.112 | 0.2529 | 127.200 | 6.0572 | 2.0398 | 4.0174 | 23.9467 | 0.56 |
| Simple Curve 13 | 966+09.112 | 971+01.815 | 0.0933 | 46.926 | 2.2346 | 0.7525 | 1.4821 | 23.9467 | 0.56 |
| Tangent | 971+01.815 | 985+97.065 | 0.2832 | 150.144 | 7.1497 | 2.3582 | 4.7915 | 25.2470 | 0.69 |
| Simple Curve 14 | 985+97.065 | $999+25.032$ | 0.2515 | 205.677 | 9.7942 | 2.9838 | 6.8103 | 38.9416 | 1.09 |
| Simple Curve 15 | 999+25.032 | 1003+65.738 | 0.0835 | 60.567 | 2.8841 | 0.8963 | 1.9878 | 34.5543 | 0.85 |
| Simple Curve 16 | 1003+65.738 | $1018+37.441$ | 0.2787 | 202.259 | 9.6314 | 2.9931 | 6.6383 | 34.5543 | 0.85 |


| Title | Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Length (mi) | Total Predicted Crashes for Evaluation Period | Predicted Total Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted FI <br> Crash <br> Frequency <br> (crashes/yr) | Predicted PDO Crash Frequency (crashes/yr) | Predicted <br> Crash Rate (crashes/mi/yr) | Predicted Travel Crash Rate (crashes/millio n veh-mi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Simple Curve 17 | 1018+37.441 | 1019+88.432 | 0.0286 | 20.751 | 0.9881 | 0.3071 | 0.6811 | 34.5543 | 0.85 |
| Simple Curve 18 | $1019+88.432$ | 1031+03.076 | 0.2111 | 157.657 | 7.5075 | 2.3849 | 5.1226 | 35.5624 | 1.14 |
| Tangent | 1031+03.076 | 1035+88.916 | 0.0920 | 48.873 | 2.3273 | 0.7202 | 1.6071 | 25.2926 | 0.73 |
| Simple Curve 19 | $1035+88.916$ | 1046+55.066 | 0.2019 | 107.821 | 5.1343 | 1.5881 | 3.5462 | 25.4273 | 0.74 |
| Tangent | 1046+55.066 | 1052+86.140 | 0.1195 | 108.372 | 5.1606 | 1.5428 | 3.6178 | 43.1768 | 1.48 |
| Simple Curve 20 | 1052+86.140 | 1063+52.291 | 0.2019 | 134.576 | 6.4084 | 1.9663 | 4.4421 | 31.7369 | 1.08 |
| Tangent | 1063+52.291 | $1127+89.533$ | 1.2192 | 991.546 | 47.2165 | 14.6989 | 32.5176 | 38.7282 |  |
| Simple Curve 21 | $1127+89.533$ | $1129+89.522$ | 0.0379 | 33.513 | 1.5959 | 0.4789 | 1.1170 | 42.1326 | 0.76 |
| Simple Curve 22 | $1129+89.522$ | $1132+54.659$ | 0.0502 | 44.430 | 2.1157 | 0.6349 | 1.4808 | 42.1326 | 0.76 |
| Simple Curve 23 | $1132+54.659$ | $1140+66.913$ | 0.1538 | 131.321 | 6.2534 | 1.8594 | 4.3939 | 40.6497 | 0.88 |
| Simple Curve 24 | $1140+66.913$ | $1142+20.312$ | 0.0291 | 25.410 | 1.2100 | 0.3414 | 0.8685 | 41.6477 | 1.65 |
| Simple Curve 25 | $1142+20.312$ | 1144+84.149 | 0.0500 | 55.450 | 2.6405 | 0.7444 | 1.8960 | 52.8421 | 1.98 |
| Tangent | 1144+84.149 | $1173+14.785$ | 0.5361 | 483.357 | 23.0170 | 6.9243 | 16.0927 | 42.9337 | 0.81 |
| Simple Curve 26 | $1173+14.785$ | 1180+16.823 | 0.1330 | 90.696 | 4.3189 | 1.3977 | 2.9212 | 32.4820 | 0.65 |
| Tangent | $1180+16.823$ | 1184+07.646 | 0.0740 | 50.489 | 2.4043 | 0.7781 | 1.6262 | 32.4814 | 0.65 |
| Simple Curve 27 | $1184+07.646$ | $1191+12.075$ | 0.1334 | 77.853 | 3.7073 | 1.2228 | 2.4845 | 27.7876 | 0.65 |
| Tangent | 1191+12.075 | $1209+46.021$ | 0.3473 | 171.431 | 8.1634 | 2.6326 | 5.5307 | 23.5026 | 0.63 |
| Simple Curve 28 | $1209+46.021$ | 1217+15.661 | 0.1458 | 71.943 | 3.4259 | 1.1048 | 2.3210 | 23.5026 | 0.63 |
| Simple Curve 29 | 1217+15.661 | $1224+85.302$ | 0.1458 | 86.361 | 4.1124 | 1.3012 | 2.8113 | 28.2128 | 0.86 |
| Tangent | $1224+85.302$ | $1260+56.704$ | 0.6764 | 336.886 | 16.0422 | 5.3114 | 10.7307 | 23.7169 | 0.80 |
| Simple Curve 30 | 1260+56.704 | $1272+63.702$ | 0.2286 | 155.128 | 7.3870 | 2.4167 | 4.9703 | 32.3145 | 0.71 |
| Tangent | 1272+63.702 | $1285+09.421$ | 0.2359 | 211.013 | 10.0483 | 3.1101 | 6.9381 | 42.5897 | 0.86 |
| Simple Curve 31 | $1285+09.421$ | 1286+01.093 | 0.0174 | 18.426 | 0.8774 | 0.2681 | 0.6094 | 50.5381 | 1.32 |
| Simple Curve 32 | 1286+01.093 | 1298+68.000 | 0.2399 | 192.651 | 9.1738 | 2.7892 | 6.3847 | 38.2332 | 0.92 |
| Simple Curve 33 | 1298+68.000 | 1301+26.584 | 0.0490 | 34.959 | 1.6647 | 0.5049 | 1.1598 | 33.9915 | 0.78 |
| Tangent | $1301+26.584$ | $1308+20.451$ | 0.1314 | 93.806 | 4.4670 | 1.3548 | 3.1122 | 33.9915 | 0.78 |
| Simple Curve 34 | $1308+20.451$ | $1314+64.093$ | 0.1219 | 158.168 | 7.5318 | 2.2012 | 5.3306 | 61.7858 | 1.69 |
| Tangent | $1314+64.093$ | $1328+00.970$ | 0.2532 | 207.796 | 9.8951 | 3.0773 | 6.8177 | 39.0806 | 0.89 |
| Simple Curve 35 | $1328+00.970$ | 1340+17.080 | 0.2303 | 176.786 | 8.4184 | 2.6529 | 5.7655 | 36.5502 | 0.68 |
| Simple Curve 36 | 1340+17.080 | $1341+21.959$ | 0.0199 | 15.246 | 0.7260 | 0.2288 | 0.4972 | 36.5502 | 0.68 |
| Tangent | 1341+21.959 | $1436+51.660$ | 1.8049 | 1,148.512 | 54.6911 | 17.4632 | 37.2279 | 30.3020 | 0.73 |
| Simple Curve 37 | $1436+51.660$ | $1444+05.265$ | 0.1427 | 66.287 | 3.1565 | 1.0651 | 2.0914 | 22.1155 | 0.56 |
| Tangent | $1444+05.265$ | $1613+06.823$ | 3.2011 | 1,736.983 | 82.7135 | 26.8512 | 55.8623 | 25.8395 | 0.78 |
| Simple Curve 38 | $1613+06.823$ | $1625+55.126$ | 0.2364 | 99.947 | 4.7594 | 1.6908 | 3.0686 | 20.1309 | 0.82 |
| Tangent | $1625+55.126$ | $1772+21.799$ | 2.7778 | 810.657 | 38.6027 | 13.7036 | 24.8992 | 13.8970 | 0.59 |
| Simple Curve 39 | 1772+21.799 | $1776+88.886$ | 0.0885 | 21.361 | 1.0172 | 0.3729 | 0.6443 | 11.4983 | 0.52 |
| Tangent | $1776+88.886$ | 1974+76.528 | 3.7477 | 643.410 | 30.6386 | 11.4841 | 19.1545 | 8.1754 | 0.59 |
| Simple Curve 40 | 1974+76.528 | 1985+13.994 | 0.1965 | 15.576 | 0.7417 | 0.3169 | 0.4248 | 3.7749 | 0.47 |
| Tangent | 1985+13.994 | $2665+03.415$ | 12.8768 | 1,006.907 | 47.9480 | 19.9211 | 28.0269 | 3.7236 | 0.50 |
| Simple Curve 41 | $2665+03.415$ | 2677+15.139 | 0.2295 | 15.083 | 0.7182 | 0.3146 | 0.4036 | 3.1297 | 0.47 |
| Simple Curve 42 | 2677+15.139 | 2692+75.308 | 0.2955 | 19.420 | 0.9248 | 0.4051 | 0.5197 | 3.1297 | 0.47 |
| Simple Curve 43 | 2692+75.308 | $2705+01.733$ | 0.2323 | 15.266 | 0.7270 | 0.3184 | 0.4085 | 3.1297 | 0.47 |
| Tangent | 2705+01.733 | $2893+06.656$ | 3.5615 | 234.075 | 11.1464 | 4.8826 | 6.2638 | 3.1297 | 0.47 |
| Simple Curve 44 | 2893+06.656 | 2912+95.834 | 0.3767 | 24.781 | 1.1801 | 0.5189 | 0.6612 | 3.1323 | 0.48 |
| Tangent | 2912+95.834 | $3044+67.123$ | 2.4946 | 165.570 | 7.8843 | 3.1124 | 4.7718 | 3.1606 | 0.55 |

Table 8. Predicted Crash Frequencies by Year (Section 1)

| Year | Total Crashes | FI Crashes | Percent FI (\%) | PDO Crashes | Percent PDO (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 630.55 | 219.14 | 0.347 | 411.41 | 0.652 |
| 2023 | 644.02 | 223.08 | 0.346 | 420.94 | 0.654 |
| 2024 | 657.61 | 227.04 | 0.345 | 430.56 | 0.655 |
| 2025 | 671.28 | 231.02 | 0.344 | 440.26 | 0.656 |
| 2026 | 685.06 | 235.00 | 0.343 | 450.06 | 0.657 |
| 2027 | 698.94 | 239.00 | 0.342 | 459.93 | 0.658 |
| 2028 | 712.92 | 243.02 | 0.341 | 469.90 | 0.659 |
| 2029 | 727.00 | 247.05 | 0.340 | 479.95 | 0.660 |
| 2030 | 741.18 | 251.09 | 0.339 | 490.09 | 0.661 |
| 2031 | 755.46 | 255.15 | 0.338 | 500.31 | 0.662 |
| 2032 | 769.84 | 259.22 | 0.337 | 510.63 | 0.663 |
| 2033 | 784.32 | 263.30 | 0.336 | 521.02 | 0.664 |
| 2034 | 798.90 | 267.39 | 0.335 | 531.51 | 0.665 |
| 2035 | 813.58 | 271.50 | 0.334 | 542.08 | 0.666 |
| 2036 | 828.36 | 275.63 | 0.333 | 552.74 | 0.667 |
| 2037 | 843.24 | 279.76 | 0.332 | 563.48 | 0.668 |
| 2038 | 858.22 | 283.91 | 0.331 | 574.31 | 0.669 |
| 2039 | 873.30 | 288.07 | 0.330 | 585.23 | 0.670 |
| 2040 | 888.48 | 292.25 | 0.329 | 596.23 | 0.671 |
| 2041 | 903.75 | 296.44 | 0.328 | 607.32 | 0.672 |
| 2042 | 919.14 | 300.64 | 0.327 | 618.50 | 0.673 |
| Total | 16,205.15 | 5,448.70 | 0.336 | 10,756.44 | 0.664 |
| Average | 771.67 | 259.46 | 0.336 | 512.21 | 0.664 |

Note: Fatal and Injury Crashes and Property Damage Only Crashes do not necessarily sum up to Total Crashes because the distribution of these three crashes had been derived independently.
Note: Fatal and Injury Crashes and Property Damage Only Crashes do not necessarily sum up to Total Crashes because the distribution of these three crashes had been derived independently.
Note: Fatal and Injury Crashes and Property Damage Only Crashes do not necessarily sum up to Total Crashes because the distribution of these three crashes had been derived independently.

Table 9. Predicted Crash Severity by Freeway Segment (Section 1)

| Seg. No. | Fatal (K) Crashes (crashes) | Incapacitating Injury (A) Crashes (crashes) | Non-Incapacitating Injury (B) Crashes (crashes) | Possible Injury (C) <br> Crashes (crashes) | No Injury (O) Crashes (crashes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.0006 | 0.0017 | 0.0117 | 0.0214 | 0.0564 |
| 3 | 0.0161 | 0.0414 | 0.2899 | 0.5329 | 1.3855 |
| 4 | 0.1949 | 0.4998 | 3.5021 | 6.4364 | 16.4745 |


| Seg. No. | Fatal (K) Crashes (crashes) | Incapacitating Injury (A) Crashes (crashes) | Non-Incapacitating Injury (B) Crashes (crashes) | Possible Injury (C) <br> Crashes (crashes) | No Injury (O) Crashes (crashes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 0.0546 | 0.1401 | 0.9817 | 1.8042 | 4.6024 |
| 8 | 0.7545 | 1.9343 | 13.5538 | 24.9100 | 64.0359 |
| 9 | 0.0680 | 0.1744 | 1.2217 | 2.2454 | 5.2045 |
| 10 | 0.4257 | 1.0914 | 7.6472 | 14.0545 | 33.9332 |
| 11 | 0.0231 | 0.0592 | 0.4149 | 0.7626 | 1.8068 |
| 12 | 0.6873 | 1.7620 | 12.3464 | 22.6909 | 61.0757 |
| 13 | 0.0202 | 0.0517 | 0.3622 | 0.6656 | 1.6034 |
| 14 | 0.4251 | 1.0899 | 7.6366 | 14.0350 | 34.1905 |
| 15 | 0.1549 | 0.3970 | 2.7818 | 5.1126 | 12.2871 |
| 16 | 0.6561 | 1.6821 | 11.7862 | 21.6614 | 57.4126 |
| 17 | 0.0122 | 0.0312 | 0.2183 | 0.4012 | 0.9515 |
| 18 | 0.4094 | 1.0495 | 7.3541 | 13.5158 | 32.7467 |
| 19 | 0.9509 | 2.4380 | 17.0831 | 31.3964 | 83.1500 |
| 20 | 0.1485 | 0.3806 | 2.6671 | 4.9017 | 13.1309 |
| 22 | 0.7035 | 1.8037 | 12.6385 | 23.2278 | 63.8152 |
| 24 | 0.0055 | 0.0141 | 0.0991 | 0.1822 | 0.4564 |
| 25 | 0.5731 | 1.4694 | 10.2958 | 18.9222 | 48.6277 |
| 26 | 0.1892 | 0.4851 | 3.3993 | 6.2474 | 15.7079 |
| 27 | 0.3699 | 0.9669 | 6.3678 | 10.8852 | 30.7988 |
| 28 | 0.0276 | 0.0732 | 0.4596 | 0.7431 | 1.9770 |
| 29 | 0.3552 | 0.9106 | 6.3803 | 11.7261 | 30.2045 |
| 30 | 0.0532 | 0.1365 | 0.9564 | 1.7578 | 4.4563 |
| 31 | 0.3560 | 0.9127 | 6.3953 | 11.7536 | 32.6032 |
| 32 | 0.1479 | 0.3791 | 2.6564 | 4.8821 | 12.5089 |
| 33 | 0.3710 | 0.9512 | 6.6653 | 12.2498 | 32.8059 |
| 34 | 0.1093 | 0.2803 | 1.9640 | 3.6095 | 10.0620 |
| 36 | 0.8057 | 2.0657 | 14.4739 | 26.6010 | 76.1994 |
| 38 | 0.1088 | 0.2790 | 1.9548 | 3.5927 | 9.9005 |
| 39 | 1.5271 | 3.9270 | 27.2539 | 49.5302 | 149.4450 |
| 40 | 0.0813 | 0.2085 | 1.4611 | 2.6852 | 8.5292 |
| 42 | 1.3401 | 3.4793 | 23.4172 | 41.0580 | 125.7823 |
| 44 | 0.1014 | 0.2692 | 1.6862 | 2.7185 | 9.1965 |
| 46 | 0.9389 | 2.4072 | 16.8671 | 30.9994 | 101.1951 |
| 49 | 0.3705 | 0.9499 | 6.6558 | 12.2324 | 36.9993 |
| 50 | 0.2100 | 0.5384 | 3.7728 | 6.9338 | 19.6399 |
| 51 | 3.0235 | 7.8043 | 53.5168 | 95.9052 | 310.8721 |
| 52 | 0.3425 | 0.8781 | 6.1525 | 11.3074 | 35.6245 |
| 54 | 2.3263 | 6.1080 | 39.6568 | 66.6660 | 228.1275 |
| 56 | 0.0420 | 0.1115 | 0.6987 | 1.1265 | 3.9645 |
| 58 | 0.4305 | 1.1429 | 7.1599 | 11.5432 | 39.5023 |
| 59 | 3.7923 | 9.8716 | 65.8897 | 114.4074 | 406.4719 |
| 60 | 0.0262 | 0.0671 | 0.4704 | 0.8646 | 2.7509 |
| 61 | 0.4249 | 1.0894 | 7.6332 | 14.0287 | 46.4644 |
| 62 | 2.8096 | 7.2876 | 49.1981 | 86.5666 | 303.2506 |
| 64 | 1.5774 | 4.1380 | 26.9448 | 45.4504 | 157.2920 |
| 66 | 2.2405 | 5.8039 | 39.3440 | 69.5633 | 230.3421 |
| 67 | 0.1492 | 0.3858 | 2.6294 | 4.6788 | 16.1823 |
| 69 | 3.1058 | 8.2465 | 51.6600 | 83.2862 | 324.4680 |
| 71 | 2.0819 | 5.4714 | 35.4162 | 59.3265 | 228.2706 |
| 75 | 0.2053 | 0.5450 | 3.4141 | 5.5043 | 21.2678 |
| 77 | 1.1815 | 3.0618 | 20.7294 | 36.5974 | 132.2335 |


| Seg. No. | Fatal (K) Crashes (crashes) | Incapacitating Injury (A) Crashes (crashes) | Non-Incapacitating Injury (B) Crashes (crashes) | Possible Injury (C) Crashes (crashes) | No Injury (O) Crashes (crashes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 78 | 0.1711 | 0.4388 | 3.0745 | 5.6504 | 19.7444 |
| 80 | 2.9324 | 7.5181 | 52.6786 | 96.8157 | 362.1230 |
| 83 |  |  |  |  | 0.0000 |
| 86 | 2.0943 | 5.4891 | 35.8398 | 60.6468 | 242.7325 |
| 88 | 0.3246 | 0.8469 | 5.6110 | 9.6584 | 39.3771 |
| 91 | 1.8630 | 4.7764 | 33.4679 | 61.5093 | 235.2998 |
| 92 | 0.4383 | 1.1238 | 7.8740 | 14.4710 | 52.5414 |
| 93 | 0.9737 | 2.5548 | 16.6241 | 28.0192 | 100.6766 |
| 94 | 0.3741 | 0.9934 | 6.2229 | 10.0325 | 35.2761 |
| 95 | 2.3533 | 6.1255 | 40.8890 | 71.0042 | 252.8804 |
| 97 | 0.7672 | 1.9670 | 13.7825 | 25.3303 | 85.4168 |
| 99 | 0.4911 | 1.2591 | 8.8225 | 16.2145 | 52.1031 |
| 100 | 0.9060 | 2.3812 | 15.4133 | 25.8189 | 87.3517 |
| 101 | 1.2283 | 3.1824 | 21.5612 | 38.0977 | 141.6830 |
| 102 | 2.8260 | 7.4106 | 48.3094 | 81.5976 | 321.9399 |
| 106 | 0.1138 | 0.2918 | 2.0446 | 3.7577 | 13.6151 |
| 108 | 3.0096 | 7.8222 | 52.4633 | 91.6097 | 336.6605 |
| 109 | 0.1298 | 0.3328 | 2.3316 | 4.2851 | 15.5048 |
| 111 | 2.1116 | 5.4137 | 37.9335 | 69.7163 | 258.7293 |
| 114 | 0.2867 | 0.7351 | 5.1509 | 9.4666 | 32.4202 |
| 115 | 0.9798 | 2.5120 | 17.6017 | 32.3495 | 108.1347 |
| 116 | 0.0591 | 0.1515 | 1.0617 | 1.9513 | 6.1862 |
| 117 | 2.8317 | 7.3007 | 50.2462 | 90.4283 | 296.1206 |
| 119 | 0.0173 | 0.0444 | 0.3112 | 0.5719 | 1.9158 |
| 121 | 1.3129 | 3.3659 | 23.5850 | 43.3458 | 148.0750 |
| 124 | 0.6215 | 1.5933 | 11.1643 | 20.5184 | 70.9053 |
| 125 | 1.1755 | 3.0137 | 21.1170 | 38.8101 | 135.2120 |
| 128 | 0.5666 | 1.4528 | 10.1795 | 18.7084 | 63.7768 |
| 129 | 1.3145 | 3.3701 | 23.6142 | 43.3996 | 142.1219 |
| 131 | 0.0520 | 0.1334 | 0.9350 | 1.7184 | 5.9252 |
| 133 | 0.9091 | 2.3307 | 16.3309 | 30.0138 | 100.9272 |
| 134 | 0.1331 | 0.3412 | 2.3906 | 4.3936 | 14.1007 |
| 135 | 1.2054 | 3.0904 | 21.6543 | 39.7976 | 132.2695 |
| 139 | 0.0839 | 0.2151 | 1.5072 | 2.7700 | 8.8039 |
| 141 | 0.9610 | 2.4890 | 16.8826 | 29.8700 | 92.9246 |
| 143 | 0.0221 | 0.0588 | 0.3681 | 0.5934 | 1.7597 |
| 144 | 2.1143 | 5.4285 | 37.8594 | 69.1996 | 196.4698 |
| 145 | 0.0512 | 0.1314 | 0.9206 | 1.6920 | 4.9191 |
| 147 | 2.5953 | 6.6538 | 46.6229 | 85.6863 | 267.1158 |
| 149 | 0.1761 | 0.4515 | 3.1634 | 5.8139 | 17.4982 |
| 151 | 0.0403 | 0.1033 | 0.7238 | 1.3302 | 3.9910 |
| 153 | 0.4633 | 1.2013 | 8.1166 | 14.2950 | 41.6049 |
| 154 | 0.4410 | 1.1305 | 7.9217 | 14.5589 | 41.4710 |
| 156 | 0.7333 | 1.8800 | 13.1730 | 24.2101 | 71.0741 |
| 159 | 0.0943 | 0.2417 | 1.6939 | 3.1131 | 8.7259 |
| 161 | 0.3007 | 0.7709 | 5.4016 | 9.9273 | 26.7627 |
| 162 | 0.0036 | 0.0091 | 0.0639 | 0.1174 | 0.2731 |
| 163 | 0.5343 | 1.3698 | 9.5983 | 17.6403 | 44.6514 |
| 164 | 0.0736 | 0.1888 | 1.3227 | 2.4309 | 6.2028 |
| 166 | 0.8080 | 2.0715 | 14.5145 | 26.6756 | 69.5953 |
| 169 | 1.1241 | 2.8931 | 20.0227 | 36.2708 | 80.8493 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Seg. No. | Fatal (K) Crashes (crashes) | Incapacitating Injury (A) Crashes (crashes) | Non-Incapacitating Injury (B) Crashes (crashes) | Possible Injury (C) Crashes (crashes) | No Injury (O) Crashes (crashes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 170 | 0.0132 | 0.0338 | 0.2369 | 0.4354 | 0.9517 |
| 172 | 0.2690 | 0.6897 | 4.8330 | 8.8824 | 19.6841 |
| 175 | 0.1198 | 0.3071 | 2.1519 | 3.9549 | 8.6370 |
| 176 | 0.9105 | 2.3345 | 16.3575 | 30.0628 | 72.3542 |
| 177 | 0.0032 | 0.0082 | 0.0573 | 0.1053 | 0.2261 |
| 178 | 0.4561 | 1.1694 | 8.1936 | 15.0586 | 33.0806 |
| 179 | 0.0005 | 0.0013 | 0.0091 | 0.0167 | 0.0355 |
| 180 | 0.7633 | 1.9569 | 13.7120 | 25.2007 | 59.9341 |
| 181 | 0.5994 | 1.5368 | 10.7679 | 19.7899 | 48.4367 |
| 184 | 3.4544 | 8.8566 | 62.0576 | 114.0529 | 256.0672 |
| 185 | 0.0137 | 0.0352 | 0.2466 | 0.4532 | 0.9617 |
| 186 | 0.6405 | 1.6421 | 11.5061 | 21.1465 | 48.9104 |
| 187 | 0.0105 | 0.0269 | 0.1887 | 0.3469 | 0.7103 |
| 188 | 2.6058 | 6.7297 | 46.0647 | 82.3757 | 176.7493 |
| 189 | 0.1463 | 0.3820 | 2.5220 | 4.3228 | 9.2806 |
| 190 | 0.3168 | 0.8123 | 5.6917 | 10.4606 | 24.3347 |
| 191 | 0.0071 | 0.0182 | 0.1275 | 0.2343 | 0.5313 |
| 193 | 0.2024 | 0.5190 | 3.6365 | 6.6834 | 15.5310 |
| 196 | 0.5584 | 1.4317 | 10.0318 | 18.4370 | 48.1630 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 9,453.0623 |

Table 10. Predicted Crash Severity by Speed Change Lane (Speed Change)

| Seg. No. | Fatal (K) Crashes (crashes) | Incapacitating Injury (A) Crashes (crashes) | Non-Incapacitating Injury (B) Crashes (crashes) | Possible Injury (C) <br> Crashes (crashes) | No Injury (O) Crashes (crashes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 0.0004 | 0.0011 | 0.0077 | 0.0142 | 0.0532 |
| 5 | 0.0004 | 0.0010 | 0.0067 | 0.0123 | 0.0584 |
| 7 | 0.0313 | 0.0804 | 0.5631 | 1.0349 | 4.8929 |
| 21 | 0.0476 | 0.1220 | 0.8546 | 1.5707 | 6.1072 |
| 23 | 0.0629 | 0.1613 | 1.1302 | 2.0771 | 8.2734 |
| 35 | 0.0853 | 0.2188 | 1.5329 | 2.8173 | 9.4970 |
| 37 | 0.0058 | 0.0149 | 0.1047 | 0.1924 | 0.6512 |
| 41 | 0.0903 | 0.2314 | 1.6214 | 2.9799 | 8.7745 |
| 43 | 0.0404 | 0.1036 | 0.7260 | 1.3343 | 4.1944 |
| 45 | 0.0756 | 0.2007 | 1.2570 | 2.0265 | 9.1270 |
| 47 | 0.0860 | 0.2206 | 1.5457 | 2.8408 | 11.6499 |
| 48 | 0.1727 | 0.4429 | 3.1031 | 5.7030 | 18.5828 |
| 53 | 0.1402 | 0.3594 | 2.5185 | 4.6286 | 18.9169 |
| 55 | 0.1530 | 0.4062 | 2.5445 | 4.1022 | 20.5608 |
| 57 | 0.0202 | 0.0536 | 0.3361 | 0.5418 | 2.7126 |
| 63 | 0.2382 | 0.6284 | 4.0206 | 6.6440 | 24.2241 |
| 65 | 0.2253 | 0.5939 | 3.8072 | 6.3053 | 27.8957 |
| 68 | 0.1023 | 0.2646 | 1.8037 | 3.2095 | 13.9576 |
| 70 | 0.1347 | 0.3575 | 2.2398 | 3.6110 | 17.9134 |
| 72 | 0.2971 | 0.7889 | 4.9423 | 7.9679 | 27.1182 |
| 73 | 0.2126 | 0.5480 | 3.7723 | 6.7905 | 28.6318 |
| 74 | 0.0935 | 0.2425 | 1.6363 | 2.8781 | 12.0959 |


| Seg. No. | Fatal (K) Crashes (crashes) | Incapacitating Injury (A) Crashes (crashes) | Non-Incapacitating Injury (B) Crashes (crashes) | Possible Injury (C) Crashes (crashes) | No Injury (O) Crashes (crashes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 76 | 0.1298 | 0.3447 | 2.1593 | 3.4812 | 15.7616 |
| 79 | 0.1516 | 0.3887 | 2.7236 | 5.0056 | 14.6813 |
| 81 | 0.1281 | 0.3285 | 2.3016 | 4.2301 | 12.4999 |
| 82 | 0.1854 | 0.4753 | 3.3301 | 6.1203 | 23.0844 |
| 84 | 0.1210 | 0.3103 | 2.1745 | 3.9965 | 12.4027 |
| 85 | 0.1115 | 0.2860 | 2.0038 | 3.6826 | 12.4027 |
| 87 | 0.2066 | 0.5296 | 3.7109 | 6.8202 | 23.7265 |
| 89 | 0.3343 | 0.8800 | 5.6653 | 9.4296 | 43.2346 |
| 90 | 0.3069 | 0.7990 | 5.3328 | 9.2591 | 40.1761 |
| 96 | 0.1915 | 0.4983 | 3.3312 | 5.7944 | 24.5052 |
| 98 | 0.2034 | 0.5215 | 3.6543 | 6.7160 | 20.5485 |
| 103 | 0.3046 | 0.7962 | 5.2427 | 8.9594 | 34.0548 |
| 104 | 0.3172 | 0.8371 | 5.3463 | 8.8168 | 41.7238 |
| 105 | 0.1986 | 0.5224 | 3.3704 | 5.6238 | 22.7911 |
| 107 | 0.0791 | 0.2028 | 1.4213 | 2.6121 | 9.4198 |
| 110 | 0.0949 | 0.2433 | 1.7048 | 3.1331 | 13.0322 |
| 112 | 0.1579 | 0.4048 | 2.8366 | 5.2132 | 21.7315 |
| 113 | 0.2653 | 0.6803 | 4.7666 | 8.7604 | 30.1369 |
| 118 | 0.1547 | 0.3967 | 2.7799 | 5.1090 | 19.2557 |
| 120 | 0.0130 | 0.0334 | 0.2342 | 0.4305 | 1.7799 |
| 122 | 0.1987 | 0.5095 | 3.5701 | 6.5614 | 27.1768 |
| 123 | 0.1881 | 0.4822 | 3.3787 | 6.2095 | 23.0421 |
| 126 | 0.2239 | 0.5739 | 4.0215 | 7.3910 | 30.6641 |
| 127 | 0.2239 | 0.5739 | 4.0215 | 7.3910 | 30.6641 |
| 130 | 0.1345 | 0.3449 | 2.4167 | 4.4416 | 15.8823 |
| 132 | 0.0417 | 0.1069 | 0.7493 | 1.3771 | 4.6320 |
| 136 | 0.1997 | 0.5120 | 3.5879 | 6.5940 | 27.2577 |
| 137 | 0.1997 | 0.5120 | 3.5879 | 6.5940 | 27.2577 |
| 138 | 0.1169 | 0.2998 | 2.1007 | 3.8607 | 13.1693 |
| 140 | 0.0611 | 0.1566 | 1.0975 | 2.0171 | 6.8427 |
| 142 | 0.1919 | 0.5095 | 3.1917 | 5.1456 | 16.2720 |
| 146 | 0.0392 | 0.1004 | 0.7038 | 1.2935 | 4.4175 |
| 148 | 0.0858 | 0.2200 | 1.5412 | 2.8326 | 9.7570 |
| 150 | 0.0984 | 0.2524 | 1.7684 | 3.2500 | 10.0339 |
| 152 | 0.0347 | 0.0888 | 0.6225 | 1.1440 | 3.5320 |
| 155 | 0.0661 | 0.1695 | 1.1874 | 2.1823 | 10.9344 |
| 157 | 0.1154 | 0.2959 | 2.0734 | 3.8106 | 15.4768 |
| 158 | 0.0260 | 0.0667 | 0.4673 | 0.8588 | 2.3007 |
| 160 | 0.0948 | 0.2430 | 1.7025 | 3.1289 | 8.3267 |
| 165 | 0.0345 | 0.0886 | 0.6206 | 1.1407 | 5.2944 |
| 167 | 0.0188 | 0.0481 | 0.3372 | 0.6197 | 2.8847 |
| 168 | 0.1026 | 0.2632 | 1.8440 | 3.3889 | 13.7125 |
| 171 | 0.0113 | 0.0289 | 0.2023 | 0.3718 | 1.4633 |
| 173 | 0.0328 | 0.0840 | 0.5884 | 1.0814 | 4.2592 |
| 174 | 0.0197 | 0.0505 | 0.3538 | 0.6501 | 3.4222 |
| 182 | 0.0409 | 0.1048 | 0.7343 | 1.3495 | 5.3014 |
| 183 | 0.0272 | 0.0698 | 0.4894 | 0.8995 | 3.7559 |
| 192 | 0.0061 | 0.0156 | 0.1093 | 0.2009 | 0.7839 |
| 194 | 0.0278 | 0.0713 | 0.4999 | 0.9187 | 3.5880 |
| 195 | 0.0164 | 0.0421 | 0.2951 | 0.5424 | 2.9378 |
| Total | 8.6501 | 22.4056 | 152.0287 | 269.7236 | 1,047.8812 |

Table 11. Predicted Freeway Segment Crash Type Distribution (Section 1)

| Element Type | Crash Type | FI Crashes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent FI } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | PDO <br> Crashes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { PDO (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | Total Crashes | Percent <br> Total (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway <br> Segment | Collision with Animal | 9.94 | 0.1 | 102.92 | 0.7 | 112.86 | 0.8 |
| Highway Segment | Collision with Fixed Object | 1,793.65 | 12.2 | 3,349.55 | 22.8 | 5,143.19 | 35.1 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Collision with Other Object | 126.70 | 0.9 | 650.26 | 4.4 | 776.96 | 5.3 |
| Highway Segment | Other Single-vehicle Collision | 516.73 | 3.5 | 500.56 | 3.4 | 1,017.29 | 6.9 |
| Highway Segment | Collision with Parked Vehicle | 37.26 | 0.3 | 74.85 | 0.5 | 112.11 | 0.8 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Total Single Vehicle Crashes | 2,484.28 | 16.9 | 4,678.14 | 31.9 | 7,162.41 | 48.8 |
| Highway Segment | Right-Angle Collision | 77.44 | 0.5 | 90.17 | 0.6 | 167.60 | 1.1 |
| Highway Segment | Head-on Collision | 19.98 | 0.1 | 10.02 | 0.1 | 30.00 | 0.2 |
| Highway Segment | Other Multi-vehicle Collision | 77.44 | 0.5 | 120.22 | 0.8 | 197.66 | 1.3 |
| Highway Segment | Rear-end Collision | 1,873.49 | 12.8 | 3,456.36 | 23.6 | 5,329.85 | 36.3 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Sideswipe, Same Direction Collision | 449.64 | 3.1 | 1,332.45 | 9.1 | 1,782.09 | 12.1 |
| Highway Segment | Total Multiple Vehicle Crashes | 2,497.98 | 17.0 | 5,009.22 | 34.1 | 7,507.21 | 51.2 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Total Highway Segment Crashes | 4,982.26 | 34.0 | 9,687.36 | 66.0 | 14,669.62 | 100.0 |
|  | Total Crashes | 4,982.26 | 34.0 | 9,687.36 | 66.0 | 14,669.62 | 100.0 |

Note: Fatal and Injury Crashes and Property Damage Only Crashes do not necessarily sum up to Total Crashes because the distribution of these three crashes had been derived independently.

Table 12. Predicted Exit Speed Change Lane Crash Type Distribution (Speed Change)

| Element Type | Crash Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { FI } \\ \text { Crashes } \end{gathered}$ | Percent FI <br> (\%) | PDO <br> Crashes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { PDO (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | Total Crashes | Percent <br> Total (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway Segment | Collision with Animal | 0.00 | 0.0 | 3.57 | 0.5 | 3.57 | 0.5 |
| Highway Segment | Collision with Fixed Object | 39.27 | 5.5 | 105.60 | 14.9 | 144.88 | 20.4 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Collision with Other Object | 3.21 | 0.5 | 15.30 | 2.2 | 18.51 | 2.6 |
| Highway Segment | Other Single-vehicle Collision | 9.82 | 1.4 | 11.73 | 1.7 | 21.55 | 3.0 |
| Highway Segment | Collision with Parked Vehicle | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.0 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Total Single Vehicle Crashes | 52.30 | 7.4 | 136.21 | 19.2 | 188.51 | 26.5 |
| Highway Segment | Right-Angle Collision | 2.20 | 0.3 | 6.12 | 0.9 | 8.33 | 1.2 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Head-on Collision | 1.00 | 0.1 | 1.02 | 0.1 | 2.02 | 0.3 |
| Highway Segment | Other Multi-vehicle Collision | 3.21 | 0.5 | 8.16 | 1.1 | 11.37 | 1.6 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Rear-end Collision | 110.00 | 15.5 | 288.24 | 40.6 | 398.24 | 56.0 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Sideswipe, Same Direction Collision | 31.66 | 4.5 | 70.40 | 9.9 | 102.06 | 14.4 |
| Highway Segment | Total Multiple Vehicle Crashes | 148.07 | 20.8 | 373.94 | 52.6 | 522.02 | 73.5 |
| Highway Segment | Total Highway Segment Crashes | 200.37 | 28.2 | 510.15 | 71.8 | 710.52 | 100.0 |
|  | Total Crashes | 200.37 | 28.2 | 510.15 | 71.8 | 710.52 | 100.0 |

Note: Fatal and Injury Crashes and Property Damage Only Crashes do not necessarily sum up to Total Crashes because the distribution of these three crashes had been derived independently.

Table 13. Predicted Entrance Speed Change Lane Crash Type Distribution (Speed Change)

| Element Type | Crash Type | FI <br> Crashes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent FI } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | PDO <br> Crashes | Percent PDO (\%) | Total Crashes | Percent <br> Total (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway Segment | Collision with Animal | 0.00 | 0.0 | 1.12 | 0.1 | 1.12 | 0.1 |
| Highway Segment | Collision with Fixed Object | 51.62 | 6.3 | 72.10 | 8.7 | 123.72 | 15.0 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Collision with Other Object | 5.05 | 0.6 | 20.12 | 2.4 | 25.18 | 3.1 |
| Highway Segment | Other Single-vehicle Collision | 17.83 | 2.2 | 8.94 | 1.1 | 26.77 | 3.2 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Collision with Parked Vehicle | 1.06 | 0.1 | 1.68 | 0.2 | 2.74 | 0.3 |
| Highway Segment | Total Single Vehicle Crashes | 75.56 | 9.2 | 103.96 | 12.6 | 179.53 | 21.8 |
| Highway Segment | Right-Angle Collision | 5.05 | 0.6 | 8.94 | 1.1 | 14.00 | 1.7 |
| Highway <br> Segment | Head-on Collision | 1.06 | 0.1 | 0.56 | 0.1 | 1.62 | 0.2 |
| Highway Segment | Other Multi-vehicle Collision | 4.52 | 0.5 | 8.38 | 1.0 | 12.91 | 1.6 |
| Highway Segment | Rear-end Collision | 144.48 | 17.5 | 296.23 | 35.9 | 440.71 | 53.4 |
| Highway Segment | Sideswipe, Same Direction Collision | 35.39 | 4.3 | 140.85 | 17.1 | 176.24 | 21.4 |
| Highway Segment | Total Multiple Vehicle Crashes | 190.51 | 23.1 | 454.97 | 55.1 | 645.48 | 78.2 |
| Highway Segment | Total Highway Segment Crashes | 266.07 | 32.3 | 558.93 | 67.7 | 825.00 | 100.0 |
|  | Total Crashes | 266.07 | 32.3 | 558.93 | 67.7 | 825.00 | 100.0 |

Note: Fatal and Injury Crashes and Property Damage Only Crashes do not necessarily sum up to Total Crashes because the distribution of these three crashes had been derived independently.

## Table 14. Evaluation Message

| Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Message |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $88+50.570$ | 92+73.870 | for segment \#9 (88+50.570 to $92+73.870$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 114+92.280 | 116+12.410 | for segment \#11 (114+92.280 to 116+12.410), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 159+52.850 | 160+55.670 | for segment \#13 (159+52.850 to 160+55.670), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 182+04.980 | 190+78.150 | for segment \#15 (182+04.980 to 190+78.150), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 234+73.270 | 235+38.500 | for segment \#17 (234+73.270 to $235+38.500$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 376+84.690 | 377+09.150 | for segment \#24 (376+84.690 to 377+09.150), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| $401+43.300$ | 410+45.320 | for segment \#26 ( $401+43.300$ to $410+45.320$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| $430+10.320$ | 431+12.710 | for segment \#28 ( $430+10.320$ to $431+12.710$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 444+62.420 | 446+92.250 | for segment \#30 ( $444+62.420$ to $446+92.250$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| $466+93.140$ | 473+45.480 | for segment \#32 ( $466+93.140$ to $473+45.480$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 473+45.480 | 487+68.410 | for segment \#33 ( $473+45.480$ to $487+68.410$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 487+68.410 | 494+75.370 | for segment \#34 ( $487+68.410$ to $494+75.370$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 518+49.370 | 522+06.730 | for segment \#38 (518+49.370 to 522+06.730), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 590+45.470 | 624+72.020 | for segment \#42 (590+45.470 to 624+72.020) , Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 624+72.020 | 628+07.980 | for segment \#44 (624+72.020 to $628+07.980$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| $651+65.010$ | $660+88.730$ | for segment \#49 (651+65.010 to 660+88.730) , Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| $660+88.730$ | 667+93.530 | for segment \#50 ( $660+88.730$ to $667+93.530$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| $761+78.560$ | 773+07.600 | for segment \#52 ( $761+78.560$ to $773+07.600$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 773+07.600 | 806+52.740 | for segment \#54 ( $773+07.600$ to $806+52.740$ ), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| $806+52.740$ | 807+42.600 | for segment \#56 ( $806+52.740$ to $807+42.600$ ), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 807+42.600 | 813+44.180 | for segment \#58 (807+42.600 to 813+44.180), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 872+94.110 | 873+42.940 | for segment \#60 ( $872+94.110$ to $873+42.940$ ), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |


| Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Message |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 921+17.280 | 946+88.890 | for segment \#64 ( $921+17.280$ to $946+88.890$ ), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| $946+88.890$ | 983+35.310 | for segment \#66 ( $946+88.890$ to $983+35.310$ ), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 983+35.310 | 986+82.810 | for segment \#67 ( $983+35.310$ to $986+82.810$ ), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1075+52.580 | 1079+97.540 | for segment \#78 (1075+52.580 to 1079+97.540), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1116+60.530 | 1118+47.190 | for segment \#83 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $180,782 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2031 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#83 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $183,475 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2032 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| $1116+60.530$ | 1118+47.190 | for segment \#83 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $186,167 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2033 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| $1116+60.530$ | 1118+47.190 | for segment \#83 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $188,860 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2034 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#83 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $191,552 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2035 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#83 ( $1116+60.530$ to 1118+47.190) , traffic volume ( $194,245 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2036 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| $1116+60.530$ | 1118+47.190 | for segment \#83 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $196,937 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2037 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#83 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $199,630 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2038 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#83 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $202,322 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2039 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| $1116+60.530$ | 1118+47.190 | for segment \#83 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $205,015 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2040 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#83 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190) , traffic volume ( $207,707 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2041 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#83 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190) , traffic volume ( $210,400 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2042 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 F |
| 1173+14.860 | 1184+67.050 | for segment \#93 (1173+14.860 to 1184+67.050), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1184+67.050 | 1189+27.220 | for segment \#94 (1184+67.050 to 1189+27.220), Freeway Segment of type Eight-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1189+27.220 | 1229+20.230 | for segment \#95 (1189+27.220 to 1229+20.230), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| $1229+20.230$ | $1246+54.550$ | for segment \#97 (1229+20.230 to 1246+54.550), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 1246+54.550 | 1257+20.070 | for segment \#99 (1246+54.550 to 1257+20.070), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 1257+20.070 | 1268+72.230 | for segment \#100 (1257+20.070 to 1268+72.230), Freeway Segment of type Eight-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| $1384+38.980$ | 1388+36.180 | for segment \#114 (1384+38.980 to 1388+36.180), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1407+00.830 | 1407+99.290 | for segment \#116 (1407+00.830 to 1407+99.290 ), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1407+99.290 | $1458+80.350$ | for segment \#117 (1407+99.290 to 1458+80.350), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| $1458+80.350$ | 1459+28.940 | for segment \#119 (1458+80.350 to 1459+28.940), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1459+28.940 | 1485+21.570 | for segment \#121 (1459+28.940 to 1485+21.570), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1524+23.110 | 1548+51.750 | for segment \#129 (1524+23.110 to 1548+51.750 ), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |


| Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Message |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1567+03.620 | 1569+20.770 | for segment \#134 ( $1567+03.620$ to $1569+20.770$ ), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1569+20.770 | 1597+23.110 | for segment \#135 (1569+20.770 to 1597+23.110), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1597+23.110 | 1600+07.160 | for segment \#139 (1597+23.110 to 1600+07.160), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1600+07.160 | 1622+13.430 | for segment \#141 (1600+07.160 to 1622+13.430), Freeway Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1622+13.430 | 1622+60.330 | for segment \#143 ( $1622+13.430$ to 1622+60.330) , Freeway Segment of type Eight-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 1622+60.330 | 1693+03.680 | for segment \#144 (1622+60.330 to 1693+03.680), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 1693+03.680 | 1695+79.250 | for segment \#145 (1693+03.680 to 1695+79.250), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| $1758+35.390$ | 1765+64.940 | for segment \#149 (1758+35.390 to $1765+64.940)$, Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 1823+66.040 | 1829+76.930 | for segment \#159 (1823+66.040 to 1829+76.930), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 1848+64.940 | 1848+81.480 | for segment \#162 (1848+64.940 to 1848+81.480), Freeway Segment of type Eight-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Ten-lane Freeway |
| 2027+95.160 | 2037+89.330 | for segment \#175 (2027+95.160 to 2037+89.330) , Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| $2126+91.660$ | 2127+16.900 | for segment \#177 ( $2126+91.660$ to $2127+16.900$ ), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 2163+05.440 | 2163+09.560 | for segment \#179 (2163+05.440 to 2163+09.560), Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 2577+64.980 | 2578+84.390 | for segment \#185 (2577+64.980 to 2578+84.390) , Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 2652+16.980 | 2653+16.980 | for segment \#187 (2652+16.980 to 2653+16.980) , Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 2905+85.060 | 2919+19.840 | for segment \#189 (2905+85.060 to 2919+19.840) , Freeway Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway and Eight-lane Freeway |
| 487+68.410 | 494+75.370 | for segment \#35 ( $487+68.410$ to $494+75.370$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 590+45.470 | 592+86.090 | for segment \#43 (590+45.470 to $592+86.090$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 624+72.020 | 628+07.980 | for segment \#45 ( $624+72.020$ to $628+07.980$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| $761+78.560$ | 769+28.560 | for segment \#53 (761+78.560 to 769+28.560), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 799+92.600 | 806+52.740 | for segment \#55 ( $799+92.600$ to $806+52.740$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| $806+52.740$ | 807+42.600 | for segment \#57 (806+52.740 to 807+42.600), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 939+38.890 | 946+88.890 | for segment \#65 ( $939+38.890$ to $946+88.890$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |


| Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Message |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 983+35.310 | 986+82.810 | for segment \#68 ( $983+35.310$ to $986+82.810$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1075+52.580 | 1079+97.540 | for segment \#79 ( $1075+52.580$ to 1079+97.540), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| $1116+60.530$ | 1118+47.190 | for segment \#84 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190), traffic volume ( $180,782 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2031 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#84 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190), traffic volume ( $183,475 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2032 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#84 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190), traffic volume ( $186,167 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2033 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#84 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190), traffic volume ( $188,860 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2034 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| 1116+60.530 | 1118+47.190 | for segment \#84 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190), traffic volume ( $191,552 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2035 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#84 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190) , traffic volume ( $194,245 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2036 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#84 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190), traffic volume ( $196,937 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2037 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| 1116+60.530 | 1118+47.190 | for segment \#84 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190), traffic volume ( $199,630 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2038 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#84 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190) , traffic volume ( $202,322 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2039 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| 1116+60.530 | 1118+47.190 | for segment \#84 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190), traffic volume ( $205,015 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2040 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| 1116+60.530 | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#84 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190), traffic volume ( $207,707 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2041 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#84 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190), traffic volume ( $210,400 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2042 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| 1116+60.530 | 1118+47.190 | for segment \#85 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $180,782 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2031 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | 1118+47.190 | for segment \#85 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190), traffic volume ( $183,475 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2032 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | 1118+47.190 | for segment \#85 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190), traffic volume ( $186,167 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2033 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#85 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $188,860 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2034 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#85 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190) , traffic volume ( $191,552 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2035 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#85 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $194,245 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2036 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#85 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $196,937 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2037 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| 1116+60.530 | 1118+47.190 | for segment \#85 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $199,630 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2038 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#85 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $202,322 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2039 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#85 (1116+60.530 to 1118+47.190), traffic volume ( $205,015 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2040 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#85 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $207,707 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2041 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| $1116+60.530$ | $1118+47.190$ | for segment \#85 ( $1116+60.530$ to $1118+47.190$ ), traffic volume ( $210,400 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for 2042 exceeds model limit ( $180,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ ) for reliable results for segment type 6 SC |
| 1221+70.230 | 1229+20.230 | for segment \#96 (1221+70.230 to 1229+20.230), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1239+04.550 | 1246+54.550 | for segment \#98 (1239+04.550 to 1246+54.550), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1407+99.290 | 1415+49.290 | for segment \#118 ( $1407+99.290$ to $1415+49.290$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| $1458+80.350$ | 1459+28.940 | for segment \#120 ( $1458+80.350$ to $1459+28.940$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1459+28.940 | 1466+30.350 | for segment \#122 (1459+28.940 to 1466+30.350), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1459+28.940 | 1466+78.940 | for segment \#123 (1459+28.940 to 1466+78.940), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |


| Start Location (Sta. ft) | End Location (Sta. ft) | Message |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1542+57.160 | 1548+51.750 | for segment \#130 ( $1542+57.160$ to $1548+51.750$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1569+20.770 | 1576+70.770 | for segment \#136 (1569+20.770 to $1576+70.770$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1589+73.110 | 1597+23.110 | for segment \#137 ( $1589+73.110$ to $1597+23.110$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1592+57.160 | 1597+23.110 | for segment \#138 ( $1592+57.160$ to $1597+23.110$ ), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1597+23.110 | 1600+07.160 | for segment \#140 (1597+23.110 to 1600+07.160), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1614+63.430 | 1622+13.430 | for segment \#142 (1614+63.430 to 1622+13.430), Speed Change Segment of type Nine-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change and Ten-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1693+03.680 | 1695+79.250 | for segment \#146 (1693+03.680 to 1695+79.250), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1760+10.210 | 1765+64.940 | for segment \#150 (1760+10.210 to 1765+64.940), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |
| 1823+66.040 | 1829+76.930 | for segment \#160 (1823+66.040 to 1829+76.930), Speed Change Segment of type Seven-lane Freeway Speed Change is using unbalanced lane processing with types Six-lane Freeway Speed Change and Eight-lane Freeway Speed Change |

## Appendix G

## Technology Report



## Reimagine l-10 Corridor Study

## Technology Report

CSJ: 2121-01-095

September 2019

## Table of Contents

1.Introduction ..... 1-1
1.1 Defining the Study Area ..... 1-1
1.2 Study Objectives. ..... 1-1
2.Corridor Characteristics ..... 2-1
2.1 Corridor Configuration Overview ..... 2-1
2.2 Existing Traffic Conditions ..... 2-2
(a) Traffic Volume (AADT) ..... 2-2
(b) Travel Patterns ..... 2-3
(c) Mix of Traffic (Commuter, Local, Long-Distance, Trucks) ..... 2-6
2.3 Summary of Current Corridor Technologies ..... 2-7
(a) Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Cameras ..... 2-7
(b) Dynamic Message Signs ..... 2-8
(c) Vehicle Detection Sensors ..... 2-9
(d) Traveler Information Systems ..... 2-10
(i) Trip Planning Application (Mobile Devices) ..... 2-11
(ii) 511 ..... 2-11
(e) Existing Communications Coverage ..... 2-11
3.Emerging Transportation Technologies. ..... 3-1
3.1 Enabling Technologies ..... 3-1
3.2 Safety Technologies ..... 3-2
(a) Autonomous Vehicles ..... 3-2
(i) Passenger Vehicles ..... 3-8
(ii) Transit Vehicles ..... 3-10
(A) Heavy Duty Vehicles (Platooning) ..... 3-11
(b) Connected Vehicles ..... 3-11
(i) Dedicated Short Range Communications ..... 3-12
(A) V2I Safety Applications ..... 3-13
(B) V2V Safety Applications ..... 3-14
(C) Mobility Applications ..... 3-14
(ii) 5th Generation Mobile Networks ..... 3-15
(c) 3.2.3 5 G versus DSRC ..... 3-17
3.3 Monitoring and Detection ..... 3-17
(a) Camera Technology Improvements (infrared, auto traffic classification and counting) ..... 3-18
(b) Bluetooth and WiFi ..... 3-19
(c) RWIS ..... 3-20
(d) Radar ..... 3-20
(e) Laser and LIDAR Systems ..... 3-20
(f) Magnetometers ..... 3-21
(g) Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) ..... 3-21
3.4 Operational Optimization ..... 3-21
(a) Active Freeway Management ..... 3-22
(i) Queue Warning Systems ..... 3-22
(ii) Ramp metering. ..... 3-22
(iii) Dynamic Speed/Lane Control ..... 3-23
(iv) Active Arterial Management ..... 3-23
(v) Adaptive Traffic Signal Controls ..... 3-23
(vi) Decision Support System ..... 3-24
(b) Transit Management ..... 3-24
(i) Bus-on-Shoulder ..... 3-24
(ii) Arterial Transit Signal Priority/Preemption. ..... 3-24
(iii) Dynamic Transit Dispatch. ..... 3-25
3.5 Mode/Travel Demand Change ..... 3-25
4.Federal and State Technology Programs and Initiatives ..... 4-1
4.1 FHWA Office of Operations Congestion Initiative ..... 4-1
(a) Urban Partnership Agreements ..... 4-1
(b) Integrated Corridor Management ..... 4-1
(i) Relevance to Technology ..... 4-2
(ii) Lessons Learned ..... 4-3
4.2 Smart City ..... 4-3
4.3 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality. ..... 4-5
4.4 Connected Vehicle Pilot Deployment Program ..... 4-5
4.5 U.S. DOT Automated Driving System Demonstration Grants ..... 4-7
4.6 Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Integrated Mobility Innovation ..... 4-8
4.7 State Technology Programs ..... 4-8
(a) Road X ..... 4-8
(b) Road to Tomorrow ..... 4-8
(c) California PATH ..... 4-9
(d) I-95 Corridor Coalition ..... 4-9
5.Technology Assessment and Recommendations ..... 5-1
5.1 Enhancements to Existing ITS Technologies ..... 5-1
(a) Power and Communications Upgrades ..... 5-1
(b) Improvements to Closed Circuit Television Cameras ..... 5-1
(c) Improvements to Dynamic Message Signs ..... 5-2
(d) Integrated Trip Planning Applications ..... 5-2
(e) Streetlight Improvements ..... 5-2
5.2 Investments for Emerging Technologies ..... 5-2
(a) Autonomous and Connected Vehicle Technology ..... 5-2
(i) Establishing a Baseline Connected Vehicle Corridor ..... 5-3
(ii) Facilitating Commercial Vehicle Movements ..... 5-5
(b) Dynamic Lane Assignment ..... 5-6
(c) Truck Parking and Port of Entry (POE) Reservation System ..... 5-7
(d) Speed Harmonization and Queue Warning ..... 5-7
6.Summary and Conclusions ..... 6-1
6.1 5G 6-1
6.2 Electrification Corridor ..... 6-2
6.3 I-10 Rest Area Electric Vehicle Charging Station Pilot ..... 6-3
6.4 I-10 HOV EV Lanes Pilot ..... 6-3
6.5 Install Charging Stations at Major Area Employers along the I-10 Corridor Pilot ..... 6-3
6.6 UAS Incident Management. ..... 6-3
6.7 Truck Platooning ..... 6-5
6.8 Drayage Operations ..... 6-6
6.9 Border Operations ..... 6-6
6.10 Long Haul Trucking ..... 6-6

## List of Figures

Figure 1. l-10 Study Limits ..... 1-1
Figure 2. I-10 Segments ..... 2-1
Table 1. Overview of I-10 Segment Characteristics ..... 2-2
Table 2. I-10 Westbound Travel Volumes ..... 2-2
Table 3. I-10 Eastbound Traffic Volumes ..... 2-3
Figure 3. I-10 Segment 1 Local Traffic Patterns ..... 2-4
Figure 4. l-10 Segment 2 Local Traffic Patterns ..... 2-5
Figure 5. l-10 Segment 3 Local Traffic Patterns ..... 2-5
Figure 6. l-10 Segment 4 Local Traffic Patterns ..... 2-6
Figure 7. I-10 Local and Through Traffic Distribution ..... 2-6
Figure 8. Map of Existing CCTV Locations ..... 2-8
Figure 9. Map of Existing DMS Locations ..... 2-9
Figure 10. Locations of Existing Microwave Vehicle Detectors ..... 2-10
Figure 11. Screenshot of TxDOT's DriveTexas ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Traveler Information Portal ..... 2-11
Figure 12. Existing communication coverage in the El Paso region. ..... 2-12
Figure 13. Sensors and Levels of Automation for Autonomous Vehicles ..... 3-4
Figure 14. Operating Administrations under AV 3.0 ..... 3-6
Figure 15. Autonomous Vehicle Sales and Fleet Projections in Published Literature ..... 3-9
Figure 16. Technology Adoption Rates of the Past Century ..... 3-10
Figure 17. Estimated Adoption Rate for Level 3 and Above Autonomous Passenger Vehicles ..... 3-10
Figure 18. Components of a DSRC System ..... 3-13
Figure 19. Video Cameras are Commonly Used for Vehicle Counting and Classification ..... 3-19
Figure 21. RWIS Platform ${ }^{18}$ ..... 3-19
Figure 20. Typical Bluetooth/Wi-Fi Roadside Sensor ${ }^{17}$ ..... 3-19
Figure 22. Typical Radar Device ${ }^{19}$ ..... 3-20
Figure 23. In-Ground Wireless Magnetometer for Vehicle Detection. ..... 3-21
Figure 24. Illustration of Ramp Metering ..... 3-23
Figure 25. Illustration of Adaptive Traffic Signals ${ }^{23}$ ..... 3-24
Figure 26. US DOT Smart City Vision Elements ..... 4-4
List of Tables
Table 1. Overview of I-10 Segment Characteristics ..... 2-2
Table 2. I-10 Westbound Travel Volumes ..... 2-2
Table 3. I-10 Eastbound Traffic Volumes ..... 2-3
Table 4. Proposed RSE Locations along I-10 Corridor ..... 5-4
Table 5. RSE Installation and Operation Costs for Recommended Locations ..... 5-5

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Defining the Study Area

Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) in coordination with, El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and City of El Paso is conducting a study of the Interstate Highway 10 (I-10) Corridor from the New Mexico Stateline to FM 3380 (Aguilera International Highway) (Figure 1). The study's purpose is to analyze current and future transportation needs for the El Paso I-10 Corridor.


Figure 1. I-10 Study Limits

### 1.2 Study Objectives

The overall objective of this study is to conduct a corridor feasibility and planning analysis of current and future transportation needs for the approximate 55 miles of the I-10 Corridor in El Paso from the New Mexico State Line to FM 3380 (M.F. Aguilera Rd).

The objective of this technical memorandum is to provide an assessment and recommendations for transportation technology options within this corridor as part of the overall feasibility and planning analysis.

## 2. Corridor Characteristics

This corridor is highly traveled by both passenger and commercial vehicles. When considering transportation technology options for the corridor, it is important to have an understanding and a sense of the current traffic conditions along the corridor. One important component is to understand the utilization of the corridor by passenger vehicles versus commercial vehicle or truck traffic as there could potentially be different technology options that are more suitable for one versus the other. Much of the traffic conditions and future traffic projections for the corridor have been documented as part of the overall project with only a brief summary included below.

### 2.1 Corridor Configuration Overview

To better evaluate the elements of the corridor, the corridor was broken into four segments (Figure 2), or context areas, to identify unique characteristics and needs specific to that segment which may not be applicable to the entire project area. The four segments are as follows:

- Segment 1: Northern Gateway (New Mexico State Line to Executive Center Boulevard)
- Segment 2: Downtown (Executive Center Boulevard to US 54)
- Segment 3: Airport (US 54 to Loop 375)
- Segment 4: Southern Gateway (Loop 375 to FM 3380).


Figure 2. I-10 Segments
HDR was given a travel demand model for the state of Texas created by Alliance Transportation Group, Inc. for TxDOT. The Texas Statewide Analysis Model Version 3 (SAM-V3) model includes scenarios for the year 2010, 2020, 2030, and 2040. The SAM model is based on the four-step model and is a multimodal travel demand model that focuses on forecasting traffic volumes for passenger and freight transportation, rail ridership, freight rail tonnage, and train and rail projections. The interface includes the model steps of Network Update, Trip Generation, Freight Trip Generation, Trip Distribution, Freight Trip Distribution, Mode Choice, Freight Mode Choice, Assignment, Optional Assignment, and Reports.

### 2.2 Existing Traffic Conditions

| I-10 <br> Segment | Length <br> $(\mathrm{mi})$ | Speed <br> Limit <br> $(\mathrm{mph})$ | Average <br> Travel Speed <br> $(\mathrm{mph})$ | Speed Limit - <br> Average Speed <br> $(\mathrm{mph})$ | Ramp <br> Density <br> (per mile) | Crashed (per <br> mile - 5 yr avg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Segment 1 | 16.3 | 75 | 61 | 14 | 1 | 12 |
| Segment 2 | 7 | 60 | 35 | 25 | 2.1 | 27 |
| Segment 3 | 12.3 | 60 | 49 | 11 | 1.9 | 25 |
| Segment 4 | 22.5 | 75 | 71 | 4 | 0.5 | 4 |

gives an overview of the current characteristics of each of the four segments of I-10, including the segment length, speed limit, average speed, ramp density, and crashes per mile. Segment 2 is the shortest, has the largest difference between speed limit and average speed, and the highest ramp density and crashes per mile. On the contrary, Segment 4 is the longest and has the lowest ramp density, crashes per mile, and difference between speed limit and average speed.

Table 1. Overview of I-10 Segment Characteristics

| I-10 <br> Segment | Length <br> $(\mathrm{mi})$ | Speed <br> Limit <br> $(\mathrm{mph})$ | Average <br> Travel Speed <br> $(\mathrm{mph})$ | Speed Limit - <br> Average Speed <br> (mph) | Ramp <br> Density <br> (per mile) | Crashed (per <br> mile-5 yr avg) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Segment 1 | 16.3 | 75 | 61 | 14 | 1 | 12 |
| Segment 2 | 7 | 60 | 35 | 25 | 2.1 | 27 |
| Segment 3 | 12.3 | 60 | 49 | 11 | 1.9 | 25 |
| Segment 4 | 22.5 | 75 | 71 | 4 | 0.5 | 4 |

(a) Traffic Volume (AADT)

Traffic data for the four segments of the I-10 mainline was collected for four time periods. The time periods reflect those used in the MPO's travel demand model: 6:30-8:30AM, 8:30AM-2:30PM, 2:30PM-6:30PM, and 6:30PM-6:30AM. Volumes were captured by vehicle class and summarized into car and truck traffic. Tables 2 and 3 show the traffic volume and percentage of truck traffic by time of day for the westbound and eastbound segments of l-10. The values are shaded to reflect the magnitude of the value with dark shading representing the highest values. The morning and midday volumes are the highest across all segments of the corridor while Segment 4 experiences the lowest volume and the highest percentage of truck traffic.

Table 2. I-10 Westbound Travel Volumes

| Time of Day | Segment 1 EB |  | Segment 2 EB |  | Segment 3 EB |  | Segment 4 EB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Volume (veh/hr) | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Trucks } \end{gathered}$ | Volume (veh/hr) | \% Trucks | Volume (veh/hr) | \% Trucks | Volume (veh/hr) | \% Trucks |
| 6:30 AM to 8:30 AM | 2642 | 11\% | 6935 | 3\% | 6160 | 6\% | 1120 | 14\% |
| 8:30 AM to 2:30 PM | 2240 | 18\% | 5324 | 5\% | 4539 | 11\% | 895 | 29\% |
| 2:20 PM to 6:30 PM | 1292 | 14\% | 2395 | 5\% | 2354 | 10\% | 478 | 26\% |
| 6:30 PM to 6:30 AM | 1454 | 13\% | 2203 | 5\% | 2432 | 9\% | 522 | 29\% |

Table 3. I-10 Eastbound Traffic Volumes

| Time of Day | Segment 1 EB |  | Segment 2 EB |  | Segment 3 EB |  | Segment 4 EB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Volume (veh/hr) | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Trucks } \end{gathered}$ | Volume (veh/hr) | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Trucks } \end{gathered}$ | Volume (veh/hr) | \% Trucks | Volume (veh/hr) | \% Trucks |
| 6:30 AM to 8:30 AM | 2415 | 7\% | 5560 | 4\% | 4145 | 6\% | 700 | 21\% |
| 8:30 AM to 2:30 PM | 2319 | 14\% | 6172 | 8\% | 4952 | 10\% | 699 | 36\% |
| 2:20 PM to 6:30 PM | 1285 | 13\% | 3795 | 6\% | 2920 | 9\% | 436 | 32\% |
| 6:30 PM to 6:30 AM | 1377 | 14\% | 3742 | 7\% | 3146 | 8\% | 541 | 31\% |

(b) Travel Patterns

The travel patterns for each segment of the corridor were studied by tracking destinations of vehicles traveling on I-10. Most heavily used eastbound exits include Old Hueco Tanks Road for cars and Horizon Boulevard for both cars and trucks. On the Westbound segment, the Sunland Park Drive and Horizon Boulevard exits experience the heaviest traffic of passenger cars and trucks. Figures 3 through 6 show the breakdown of the exits used by local car and truck traffic as well as the percentages of through traffic for each segment.


Figure 3. l-10 Segment 1 Local Traffic Patterns
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Figure 4. l-10 Segment 2 Local Traffic Patterns


Figure 5. I-10 Segment 3 Local Traffic Patterns
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Figure 6. l-10 Segment 4 Local Traffic Patterns
(c) Mix of Traffic (Commuter, Local, Long-Distance, Trucks)

Traffic along the l-10 corridor is made up of local and long-distance passenger car and truck traffic. Figure 7 shows the distribution of local and through traffic for both vehicle categories on l-10 Eastbound and Westbound. As expected, more through traffic was observed for trucks than cars in both directions.


Figure 7. I-10 Local and Through Traffic Distribution

### 2.3 Summary of Current Corridor Technologies

TXDOT EI Paso district has been implementing numerous ITS technologies and solutions on the l-10 corridor. The current deployment includes fiber optic communication, video surveillance, speed monitoring and data sharing with other agencies. The current breakdown of ITS technology deployed throughout the I-10 corridor is as follows:

- CCTV Cameras: 38 cameras currently monitor 37 miles of the corridor starting at the New Mexico state line and end at Horizon Blvd.
- Dynamic Message Signs (DMS): 25 signs provide information to the traveling public beginning at Westway Blvd and ending at Horizon Blvd.
- Vehicle Detectors: 141 detectors are stationed on 37 miles of the corridor starting at the New Mexico state line and end at Horizon Blvd.
- Lane Control Signals: 34 LCS stations from Country Club Rd. to Horizon Blvd.
- Highway Advisory Radio: 9 controllers and 8 beacons provide information to tune in to a preset station on the travelers radio.

The data received from these devices is transmitted to the TxDOT TransVista TMC and shared with the City of El Paso's TMC and 911 emergency center which includes Police, Fire and EMS.

The utilization of traditional ITS technologies can facilitate a smoother transition into AV/CV. The existing ITS infrastructure can support the AV/CV hardware by mounting to the camera/detector poles and utilizing the same sources for power and communications backhaul as the existing ITS systems. This coordination is key to providing seamless implementation of future advancements in connected vehicles.

With expanding technology and ITS infrastructures, being able to provide a system that is can adjust with additional networked devices is critical. To facilitate new technologies, TxDOT should ensure that legacy ITS technology is upgraded to include Ethernet based IP networking, has dedicated power, and has expansion capabilities so that new technologies that require Power-over-Ethernet (POE) and a communications backhaul such as Dedicated Short Range Communications (DSRC) or 5G microcells can be readily added.
(a) Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Cameras

CCTV cameras provide visual traffic monitoring and incident verification that can be shared with various agencies and the traveling public. There are two variations of CCTV camera technology, analog and digital, which is typically implemented through an Internet Protocol (IP) communications bridge. As technology has progressed, analog video feeds are no longer the preferred technology as digital, IP based technology has the following advantages:

- Resolution: High definition digital IP cameras provide higher zoom-in capabilities and details for traffic incident management.
- Resource Sharing: Video feeds are already digitized at the camera, providing that video to other agencies and the traveling public will be easier and not require extra hardware that an analog camera system would typically use.
- Less Hardware: Analog systems require two fiber optic strands per camera, however with digital, IP based systems multiple cameras can utilize the same fiber optic strands. This enables the use of the fiber optic strands for other purposes in addition to reducing the amount of equipment required at the local cabinet, satellite cabinets and TMC.
- Expandability: Because the images and video are digital, they can be readily analyzed by computer software for image recognition to enable vehicle detection, incident detection, vehicle classifications, and vehicle counts (see Section 3.3.a).

Currently, the existing CCTV cameras along the corridor are analog-based (see Figure 8). As funding and resources permit, these systems should be replaced with digitalII based systems. Future camera deployments should be digital-IP based.


Figure 8. Map of Existing CCTV Locations
(b) Dynamic Message Signs

DMS technology has progressed in the past years and more agencies are switching to a highresolution full color LED. A potential benefit of this technology is the customization of the message
to include MUTCD compliant graphics. These graphics are thought to do a better job of getting the attention of the traveling public over traditional monochrome three-line text. This in turn, could lead to a faster response time to avoid incidents and decrease travel delays. The current signs on the corridor are character and line matrix amber LED (see Figure 9 for locations). DMS are a key part of Active Traffic Management applications as the signs can provide lane specific information (i.e. dynamic lane assignments), assist with lane closures due to planned roadwork, and incident management. The Lane Use DMS would allow more detailed information over each lane during an incident vs. the existing lane control signals which only provide open/closed status. Connected and autonomous vehicles would also be able to receive the information from these signs and display them internally to provide instant updates to the passengers.


Figure 9. Map of Existing DMS Locations
(c) Vehicle Detection Sensors

Microwave vehicle detection provides accurate speed data to the TMC and also the data can be shared with both public and private partners such as Google and Waze. These sensors are commonly
used in conjunction with the CCTV cameras to identify incidents. In addition, these types of sensors can be placed to monitor queues within on-ramps or on arterials for incident detection and traffic queues. Currently, a number of radar detection devices offer built in cameras for detection lane verification and to offer additional video coverage. El Paso is moving to these types of detectors, which will provide more ways to improve traffic management.

El Paso also utilizes Bluetooth technology for vehicle detection. The Bluetooth sensors are installed in the same locations as the microwave sensors and also provide vehicle detection and speeds. However, because the Bluetooth sensors at multiple locations can be linked (see Section 3.3.b below) these sensors can be used to estimate travel times and to provide origin/destination information.


Figure 10. Locations of Existing Microwave Vehicle Detectors ${ }^{1}$
(d) Traveler Information Systems

TxDOT's Travel Information Division supports a number of information systems that provide real-time information on the conditions of roadways throughout Texas, including the I-10 Corridor. One such

[^20]tool is the DriveTexas ${ }^{\top M}$ portal that is available as a web or mobile application that provides historical and current traffic conditions throughout Texas. Information such as road closures, traffic, and construction are displayed as information layers on an interactive map (Figure 11).


Figure 11. Screenshot of TxDOT’s DriveTexas ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Traveler Information Portal
(i) Trip Planning Application (Mobile Devices)

Within El Paso, there are a number of different trip planning applications and tools. One in particular is SunMetro's Trip Planner tool. This tool enables trip planning for the area's mass transit system, which is an alternative mode for travel on I-10 within the city. However, this trip planning application does not integrate with traffic conditions or other systems such as carpooling or ridesharing/ridesourcing.

$$
\text { (ii) } 511
$$

There is not currently a 511 system in the El Paso area. The only 511 system currently available in the state of Texas is in the Dallas-Fort Worth metro area.
(e) Existing Communications Coverage

Figure 12 below shows the existing cellular coverage of all providers in the El Paso region. The I-10 Corridor is well covered by existing cellular communications providers.


Figure 12. Existing communication coverage in the El Paso region

## 3. Emerging Transportation Technologies

There are a number of technologies that have been developed and deployed during the past several years. The rapid pace of technological advancement in transportation promises to bring about a sea change for transportation owners and the traveling public. Key technological improvements include not just the evolution and adaptation of autonomous and connected vehicles, but other transportation technologies as well. These technologies include adaptive traffic signals, smart streetlights, smart parking, integrated multi-modal trip planning applications, integrated payment systems, ridesourcing, and dynamic transit service. This section summarizes these technologies, followed by a discussion of potential adoption rates.

There are five broad categories of technologies that are emerging within the transportation market. These technology categories include:

1. Enabling Technologies: These technologies are fundamental elements for other technological components. These include technologies such as advancements in fiber optic technologies, wireless communications backhaul technologies, Power-Over-Ethernet (POE), etc.
2. Safety: These technologies are focused directly upon improving the safety of a component(s) of the transportation system. While several technologies may indirectly improve safety by reducing congestion, these technologies will have a direct and measureable improvement on safety.
3. Monitoring and Detection: These technologies involve various methods and approaches for detecting vehicles and/or incidents as well as monitoring roadway conditions.
4. Operational Optimization: These technologies include the set of technologies that are designed and deployed with the express purpose of improving the management of the transportation system through optimizing vehicle travel throughout a corridor.
5. Mode/Travel Demand Change: These technologies facilitate the use of modes other than personally-owned vehicles (POVs) for travel. They also include those technologies that are used to shift transportation demand from peak congestion periods.

### 3.1 Enabling Technologies

In many respects, enabling technologies are not necessarily new. For example, TxDOT has long supported ITS deployments requiring power and communications backhaul (e.g., DMS). However, as technologies continue to advance, they are increasingly dependent upon power and backhaul communications. So much so that assessing and providing dedicated power to new technologies should be viewed as an important and critical component of design/construction. Moreover, with the dependence on power, TxDOT and other State Agencies should include provisions for alternative power sources and power management capabilities.

Fiber optic technologies continue to advance as does improvements in other backhaul communications devices such as millimeter wave and even cellular communications. Fiber optic communication is a method of sending data by transmitting pulses of light through an optical fiber. The transmitted light forms an electromagnetic carrier wave that is then modulated to carry information. Fiber is preferred over electrical cabling when high bandwidth, long distance, or immunity to electromagnetic interference are required and is becoming common within the transportation environment for these reasons. Currently, fiber optic systems used in transportation provide 1 Gbps transmission rates and include 72,96 , or 144 strands for backhaul communications with 144 strands commonly used. Currently, transmission rates of 10 Gbps are possible with expected improvements to $40+$ Gbps in the near future.

Two technologies that particularly require significant fiber optic backhauls are connected vehicle communications including either Dedicated Short Range Communications (DSRC) and/or 5G communications. The extent that these communication technologies are adopted by the Texas public and used by TxDOT to capture information from vehicle-to-infrastructure communications will drive both the number and bandwidth of the stands and associated equipment. Currently, some DOTs are installing one pair of 1 Gbps for each connected vehicle radio while others are linking 10-20 radios with a single pair. A standard has yet to emerge, but a conservative approach would be to consider connected vehicle communications as equivalent to digital video feeds suggesting that 6-8 radios can be linked to a given pair.

### 3.2 Safety Technologies

These technologies are focused directly upon improving the safety of a component(s) of the transportation system. They include technologies associated with autonomous and connected vehicles as well as other infrastructure-based technologies.

## (a) Autonomous Vehicles

Autonomous and connected vehicles include a variety of technologies that enable vehicle operation without the need or with a reduced need for a driver. Autonomous vehicles use several sensors simultaneously to safely operate the vehicle. Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) and optical camera technology are the vehicle's eyes, "seeing" the edge of the road and lane markings by bouncing pulses of light of the vehicle's surroundings. When parking, ultrasonic sensors detect curbs and other vehicles. More powerful and quicker-transmitting radios or cellular technology will be used to share basic safety messages with other nearby vehicles 10 times a second - faster than you can blink your eyes. This technology helps keep all vehicles alert to the presence of potential conflicts. At the very core of all this technology is a central computer, or brain, that is constantly analyzing the data received to control steering, acceleration and braking through the use of vehicle actuators, which act as the vehicle's hands and feet.

Autonomous vehicles utilize technology to monitor the driving environment and perform driving functions independent of human interaction. There are several technologies that support these functions:

- Radar sensors monitor the position of nearby vehicles.
- LIDAR sensors detect lane markings and road edges.
- Video cameras interpret traffic signals and road signs and detect pedestrians, nearby vehicles, and other objects.
- A global positioning system (GPS) places the vehicle accurately within a map.
- An on-board computer analyzes the above inputs and controls steering, acceleration, and braking.

Today, AV technology exists on a spectrum, with many currently available vehicles having autonomous capabilities such as radar cruise control and lane keeping assistance. The Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) has defined the following levels of autonomy (Figure 13):

- Level 0 vehicles lack any autonomous capabilities.
- Level 1 vehicles have a specific driver assistance function such as adaptive cruise control, with all other driving functions performed by the driver.
- Level 2 vehicles utilize multiple forms of assistance such as control over steering and acceleration, allowing the driver to have his or her hands off the steering wheel and foot off the pedals at the same time.
- Level 3 vehicles are capable of monitoring the driving environment and making safetycritical decisions but require a driver in the vehicle to intervene.
- Level 4 vehicles are capable of completing fully autonomous trips, but only under certain driving scenarios.
- Level 5 vehicles are fully autonomous and capable of driving in any scenario.


Figure 13. Sensors and Levels of Automation for Autonomous Vehicles
The potential impacts of autonomous vehicles depend on the speed of technological advancement, the rate of public acceptance, and the presence of a variety of societal trends. As the technology continues to advance, the anticipation of these impacts must guide the adoption of policy and investments in infrastructure. Autonomous vehicles will cause changes in driver behavior, incident frequency, and infrastructure needs. In recent years, experts have closely examined the potential impacts of autonomous driving systems as research and development have advanced towards a future in which these vehicles are expected to be widely available.

In the 2060s and 2070s, as autonomous vehicles become a major share of total vehicle travel, there will be a significant reduction in traffic and an increase in roadway capacity. This will be a result of vehicles traveling closer together, maintaining a free flow speed, and a reduction of crashes which are a result of human error. It is likely that there will be a significant reduction in personal vehicles as the costs of owning a personal vehicle exceed the benefits. While this could result in fewer cars on the road, an increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is likely as vehicles are constantly picking up and dropping off passengers. It is also important to note that the impacts will vary between rural and urban areas. Urban areas tend to have more affluent persons (early adopters) and more congestion while rural areas are slower to adopt new technologies and rarely experience congestion.

Research indicates that $80 \%-90 \%$ of vehicle crashes are due to human error. The elimination of human drivers takes away the risks associated with distracted or fatigued driving, speed limit violations, and driving under the influence. Autonomous vehicles introduce an easy transportation for groups that are currently unable to drive such as the elderly, people with disabilities, and children. Autonomous vehicles will greatly increase the efficiency of existing transportation systems. Aside from the decreases in congestion and increases in capacity, the technology will allow travel time to
be spent however each passenger chooses, whether it be sleeping, working, reading, or exercising. This increased freedom while utilizing a safe, reliable, and comfortable mode of transportation on a less congested network has the potential to drastically change societies.

Autonomous vehicles are being driven by private industry and are quickly moving into the market. According to the National Council on State Legislatures, "twenty-nine states - Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, New York, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Vermont, Washington and Wisconsin -and Washington D.C have passes legislation related to autonomous vehicles.2" Further, "Governors in Arizona, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Ohio, Washington and Wisconsin have issued executive orders related to autonomous vehicles. ${ }^{3}$ "The pace of legislation has slowed since 2017, but states such as Michigan, Arizona and California have either passed legislation or through executive order to allow for the testing of autonomous vehicles under certain conditions and criteria. In Texas, the Governor signed a bill in June of 2017 that allows an automated motor vehicle to operate in the state regardless of whether a human operator is present in the vehicle, as long as certain requirements are met.4,5

On a Federal level, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) issued their third guide to highly automated vehicles In September of 2018, titled "Preparing for the Future of Transportation: Automated Vehicles 3.0'. ${ }^{6}$ This guidance document is an update to the Automated Driving Systems (ADS): A Vision for Safety 2.0 document that was released by NHTSA in September of 2017. AV 3.0, as it is commonly referred to, outlines the role of the Federal Government for regulating and administering autonomous vehicles. AV 3.0 outlines all of the operating administrations, eight in total, within the Department of Transportation, that are involved with regulating autonomous vehicles.

[^21]
## OPERATING ADMINISTRATIONS

For more information on how U.S. DOT agencies engage with automation, see www.transportation.gov/av

$\left.\sqrt{1} \begin{array}{l}1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1\end{array}\right)$
Federal Highway Administration

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is responsible for providing stewardship over the construction, maintenance, and preservation of the Nation's highways, bridges, and tunnels. Through research and technical assistance, the FHWA supports its partners in Federal, State, and local agencies to accelerate innovation and improve safety and mobility.


Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's (FMCSA) mission is to reduce crashes, injuries, and fatalities involving large trucks and buses. FMCSA partners with industry, safety advocates, and State and local governments to keep the Nation's roads safe and improve commercial motor vehicle (CMV) safety through regulation, education, enforcement, research, and technology

Federal Aviation Administration

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) provides the safest and most efficient aviation system in the world. Annually, FAA manages over 54 million flights, approaching a billion passengers.

## Q <br> Federal Railroad Administration

The Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA) mission is to enable the safe, reliable, and efficient movement of people and goods for a strong America. FRA is advancing the use of new technology in rail.


## Federal Transit

 AdministrationThe Federal Transit Administration (FTA) provides financial and technical assistance to local public transit systems, including buses, subways, light rail, commuter rail, trolleys, and ferries. FTA also oversees safety measures and helps develop next-generation technology research.


Maritime Administration

The Maritime Administration (MARAD) promotes the use of waterborne transportation and its seamless integration with other segments of the transportation system, and the viability of the U.S. merchant marine.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's (NHTSA) mission is to save lives, prevent injuries, and reduce the economic costs of road traffic crashes through education, research, safety standards, and enforcement activity. NHTSA carries out highway safety programs by setting and enforcing safety performance standards for motor vehicles and equipment, identifying safety defects, and through the development and delivery of effective highway safety programs for State and local jurisdictions.


Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) protects people and the environment by advancing the safe transportation of energy and other hazardous materials that are essential to our daily lives. To do this, PHMSA establishes national policy, sets and enforces standards, educates, and conducts research to prevent incidents.

Figure 14. Operating Administrations under AV 3.07
Key operating administrations include NHTSA, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). NHTSA governs the safety authority over Automated Driving System (ADS) -Equipped Vehicles \& Equipment. In addition, NHTSA is the owner of the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS) regulations and waivers. AV 3.0 directs FMCSA to avoid barriers to the development of ADS in commercial vehicles and to work closely with industry, state and local agencies. FHWA administers the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and will be pursuing an update to the 2009 MUTCD to incorporate ADS technology. The FTA will work with transit agencies on tailored technical assistance on safety management systems (SMS). The US DOT will also play a leading role in cross-cutting policy issues as they relate to ADS such as Cybersecurity, Connectivity, Piloting and Privacy.
In addition to updating the guidance on ADS on a Federal level, AV 3.0 also highlighted roles and responsibilities for state, local and tribal governments for ADS. AV 3.0 showcases ways that states, local and tribal governments can prepare for AV's including focusing on:

[^22]- Laws \& Regulations;
- Licensing \& Registrations;
- Assessing Infrastructure Elements; and
- Providing Guidance, Information \& Training.

AV 3.0 highlights best practices for state legislatures and highway safety officials along with consideration given to owners \& operators of infrastructure. In addition, AV 3.0, lays out criteria that state agencies should consider with ADS-equipped vehicles to ensure compatibility between intrastate and interstate commercial vehicle regulations and continued application of roadside inspection procedures. The DOT, through AV 3.0, offers the Public Sector Transit Industry and Stakeholders areas of consideration with the adoption of ADS including:

- Needs-Based Implementation;
- Realistic Expectations;
- Workforce \& Labor;
- Complete Streets;
- Accessibility; and
- Engagement \& Education.

AV 3.0 points to the fact that local governments should consider facilitating safe testing and operation of ADS vehicles on local streets and understand near term opportunities \& affects for land use, curb space \& congestion on ADS deployments. The US DOT, through AV 3.0 encourages States, local, Tribal, and Territorial governments to fully utilize the resources provided by United States Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT) for ADS cybersecurity.

AV 3.0 also highlights the role of private industry in the adoption and deployment of ADS equipped vehicles. AV 3.0 highlights the role of Voluntary Safety Self-Assessments (VSSA) that were first outlined in AV 2.0 and encourages private entities to make public their VSSA to promote transparency and strengthen public acceptance of ADS technology. Through AV 3.0, the US DOT encourages vehicles owners and operators to explore the adoption and impact of ADS technology on:

- System Knowledge;
- System Functionality;
- System Training;
- Equipment Maintenance;
- Information Exchange; and
- Safety Inspection.

Finally AV 3.0 highlights the role of private industry in helping to promote safety, volunteer consensus based standards, and adopt best practices for cyber security.

At the Congressional level, bills such as the SEF DRIVE ACT, are stalled in Congress and any movement towards its passage will most likely occur after the 2020 Presidential election.

Most vehicles now offer technology in line with Level 1 automation as an option, with some luxury brands offering Level 2 capabilities. Advanced driver assist systems such as Tesla's Autopilot and General Motors' Super Cruise offer capabilities in line with Level 3. Numerous major automakers have committed to offering advanced autonomy in the coming years:

- Daimler, in partnership with Uber and Bosch, intends to offer nearly fully autonomous vehicles by the early 2020s
- Ford has partnered with Argo Al to offer full autonomy in 2021
- Honda has partnered with Waymo to offer full autonomy on highways by 2020
- Hyundai will offer highway self-driving by 2020 and urban autonomy by 2030
- Renault-Nissan, in partnership with Microsoft, intends to offer autonomous cars in urban conditions in 2020, and truly driverless cars in 2025
- Toyota intends to offer full autonomy on highways by 2020
- Volvo, in partnership with Uber, intends to offer self-driving on highways by 2021.

There are varying projections on the timeline of connected and autonomous vehicle adoption. Automakers such as Tesla have demonstrated Level 3 autonomy capabilities (autonomous driving capabilities with driver fallback under some conditions), while many manufacturers have committed to making Level 3 vehicles available to the public by 2021. Level 4 (capable of fully autonomous trips on certain roadways) are currently in the testing stage. As with other forms of new technology, it is anticipated that early autonomous technology will be made available as an option on higher end vehicle models, with technology trickling down across the entire fleet over the next decade.


Figure 15. Autonomous Vehicle Sales and Fleet Projections in Published Literature


Figure 15 shows estimated adoption rates for autonomous vehicles based upon a literature review. As observed in the figure, there is significant variability in the estimated adoption rates of autonomous passenger vehicles Level 3 or higher. For example, by 2040, estimates in the literature suggest an adoption rate ranging from $20 \%$ to nearly $90 \%$. With such variability within the literature it is challenging to provide a concrete estimate of adoption rates for autonomous passenger vehicles. However, recent trends in adoption of other technologies, such as smartphones, tablets, etc. suggests a rapid adoption rate (Figure 16) or one that is closer to the upper end of the range presented in Figure 17.

Figure 16. Technology Adoption Rates of the Past Century ${ }^{8}$


Figure 17. Estimated Adoption Rate for Level 3 and Above Autonomous Passenger Vehicles
(ii) Transit Vehicles

Autonomous Vehicle technology offers a number of potential applications for transit vehicles, from microshuttle vehicles to full-size buses. A number of manufacturers are marketing low-speed 8-16 passenger autonomous shuttle vehicles. At present these vehicles operate primarily in dedicated

[^23]lanes, though some pilots are making the push towards mixed-traffic scenarios. Examples of microshuttle manufacturers include:

- EasyMile, a French-based company, offers a 12-passenger all-electric shuttle vehicle with a top speed of 23 miles per hour.
- Navya, another French-based company, builds a 15-passenger all-electric shuttle vehicle with a top speed of 28 miles per hour.
- Local motors, based in the United States, offers a 12-passenger all-electric shuttle with a top speed of 30 miles per hour.
- Coast Autonomous, also based in the United States, builds an 8-passenger all-electric shuttle with a top speed of 12.5 miles per hour.

As currently configured and available, these microtransit vehicles are not suitable for deployment on highways and Interstates such as l-10. However, these vehicles are suitable for providing first-mile/last-mile connectivity to a fixed route transit system or to bridge connectivity for travelers utilizing ridesharing or carsharing within arterials and surface streets within the l-10 Corridor.

Other manufacturers are developing full-size transit vehicles at varying levels of automation. For example, Daimler is developing the fully autonomous Mercedes-Benz Future Bus prototype as part of the City Pilot demonstration. On the other end of the spectrum, vendors such as Mobileye are developing aftermarket solutions to add low level autonomous features such as pedestrian detection and collision avoidance that can be added to existing transit vehicles.

## (A) Heavy Duty Vehicles (Platooning)

Platooning technology merges the benefits of connected and autonomous vehicles while utilizing human drivers. Platoons allow multiple vehicles to couple electronically such that many vehicles can accelerate and brake simultaneously based on the steering, acceleration, and braking inputs of the lead vehicle. The connection between vehicles be done via DSRC technology, with the vehicle controls for platooning vehicles being automated.

Truck platooning in particular has quickly emerged as a means of improving capacity through reduced headways; increasing fuel economy due to lower air resistance; and decreasing collisions due to increased connectivity and automating among vehicles. Truck platooning technology is currently nearing maturity for market penetration and is likely to be one of the early dominant forms of automation.
(b) Connected Vehicles

Dedicated Short Range Communications (DSRC) and 5G cellular are two rapidly emerging technologies that enable vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) and vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) communications
with very low latencies. In this section, we describe these two similar, competing technologies and why 5G may become the industry standard for enabling V2V and V2I communications.

## (i) Dedicated Short Range Communications

DSRC technology utilizes low latency wireless connections using an 802.11 phased modulation wireless router across a spectrum of 5.9 GHz band that was dedicated to Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) by the U.S. Federal Communications Commission (FCC). Connected vehicle technology consists of point-to-point wireless communication between and among vehicles and infrastructure. Beyond infrastructure- and vehicle-based radios, connected vehicle technology relies upon a communications link to a back office for system management. This is typically done using fiber optic or cellular connectivity. Additional interfaces with infrastructure, such as signal control cabinets or road weather information stations, may also be necessary depending upon the desired application.

Connected vehicle technology consists of point-to-point wireless communication between and among vehicles and infrastructure, including the following:

- Vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) communication that allows vehicles to communicate with each other;
- Vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) communication that allows vehicles to communicate with surrounding infrastructure; and,
- Vehicle-to-all (V2X) communication that enables the interaction of vehicles and any capable communication device in the immediate vicinity.

There are three components to a Connected Vehicle system as illustrated in Figure 18. First, there is the DSRC radio that is on-board the vehicle (On-Board Unit or OBU). This component receives information from the vehicle's sensors and broadcasts DSRC messages from the vehicle to other

vehicles and the roadside infrastructure. Connected Vehicle applications that are associated with V2V communications are typically installed on this device. Second, the Connected Vehicle infrastructure component is a pole-mounted DSRC radio frequently referred to as the Roadside Equipment (RSE) or Roadside Unit (RSU). This radio serves the same functionality as the on-board unit, but is also tied back to a central data repository and processing system, which is the third major component of a Connected Vehicle system.

Figure 18. Components of a DSRC System ${ }^{9}$
DSRC technologies have been under development for more than a decade, mostly through sponsorship by the U.S. DOT. There are existing standards governing the hardware, software and transmission protocols that have been developed and adopted by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) and the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE). Currently, The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) is considering mandating DSRC technology on new vehicles, a move that is supported by the automotive industry, but one that has met with political resistance from the White House. If the proposed rulemaking comes to fruition it is expected that the draft mandate will be released around 2019, followed by comment and phase-in periods. Full implementation of this rule was expected in the 2021-2023 range, but this timing has now been questioned. Based on anticipated availability and typical fleet turnover rates, the potential adoption rates for connected vehicle technologies would be significant with more than $50 \%$ of the U.S. fleet being equipped by 2030. One factor that will likely accelerate adoption rates is the availability of aftermarket safety devices for vehicles that contain a DSRC radio. As production increases and the price of radios decreases over time, drivers of older model vehicles will likely seek ways to capitalize on the safety and mobility benefits that connected vehicle technology can offer.

The key benefits of DSRC technologies primarily stem from the low-latency communications capabilities of the radios with additional benefits just due to the establishment of a communications link between vehicles and with infrastructure components. Safety benefits are primarily realized from low-latency communications employed by radio applications such as Emergency Electronic Brake Lights, Queue Warning, etc. The potential applications allowed by this environment are considerable in number and include safety, environmental mobility, agency data, road weather, and smart roadside families of applications. The following is a brief summary of a small selection of applications that may be relevant for improving safety and congestion on l-10.

## (A) V2I Safety Applications

The V2I Safety family of applications integrate roadside DSRC infrastructure and vehicle data to enhance safety while also providing potential mobility benefits to drivers. Potential V2I safety applications that could serve highway travelers include:

[^24]- Curve Speed Warning: An application that provides an alert to a driver approaching a curve at a speed beyond what is recommended for that curve.
- Spot Weather Impact Warning: An application that warns drivers of local weather impacts by relaying information from roadside weather stations and centralized operations.
- Reduced Speed/Work Zone Warning: An application that broadcasts alerts to drivers to reduce speed, change lanes, or come to a stop utilized within work zones.
(B) V2V Safety Applications

The V2V Safety family of applications utilize communication between vehicles (V2V) to prevent crashes. Emergency Electronic Brake Lights, Forward Collision Warning, and Blind Spot/Lane Change Warning applications all have relevance on a highway corridor. However, it is assumed that these will fall under the purview of automakers, which will deploy in-vehicle DSRC radios as part of the proposed NHTSA rulemaking if passed.

## (C) Mobility Applications

There are many different potential mobility applications and applications in general that DSRC would enable. While these applications are generally designed to improve mobility of travelers, several of these applications will also enhance safety of the traveling public. These applications include:

- Dynamic Speed Harmonization: An application that recommends target speeds in response to congestion, incidents, and road conditions to optimize throughput and reduce incidents.
- Queue Warning: An application that warns drivers of existing and developing queues downstream.
- Cooperative Adaptive Cruise Control: An application that dynamically adjusts and coordinates cruise control speeds among platooning vehicles to improve traffic flow and throughput.
- Incident Scene Pre-Arrival Staging: An application that provides incident information, including positioning of the disabled vehicle to first responders while en-route to the incident to improve incident staging and reduce impact to the roadway facility.
- Incident Scene and Work Zone Alerts: Provides real-time alerts to workers and first responders in incident and work zones for incursion of an on-coming vehicle into the zone.
- Dynamic Ridesharing: This application leverages V2V and V2I communications to promote the arranging and execution of dynamic ridesharing to reduce congestion and subsequently improve safety.

Although the final rule from NHTSA on DSRC has not yet been issued, there have been significant deployments of DSRC technologies in the U.S. Most notably, there are three on-going Connected

Vehicle Regional Pilots in New York City, Tampa, and Wyoming where thousands of vehicles and infrastructure components are being equipped with DSRC equipment. Additionally, through the Advanced Transportation Congestion Mitigation and Technology Deployment (ATCMTD) program and other grants, U.S. DOT has continued to promote and encourage the deployment of DSRC. Additionally, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) has issued a "Signal Phase and Timing or SPaT Challenge" to States also encouraging the deployment of DSRC.

## (ii) 5th Generation Mobile Networks

$5^{\text {th }}$ Generation Mobile Networks ( 5 G ) is an alternative wireless protocol that is a widely touted alternative to DSRC for supporting V2V, V2I, and V2X communications. Although universal standards for 5 G have not yet been adopted or promulgated and are not expected until 2019, existing standards for 4G provide a likely perspective for future 5G standards. Unlike DSRC, 5 G is being driven by private industry, primarily the telecommunications firms, which would provide significant opportunities for public/private partnerships for states, cities, and local agencies.

There are many different visions and use cases associated with 5 G , but a consistent theme is that 5 G will enable a higher density of mobile broadband users (i.e., more simultaneously connected devices) and will more reliably support low latency device-to-device communications than 4G. The key technological advances for 5 G is that it will dynamically operate across several spectrums or frequencies with each frequency serving a specific use case and need.

The exact implementation of 5 G remains to be seen, however, the emergence of a host of small cells including femtocells, picocells, and microcells across the U.S. might suggest that one possible deployment of 5G technology would involve localized transmitters. This is a particularly likely scenario for low-latency applications such as those involving autonomous and connected vehicles.

5 G is an enabling technology that allows communication between devices, but C-V2X is the critical application that allows for the connectivity between vehicles and everything else. C-V2X, which was standardized in 2017, is designed to connect vehicles to each other, to roadside infrastructure, to other road-users and to cloud-based services. ${ }^{10}$ C-V2X employs two complementary transmission modes:

1. Direct communications between vehicles, between vehicles and infrastructure, and vehicles and other road users, such as cyclists and pedestrians. In this mode, C-V2X works independently of the cellular networks.

[^25]2. Network communications, in which C-V2X employs the conventional mobile network to enable a vehicle to receive information about road conditions and traffic in the area. ${ }^{11}$

The application of C-V2X will have a wide-ranging effect on existing traffic management, traffic management safety, traffic tolling in dense urban area, and the speed of adoption of autonomous vehicles. Examples of applications include: ${ }^{12}$

Platooning: The formation of a convoy in which the vehicles are much closer together than can be safely achieved with human drivers, making better use of road space, saving fuel and making the transport of goods more efficient.

Co-operative driving: Vehicles can use C-V2X to work together to minimize the disruption caused by lane changes and sudden braking.

Queue warning: Roadside infrastructure can use C-V2X to warn vehicles of queues or road work ahead of them, so they can slow down smoothly and avoid hard braking.

Avoiding collisions: Each vehicle on the road could use C-V2X to broadcast its identity, position, speed and direction. An on-board computer could combine that data with that from other vehicles to build its own real-time map of the immediate surroundings and alert the driver to any potential collisions.

Hazards ahead warning: C-V2X can be used to extend a vehicle's electronic horizon, so it can detect hazards around a blind corner, obscured by fog or other obstructions, such as high vehicles or undulations in the landscape.

Increasingly autonomous driving: Along with other sensors and communications systems, C-V2X will play an important role in enabling vehicles to become increasingly autonomous.

Collecting road tolls: designed to reduce congestion and the impact of motor transport on the environment

C-V2X allows for critical applications to be deployed which will allow for an increase in driving speeds and corresponding decrease in congestion, a reduction in roadside accidents and fatalities and the ability to create real-time demand-based tolling systems to change driving behavior in highly dense urban areas. C-V2X applications are now being tested by an assortment of leading automotive companies such as Audi, Toyota and the PSA Group along with technology infrastructure companies such as Qualcomm, AT\&T, Verizon and Nokia. Ford announced at CES 2019, that all of their global fleet will adopt C-V2X technology by 2022. ${ }^{13}$

[^26](c) 3.2.3 5 G versus DSRC

With the rollout of 5G C-V2X applications and the lack of a governmental mandate on the use of DSRC technology, there is an industry wide debate as to which technology will become the industry standard. Having been tested and deployed over the past decade, DSRC would seem to have an early advantage over 5G and C-V2X. With that said, China and some in the automotive industry are placing their bets on 5G C-V2X. Companies such as Qualcomm have indicated that 5G and C-V2X are compatible with prior cellular standards, such as 4G, which should allow for a faster rollout. 5G may have a further advantage: Many pedestrians and bicyclists carry smartphones in their pockets, their precise locations may be more seamlessly transmitted to vehicles ${ }^{14}$. Finally, potential advantages of 5G over DSRC, including greater interoperability, wider bandwidth, increased cybersecurity and a decentralized network that runs on private cell towers instead of dedicated roadside units that the government has to pay for and maintain ${ }^{15}$. While the two different technologies will continue to be used over the next few years, 5G and C-V2X, may become the long-term predominant technology for connected vehicles.

### 3.3 Monitoring and Detection

The use of roadside equipment to gather information on traffic, vehicles, and travel has been used for decades. Many early uses of roadside sensors were in-pavement loop detectors that were used both to count and classify vehicles as well as to identify when a vehicle was present. Today's roadside sensors are much more sophisticated than pneumatic loop detectors and are capable of collecting a wide variety of data to benefit traffic operations and maintenance. This section discusses those roadside sensors that are widely used today by agencies for congestion management and traffic analysis.

All of the technologies discussed in this section represent existing technologies and have been deployed throughout the United States. These technologies can be purchased today from a variety of different vendors and suppliers. As Connected and Autonomous Vehicles begin to emerge, these technologies will become less effective and cost prohibitive. For example, a connected vehicle will include a cellular, Wi-Fi, and/or DSRC radio, all of which can be used for origin/destination studies rendering the technologies included herein obsolete. Similarly, a connected vehicle will continuously broadcast and provide its location to roadside infrastructure and other vehicles through cellular or DSRC so these two technologies will eventually replace magnometers, loop detectors, and cameras for the detection of vehicles. Nevertheless, these technologies are still viable and provide useful information to system managers to operate and manage congestion, perform weather-related maintenance, and to obtain information on travel patterns of the traveling public. The rise of these technologies has had a tremendous impact on the transportation system, and a system operator's ability to better manger the transportation network. For example, prior to the use of RFID, Bluetooth,

[^27]and Wi-Fi sniffers on the roadside to conduct Origin/Destination studies, a DOT would have had to deploy an extensive license plate reader study using HD video, process the video images to capture the license plates and match them to origins and destinations. These technologies will continue to provide valuable information to system operators and managers for the next several years if not a decade.

Generally, these existing technologies have passed the policy and regulatory tests and have been widely deployed. During the past decade, there has been some pushback by the public regarding the use of video or still cameras for enforcement (e.g., red-light enforcement in Ohio), but other States have successfully deployed cameras for these purposes. Within Texas, video cameras and RFID sensors are widely used for open-road tolling applications and have been accepted within the policy and regulatory environment. Over the course of the next decade, all of these technologies will continue to see evolutionary improvements, particularly with respect to connectivity and ability to communicate to a central location.
(a) Camera Technology Improvements (infrared, auto traffic classification and counting)

Still frame traffic cameras are still in use throughout the U.S., though are increasingly being switched to pan-tilt-zoom video cameras by agencies. Typical applications of video-based systems include presence detection at signalized intersections and incident detection along freeways. However, the video cameras can be configured to emulate inductive loop detection as well as to perform vehicle classification and vehicle counting at highway speeds. Usually, the digital video feed from a traffic camera is streamed to a processing center where statistical algorithms scan the images and

determine the number and classification of the vehicles. These counts and classifications are then reported to a TMC in summary format.

Figure 19. Video Cameras are Commonly Used for Vehicle Counting and Classification ${ }^{16}$
As processing capabilities continue to improve, extracting events and images from digital video feeds is becoming increasingly automated. The latencies with image processing have dramatically improved during the past decade to the point where digital video processing is now being used by some agencies for real-time incident detection and notification. This includes identifying stopped vehicles, vehicles traveling in the wrong direction, etc. With the standardization and conversion to digital images, an agency may be able to conduct emerging video processing techniques and methods using their existing video hardware (i.e., video software processing is no longer strictly tied to the video hardware).
(b) Bluetooth and WiFi

Both Bluetooth and Wi-Fi are standardized communications standards that operate in the 2.4 Ghz band. These communication protocols and chipsets are common in mobile devices such as cellular phones, tablets, in-vehicle infotainment units, etc. In both cases, the transceivers regularly and continuously broadcast "discovery" messages as the devices seek other networks or devices to connect with. These discovery messages contain a media access control address (MAC address). The MAC address of a device is a unique identifier assigned to network interfaces for communications at the data link layer of a network segment. Bluetooth and Wi-Fi equipment mounted at the roadside can "listen" for these discovery messages and capture the unique MAC address without having to connect to the actual Bluetooth or Wi-Fi enabled device. Additional roadside sensors at other points of the transportation network capture the same MAC


Figure 20. RWIS Platform ${ }^{18}$

[^28]addresses, which are then matched to derive information on travel origins/destinations, travel time, speeds, etc.
(c) RWIS

A Road Weather Information System (RWIS) is an automatic weather station or Environmental Sensor Station deployed along a roadside. This system includes a number of sensors that can measure atmospheric parameters, pavement conditions, water level conditions, wind speed, barometric pressure, temperature, and other metrics such as visibility and humidity.
(d) Radar

Radar, is "a nonintrusive technology that uses microwaves to detect the presence of vehicles. Microwaves emanating from the device will reflect off of the metallic surface of the vehicle and can provide the position of the vehicle relative to the device (e.g., which lane it is in). When two radar beams are used in


Figure 22. Typical Radar Device ${ }^{19}$ series, characteristics, such as vehicle speed and length, can be obtained. Dual-beam radar antennas can be housed in the same unit; meaning only one device is needed to obtain these parameters. ${ }^{20}$ " Radar units can be installed in a "front-fire" orientation as illustrated in Figure 22, or in a "side-fire" orientation where the microwaves are beamed across the roadway travel lanes. In either case, radar units can provide a number of different data elements including speed, heading, volume, position (lane), and acceleration/deceleration.
(e) Laser and LIDAR Systems

Laser and LIDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) systems use invisible beams of light to detect vehicles in much the same fashion as radar. Fixed Laser and LIDAR systems are not common and are typically used in situations where vehicle detection is critical such as at toll gantries, ramp meters, etc. Mounted overhead in each travel lane, a Laser and LIDAR system performs well in identifying the presence of a vehicle, speed, heading, and vehicle classification. However, the performance of these

[^29]systems can be adversely impacted by weather. Because these systems are typically mounted over each travel lane, they are more expensive to deploy than other sensing technologies.
(f) Magnetometers

Magentometers is a class of vehicle detection equipment that uses changes in the earth's magnetic field to detect a vehicle. Found in both wired (microloops) and wireless form, these devices are designed to be mounted directly in the travel lane or buried immediately under the roadway surface. These devices are able to capture information similar to the traditional loop detector such as volume, lane occupancy, speed, and vehicle length. New processing algorithms are being developed and tested that would also enable vehicle classification to be performed with these devices by FHWA and others. ${ }^{21}$
(g) Radio Frequency Identification (RFID)

Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) is a technology that has been


Figure 23. In-Ground Wireless Magnetometer for Vehicle Detection heavily utilized within the transportation industry during the past two decades for tolling operations. RFID technology consists of a "tag," and a "reader." Tags can be either "passive," activated by the energy of the reader, or "active," continuously broadcasting a short message that is then received by the reader. The use of RFID technology for vehicle detection as well as origin/destination studies has increased due to the inclusion of RFID tags inside of an automobile's tires. Although the primary purpose of these tags is to monitor tire pressure, each tag has a unique signature, much like the MAC address of a Bluetooth or Wi-Fi transceiver. Roadside RDIF readers can pick up these signatures and use them to determine Origin/Destination along a given route.

### 3.4 Operational Optimization

These technologies include the set of technologies that are designed and deployed with the express purpose of improving the management of the transportation system through optimizing vehicle travel throughout a corridor. These technologies can be used to establish and manage an Integrated Corridor Management system to improve the overall operational efficiency within the I-10 corridor. What separates these technologies from others is that these technologies are specifically designed to manage and control the flow of traffic or are otherwise directly interacting with the transportation network - these are part of the "levers" that a system manager can activate to manage the transportation network.

[^30]There are several subcategories of technologies within this category including those that are used to manage freeways, arterials, and transit systems.
(a) Active Freeway Management

Strategies involving infrastructure modifications and ITS Equipment seek to relieve congestion by adding or modifying a physical component of the highway. For example, these strategies may involve installation of additional lanes, pull-over shoulders, technology, etc. that are designed to separate traffic flow from stopped vehicles or to harmonize/optimize the traffic flow.

## (i) Queue Warning Systems

Queue warning's basic principle is to inform travelers of the presence of downstream stop-and-go traffic (based on real-time traffic detection) using warning signs and flashing lights. Drivers can anticipate an upcoming situation of emergency braking and slow down, avoid erratic behavior, and reduce queuing related collisions. Dynamic message signs show a symbol or word when stop-and-go traffic is near. Speed harmonization and lane control signals that provide incident management capabilities can be combined with queue warning. The system can be automated or controlled by a traffic management center operator. Work zones also benefit from queue warning with portable dynamic message signs units placed upstream of expected queue points. Increasingly, queue warning systems are turning to mobile devices and alerts to in-dash infotainment systems to notify drivers of impending queues. Text messages and dedicated travel applications with voice and/or screen notification are typical of deployments. Recently, the Emergency Broadcast System inherent within mobile devices has been used to disseminate both Amber alerts as well as traffic related information based upon the device's current location.

## (ii) Ramp metering

Ramp meters are a traffic signal that is timed or actuated to regulate the flow of traffic entering freeways. The traffic signal consists of a red and green only (no yellow). Connected to a traffic signal
controller, the ramp meter is used either in a pre-timed or dynamic setting to segregate incoming traffic to the interstate.


Figure 24. Illustration of Ramp Metering ${ }^{22}$
(iii) Dynamic Speed/Lane Control

Dynamic lane control is a technology that is currently implemented with overhead gantries and DMS signs. These lane-level DMS signs are used to close or open an individual traffic lanes as warranted by real-time traffic flows. It can also be used to provide advance warning of closures using lane control signs to help traffic safely merge into adjoining lanes. Finally, these same signs can be used to adjust speed limits based on real-time traffic, roadway, and/or weather conditions. Ultimately, these types of technologies will become obsolete within the next decade through the adoption of V2I communications.
(iv) Active Arterial Management

Similar to Active Freeway Management, these technologies are designed to improve the flow of traffic along freeway arterials with the goal of ultimately improving throughput and congestion within the corridor. Within this category, two emerging technologies are beginning to be deployed within the U.S.

## (v) Adaptive Traffic Signal Controls

Adaptive traffic signal control is a type of technology that includes a traffic signal controller that is coupled with vehicle detection systems such as a camera or radar sensors. Adaptive traffic signal controllers change the traffic signal phases and timing dynamically in response to the actual demand
at the intersection. Typically implemented using video vehicle detection, these systems can be optimized locally or across multiple segments of roadways.

## (vi) Decision Support System

A road traffic decision support system refers to a set of computer servers and algorithms that process historical and real-time data to provide guidance to system managers on how the traffic network could be optimized. These systems can be micro, meso, or macro in scale, and are usually set to provide predictive analytics and probabilities associated with a set of conditions or trigger points upon which decisions for optimizing the network are made. Some


Figure 25. Illustration of Adaptive Traffic Signals ${ }^{23}$ decision support systems automatically implement decisions when thresholds have been crossed, others simply notify the traffic management center operators of the conditions and provide a recommendation for action.
(b) Transit Management

There are many new technologies emerging with in the transit market. One in particular is the evolution and adoption of autonomous microtransit vehicles as described above for first-mile/lastmile connectivity or for mainline services. At the same time, other technologies are emerging within the transit market that involve real-time operational management of the transit system. Many of these technologies would likely improve traffic conditions and congestion along segments of l-10 if implemented. These technologies include those associated with bus-on-shoulder operations, arterial transit signal priority/preemption, and dynamic dispatch systems.

## (i) Bus-on-Shoulder

The concept of running buses on the shoulder of a freeway segment has been around for more than a decade. However, improvements to Global Positioning Satellites (GPS) and other location-based methods such as LIDAR and Radar systems, have made bus-on-shoulder a more cost effective and implementable possibility. With these technologies, transit vehicles can successfully maintain their position within a potentially narrower shoulder.
(ii) Arterial Transit Signal Priority/Preemption

[^31]Arterial transit signal priority and preemption refers to dynamically adjusting the traffic signal timing and/or phasing to give priority or preemption to an arriving transit vehicle. This can be done by extending or shortening a phase or by jumping to a new phase out of sequence to enable the transit vehicle to traverse the intersection without stopping. Traditionally, transit signal priority/preemption was implemented using infrared transponders or RFID transponders. Improvements in technology and connectivity of traffic signals have enabled Wi-Fi and DSRC based implementation. These technologies are designed to improve the flow of traffic on arterials and thereby improve the overall corridor performance.

## (iii) Dynamic Transit Dispatch

The objective of dynamic transit dispatch is to equalize the supply of transit with the demand by dynamically introducing or moving transit vehicles from one route to another. Due to the challenges with reducing service on a route, usual deployments involve adding service to routes with higher travel volumes than normal. This operational management approach is designed to enhance the use of transit and therefore reduce the number of vehicles traveling on I-10. New fare collection technologies, such as mobile phone-based fare collection along with technologies associated with Computer Aided Dispatch and vehicle availability and location (CAD/AVL) make this strategy implementable.

### 3.5 Mode/Travel Demand Change

These technologies facilitate the use of modes other than personally-owned vehicles (POVs) for travel. They also include those technologies that are used to shift transportation demand from peak congestion periods. Many of these technologies have existed for several years and are undergoing evolutionary changes in implementation. Mostly, these technologies are being superseded by technologies involving mobile devices and associated applications such as ridesourcing, traveler information systems, and ridesharing.

## 4. Federal and State Technology Programs and Initiatives

The Federal Government has a number of initiatives and research activities designed to advance the introduction and utilization of technologies. This section provides a brief summary of some of the most relevant initiatives for the l-10 corridor.

### 4.1 FHWA Office of Operations Congestion Initiative

(a) Urban Partnership Agreements

The FHWA Office of Operations created the Urban Partnership Agreements (UPA) program in 2007 as part of the agency's Congestion Initiative as a way to evaluate strategies to reduce congestion and travel delays. The cities of Miami, Minneapolis, San Francisco, and Seattle were selected to participate in and receive funding from the UPA program to address the " 4 Ts": tolling, transit, telecommuting, and technology ${ }^{24}$. Each of the locations tested different methodologies to reduce urban congestion and impacts were subsequently evaluated to determine the most efficient longterm solutions. Across the four sites the following strategies were implemented:

- Bus Rapid Transit (Miami, Minneapolis)
- Ramp metering (Miami)
- Promotion of alternative work schedules, telecommuting, ridesharing (Miami, Seattle, San Francisco)
- HOV to HOT lane conversions (Minneapolis)
- Dynamic shoulder lanes (Minneapolis)
- Variable pricing (Minneapolis, San Francisco, Seattle).

The impacts of strategies implemented through the UPAs were evaluated to determine their effectiveness in decreasing congestion with mixed results. The UPA program did reveal that pricing does indeed influence travel behavior.
(b) Integrated Corridor Management

The Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) initiative aims to optimize existing infrastructure by dynamically managing corridors with ITS technologies to facilitate the efficient movement of people and goods. The objective of this program is to decrease congestion by improving travelers' awareness of situations, providing more detailed information, enhancing the response to incidents and congestion, and improving the overall corridor performance. The US DOT completed extensive research related to existing ICM methodologies, the feasibility of implementation, and the concepts required to successfully execute the corridor improvements. The initial evaluation was followed by a more in-depth look at the potential benefits of ICM and the development of tools and strategies to be used as the initiative moved forward.

[^32]The USDOT selected eight Pioneer Sites that included some of the country's most congested corridors to develop potential ICM strategies. Two sites were ultimately chosen to model and demonstrate the ICM systems that were developed: US 75 in Dallas, Texas and I-15 in San Diego, CA. These demonstrations were evaluated based on ICM's effects on the corridors' safety, mobility, reliability, and environmental impacts as well as a cost-benefit analysis of the system implementation. Upon completion of the evaluations, the USDOT has shared documentation of the efforts of the eight Pioneer Sites, takeaways of the two ICM demonstration projects, and resources that can be used for future ICM systems. ${ }^{25}$

## (i) Relevance to Technology

US-75 is a major corridor that provides a connection between Dallas and the cities to the north. The US-75 ICM demonstration aimed to provide updates and alerts to travelers using all modes along the 28-mile corridor segment. Components of the US-75 ICM Project included:

1. A Decision Support System to examine and analyze real-time transportation network data, recommend a response plan, and evaluate the effectiveness of the response plan.
2. A SmartNET Subsystem to communicate the status of various elements of the transportation system to travelers within the network and conveniently inform the public of system modifications.
3. A SmartFusion Subsystem to collect, store, and distribute data.
4. Dallas Area Rapid Transit's (DART) parking management system at all of the park-and-ride lots.
5. A regional 511 traveler information system.

The second ICM demonstration was completed on a 21-mile segment of I-15 that connects downtown San Diego with the northern city of Escondido. The goals of this project center on the collaborative management of all modes of travel along the corridor and improved integration with area stakeholders. Elements of the I-15 ICM project included ${ }^{26}$ :

1. A Decision Support System to assess and predict system conditions and endorse potential response plans.
2. Real-time condition and rerouting information provided to travelers using changeable message signs.
3. An arterial monitoring system to observe traffic conditions.
4. Upgrades to traffic signal systems on two parallel arterial streets.
5. The enhancement of the existing Integrated Transportation Management System.

[^33]6. The adjustment of ramp meter timing.
(ii) Lessons Learned

The I-75 ICM project in Dallas resulted in peak-hour travel time reductions of 143 person hours per day. While the ICM had positive impacts on peak-hour conditions, no notable improvements were seen when ICM strategies were applied outside of peak hours. The majority of travelers were found to have benefited from the program for 8 out of 10 scenarios. During congestion, benefits were concentrated in the immediate area of the incident causing the disruption for the peak direction of flow. Analysis indicates that use of the ICM system during a severe incident could increase transit ridership by up to 5.5 percent. ${ }^{27}$

The I-15 ICM deployment in San Diego resulted in a reduction of 1,403 person hours of travel per day. Travel time reliability was increased and the majority of travelers were found to have benefited from 6 out of 8 scenarios. The scenario including the allowed use of Express Lanes for all traffic during the period of an incident was not found to improve conditions. ${ }^{28}$

The ICM strategies improved coordination and communication between the various stakeholders and supported the use of performance measures to strengthen the decision-making process. The comprehensive approach to corridor management resulted in broader impacts and large-scale operational improvements. Moving forward, analysis of the data collected through ICM systems can assist in informed, proactive reactions to future corridor conditions.

### 4.2 Smart City

The USDOT introduced the Smart City Challenge in late 2015 as a call for applications for the funding of one city's transformation into America’s first ‘Smart City’. The goal was to solicit innovative solutions to enhance transportation systems using advanced techniques and emerging and future technologies. The USDOT provided a prioritized list of vision elements that were to be considered during the development of the Smart City applications. These 12 vision elements are shown in Error! Reference source not found..

[^34]
## USDOT Smart City Challenge <br> Vision Elements



Figure 26. US DOT Smart City Vision Elements ${ }^{29}$
The response to the Smart City Challenge was greater than expected with a total of 78 first-round applicants. After evaluating all applications, the USDOT narrowed the field to seven finalist cities that were asked to further develop their ideas into a final proposal. Columbus was announced as the ultimate winner in June 2016 and received $\$ 40$ million from the USDOT and $\$ 10$ million from Vulcan, Inc. to complement the additional $\$ 90$ million that was raised by the City from private partnerships. The successful application included the creation of a connected vehicle environment, the installation of smart street lights, and a transit pedestrian collision avoidance system. One main reason the City of Columbus was selected was the inclusion of an initiative to provide an underserved community with one of the highest infant mortality rates in the country with access to healthcare through subsidized transportation options. This component of the Smart City plan helped to unite the community's stakeholders, leading to the increased funding that strengthened the potential impacts of the successful Smart City designation.

Although only one city was selected as the winner of the USDOT's Smart City Challenge, many of the other applicants benefitted greatly from the application process. Partnerships were formed or strengthened with multiple public and private entities and many of the proposed elements are still
being pursued or considered as part of long-range strategic plans. While Columbus was awarded with the initial round of funding, additional investment opportunities for advanced transportation technology and strategies continue to be made available.

### 4.3 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality

The FHWA's Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) program was established to implement surface transportation projects that aim to reduce congestion while improving air quality. Local and State governments in areas that do not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter nonattainment areas and maintenance areas are eligible to receive funding through the CMAQ program for projects that will reduce air pollution. At this point in time, over $\$ 2$ Billion has been authorized for each fiscal year through $2020^{30}$.

CMAQ funding may be used for a variety of air pollution reduction strategies that fit four broad categories: new transit service, system or service expansion, new vehicles, or fare subsidies. New transit services and system expansion projects increase transit ridership by introducing additional transportation options or increasing the number of accessible origins and destinations. New vehicles allow the opportunity for more environmentally friendly selections and fare subsidies use financial incentives to encourage transit over other modes of transportation.

Although the main focus of the CMAQ program is improved air quality, there are a number of projects containing advanced technology elements that meet application requirements. For example, equipment and installation costs for things such as V2l communications, traveler information systems, eco-drive, Congested Intersection Adjustment, and signal phasing and timing (SPaT) could all be eligible for CMAQ funding. ${ }^{31}$

### 4.4 Connected Vehicle Pilot Deployment Program

The Connected Vehicle Pilot Deployment program was initiated by the USDOT Intelligent Transportation Systems Joint Program Office (ITS JPO) in an effort to support the development and testing of connected vehicle applications and technologies. Significant advancements in these technologies had been made in recent years and real world deployment was the most logical next step. The goals of the program are to support and accelerate early deployments of connected vehicle technologies, measure the impacts and benefits of the deployment, and enhance the development of the technologies by resolving issues throughout the deployment.

[^35]After considering the characteristics and needs of multiple cities, states, and regions, the USDOT selected three locations to serve as initial pilot deployment sites: New York City, Wyoming, and Tampa, Florida. Each pilot site proposed a detailed deployment concept that included the implementation of multiple connected vehicle technologies and applications to improve the unique transportation systems. Performance measures were developed based on individual needs of each system.

Phase 1 of the USDOT's CV Pilot Deployment Program, the Pre-Deployment Phase, included the initiation of efforts to prototype and demonstrate connected vehicle applications. The prototype design and development aimed to meet the objectives and requirements determined as part of conceptual design. Records related to the prototyping efforts for select connected vehicle applications including concepts of operations, system requirements, algorithms, design documents, and source code have been published by the USDOT. Once the prototypes were developed, they were demonstrated and field tested to evaluate the safety, mobility and environmental impacts to gain insight on the potential impacts of widespread deployment. These prototypes were then finalized and carried forward into deployment efforts.

Real world deployments were initiated during the second phase of the CV Pilot Deployment program. Each of the three pilot programs incorporated concepts that leveraged USDOT-funded research and advanced data collection and communication technology.

The New York City CV Pilot Deployment Program builds upon the City's Vision Zero initiative with an aim to increase the safety of drivers, passengers, and pedestrians and greatly reduce the associated injuries and fatalities. The project area includes sections of the densely populated boroughs of Manhattan and Brooklyn and was proposed to utilize DSRC technology to provide safety information and warnings to vehicles and pedestrians. This pilot supports the deployment of many safety-related CV applications that focus on using V2I and V2V technology to address specific concerns such as Curve Speed Compliance, Blind Spot Warning (BSW), Lane Change Warning/Assist (LCA), Pedestrian in Signalized Crosswalk, and an Intelligent Traffic Signal System (I-SIGCVDATA). In order to accomplish the pilot's goals, 353 RSUs, 8,000 vehicles, and 100 pedestrians will be equipped with connected vehicle communication technology or devices.

The focus of the Wyoming CV Pilot Program is the enhancement of I-80, the state's major east-west freight corridor that spans southern Wyoming. The main issue on this corridor is the extreme wind speeds during the winter months that significantly increase the number of truck collisions and turnovers that result in road closures. The CV applications proposed as a part of this effort are centered on the needs of commercial vehicles and include Distress Notification (DN), Spot Weather Impact Warning (SWIW), I2V Situational Awareness, and Forward Collision Warning (FCW). An estimated 75 RSUs and 400 OBUs will be utilized during this deployment.

In Tampa, the main transportation issues were identified to be peak-hour collisions, congestion, pedestrian safety, streetcar conflicts, and wrong-way drivers on the Selmon Reversible Express Lanes (REL). The pilot deployment program aims to address these safety and traffic issues with multiple
connected vehicle applications including Wrong Way Entry (WWE), Vehicle Turning Right in Front of a Transit Vehicle (VTRFTV), End of Ramp Deceleration Warning (ERDW), Intersection Movement Assist (IMA), and Probe-enabled Data Monitoring (PeDM). DSRC communication technology will be used by 40 RSUs and over 1,600 OBUs to achieve the goals of this CV pilot deployment program.

### 4.5 U.S. DOT Automated Driving System Demonstration Grants

On December 21, 2018, the U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) announced the notice of funding opportunity for automated driving system demonstration grants. This funding totaled $\$ 60$ Million dollars for projects that test the safe integration of automated driving systems (ADS) on the nation's roadways. No single grant application could receive more than $\$ 10$ Million dollars. The grants aim to gather significant safety data to inform rulemaking, foster collaboration amongst state and local government and private partners, and test the safe integration of ADS on our nation's roads. ${ }^{32}$ Goals of the ADS Demonstration grants:

- Safety: Test the safe integration of ADS into the Nations on-road transportation system. Fund projects that demonstrate how challenges to the safe integration of ADS into the Nations on-road transportation system can be addressed.
- Data for Safety Analysis and Rulemaking: Ensure significant data gathering and sharing of project data with USDOT and the public throughout the project in near real time, either by streaming or periodic batch updates, and demonstrate significant commitment to leveraging the demonstration data and results in innovative ways. Fund demonstrations that provide data and information to identify risks, opportunities, and insights relevant for USDOT safety and rulemaking priorities needed to remove governmental barriers to the safe integration of ADS technologies.
- Collaboration: This program seeks to work with innovative State and local governments, as well as universities and private partners, to create collaborative environments that harness the collective expertise, ingenuity, and knowledge of multiple stakeholders. These projects should include early and consistent stakeholder engagement, including early coordination with law enforcement, local public agencies, industry, transportation-challenged populations, the public, and other relevant stakeholders as applicable to conduct these demonstrations on terms that work for all parties. ${ }^{33}$

Over 70 applications were received by the U.S. DOT with submittals coming from Universities, State Department of Transportation agencies and cities. Award recipients are expected to be announced during the summer of 2019.

[^36]
### 4.6 Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Integrated Mobility Innovation

FTA's Integrated Mobility Innovation (IMI) Program funds projects that demonstrate innovative and effective practices, partnerships and technologies to enhance public transportation effectiveness, increase efficiency, expand quality, promote safety and improve the traveler experience. ${ }^{34}$ FTA's IMI 2019 funding opportunity provides $\$ 15$ million for demonstration projects focused on three areas of interest:

Mobility on Demand, Strategic Transit Automation Research and Mobility Payment Integration to:

- Explore new business approaches and technology solutions that support mobility
- Enable communities to adopt innovative mobility solutions that enhance transportation efficiency and effectiveness
- Facilitate the widespread deployment of proven mobility solutions that expand personal mobility

The application filing date for this funding opportunity was August 6th, 2019.

### 4.7 State Technology Programs

(a) Road X

The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) created the Road $X$ program with a vision of using advanced technologies to increase the safety and reliability of the state's transportation system. CDOT teamed up with public and private entities to invest in the most promising ideas focused on one or more of the defined action areas of commuting, sustainability, transport, safety, and connection. In 2016, the state committed $\$ 20$ million to initiate the Road X program and plans to continue to provide funds as worthwhile projects that fit the program's mission are developed. Current projects include smart truck parking, smart pavement, communication systems and infrastructure, and developing a plan for statewide electric vehicle charging stations. CDOT continues to accept ideas from the public for consideration for the RoadX program through their website. ${ }^{35}$
(b) Road to Tomorrow

In 2015, the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) introduced the Road to Tomorrow initiative that aims to prepare the state's transportation systems for emerging technologies and find innovative ways to fund the transformative projects. A mission of the program is to design the next generation of highways. Topics that have been considered as a part of this program are related to alternative energy, the Internet of Things, smart pavement, truck platooning, and EV infrastructure.

[^37]In 2016, the Road to Tomorrow program was awarded with AASHTO's President's Award for its efforts to further MoDOT and advance the future of transportation. ${ }^{36}$
(c) California PATH

In the 1980s, many universities developed programs to conduct research about emerging transportation technology. One of the most prominent programs was the California Program on Advanced Technology for the Highway (PATH), which was a collaboration between the University of California at Berkeley and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). This program aims to address issues with the State's transportation systems and continues to be an active leader in the research of transportation technology. A portion of PATH's research focuses specifically on connected and automated vehicles, including operational strategies, advanced driving features and systems, and contributing to the creation of a connected vehicle test bed along a signalized arterial between San Jose and San Francisco. ${ }^{37}$
(d) I-95 Corridor Coalition

The l-95 Corridor Coalition is composed of transportation agencies, toll authorities, public safety organizations, and other related stakeholder groups along the I-95 corridor from Maine to Florida. Affiliate members are located in Canada. The purpose of the volunteer-based Coalition is to combine the forces of all of the partner agencies to address the key widespread issues with transportation system management and operations. The Coalition's structure includes four program track committees that include travel information services, incident management and safety, intermodal freight and passenger movement, and innovation in transportation. The organization aims to support the efficient transfer of people and goods across all modes of transportation and improve coordination between agencies during normal system operations as well as in response to regional incidents. Past and ongoing projects include focuses like the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS), electronic tolling, interoperability and enforcement reciprocity, and connected and automated vehicles.

[^38]
## 5. Technology Assessment and Recommendations

Technology adoption within the transportation space is moving rapidly. While autonomous and connected vehicle deployments seem certain, what is not clear is the rate of adoption and the resulting speed at which technology improvements need to be made by TxDOT. In light of these uncertainties, TxDOT should strive to balance the maintenance of existing ITS infrastructure that is predominantly orientated to human drivers with emerging technologies that will be needed as the shift in transportation occurs. This chapter includes two sets of assessments and recommendations that are divided between existing ITS components and emerging technologies.

### 5.1 Enhancements to Existing ITS Technologies

As discussed above, the l-10 Corridor already has a significant deployment of ITS equipment including CCTV, DMS, radar and Bluetooth vehicle detection equipment throughout the corridor. Additionally, travelers on the corridor have access to cellular communications as well as trip planning applications and information dissemination mechanisms that allow for travelers to select alternative routes, modes, and time-of-day for their travel. At the same time, there are potential enhancements that could be made to the traditional ITS components that would strengthen their impact on reducing congestion and improving mobility. This section provides recommendations for potential near-term enhancements that could be made by TxDOT to increase the impact of existing ITS infrastructure on reducing congestion and improving mobility.
(a) Power and Communications Upgrades

Dedicated power and a communications backhaul are the cornerstones of ITS deployments and are even more critical for emerging technologies. In preparation for emerging technologies, TxDOT should consider enhancing the existing power and communications links to include the following:

- Dedicated power with secondary power backup for ITS components.
- Inclusion of Power-over-Ethernet (PoE) as a power source at ITS deployment locations.
- Upgrades or installation of fiber-optic strands for ITS components linked to a Traffic Management Center. These fiber-optic strands should be at least 144 strands with 10 Gbps capabilities.
(b) Improvements to Closed Circuit Television Cameras

TxDOT has coverage of the I-10 freeway in this corridor. However, this coverage is not universal throughout the corridor even on I-10. Additional camera coverage could be added to include more segments of $l-10$ as well as additional coverage of arterials and alternative routes such as SR 62 and SR 375. The coverage of additional road segments will enable TxDOT to more quickly identify and clear incidents as well as monitoring traffic on $\mathrm{I}-10$ and alternative arterials.

The existing CCTV cameras as well as any additional cameras should be digital, IP based cameras that avoid the need for direct linkages to a TMS. Moving to a digital camera platform will enable TxDOT to deploy software-based technologies that can automatically process the digital images using advanced computer analytics to identify traffic incidents, perform vehicle classification and counts, and to provide information on traffic speeds.
(c) Improvements to Dynamic Message Signs

There is coverage of $1-10$ and SR 62 with respect to DMS but other potential alternative routes such as SR 375 are lacking DMS components. Understanding that DMS as a technology will be rendered obsolete by V2V and V2I communications within the next two decades, there is still a role for DMS in the next 10-15 years to provide information to drivers of manually operated vehicles. TxDOT could consider replacing DMS components as they reach the end of their service life with high resolution full color LED instead of the existing monochrome displays.
(d) Integrated Trip Planning Applications

Travelers along the I-10 Corridor have a number of trip planning applications and information sources as previously described. However, these are not integrated into a single, comprehensive mobile application that combines traffic information on I-10 and arterials with real-time transit information. TxDOT should consider developing or supporting the development of such an integrated trip planning and real-time traffic reporting application. As an alternative, TxDOT could consider entering into agreements with large aggregators of traffic and trip information such as Waze ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ and others.
(e) Streetlight Improvements

Streetlights are not typically considered to be ITS components. However, advances in streetlights include conversion to LED as well as dynamically controlled lighting based upon motion and the amount of ambient light. New streetlights also include the ability for additional sensors, such as weather sensors, to be added. When performing routine replacement of existing streetlights in the I10 corridor, TxDOT should ensure that the replacements have the ability to add sensors (e.g., inclusion of 5-pin or 7-pin ports on the top of the light for plug in modules).

### 5.2 Investments for Emerging Technologies

Not all emerging technologies will have an immediate impact on congestion, mobility, and travel time reliability. However, these technologies will emerge rapidly and it is important for TxDOT to be in a position to capitalize upon these technologies when the market saturation is such that they will have a significant impact.
(a) Autonomous and Connected Vehicle Technology

Currently, the Tornillo/Guadalupe Port of Entry in El Paso is a partner in the Texas Autonomous Vehicle Proving Ground Partnership, which was designed as a National Autonomous Vehicle Proving Ground in 2017. This designation provides an opportunity for technology deployment and testing
along the I-10 corridor as part of a larger initiative within the State of Texas. One key sensor that enables truly autonomous vehicles is V2I communications of some sort.

Despite the ongoing debate regarding the use of DSRC versus 5G or other cellular communications for V2I and V2V communications, several researchers have suggested that the potential benefits in the short term far outweigh the costs for later conversion should that be necessary. For example, McGurrin (2017) suggests:
> "The results show that there are substantial benefits to be gained by moving forward with deployment. However, an argument for waiting is that C-V2X may prove to be superior in one or more ways, and therefore it would be advantageous to wait. To address this concern, this paper proposes a new approach, called "Dual-Mode Transition," where the nation moves forward with DSRC-based deployment, but transitions through a dual-mode deployment for several years before converting to purely C-V2X, should the latter prove superior in some way. The costs significantly outweigh the additional costs. Although further analysis is needed, such as refinement of the cost-benefit analysis, confirmation of the technical feasibility of the dual-mode approach, and further assessment of the impact of the increased in-vehicle costs, this analysis provides quantitative data supporting moving forward with a DSRC-based deployment, regardless of whether C-V2X proves to offer advantages in the longer term. However, it is also important to realize that further delay in deploying V2V safety comes at a cost in terms of lost lives, more injuries, and increased property damage. Not making a decision is equivalent to making a decision to delay. ${ }^{38 "}$

Many States, Cities, and Municipalities are currently investing and deploying connected vehicle technologies, particularly DSRC RSEs along Interstate and Highway corridors as part of other initiatives or as standalone deployments. Within the realm of autonomous and connected vehicles there are several potential areas where investing in autonomous and connected vehicle technologies would potentially improve congestion and mobility along the l-10 corridor.

## (i) Establishing a Baseline Connected Vehicle Corridor

Although mature, DSRC technologies represent a relatively new type of technology for many State DOTs. The provisioning of RSEs and the capture and analysis of resulting messages from V2l communications is different than traditional data collection activities. With DSRC, vehicles will be broadcasting a Basic Safety Message (BMS) at a frequency of 10 Hz . Other types of V2I communications at less frequent intervals would include Travel Advisory Messages and Roadside Alert Messages. TxDOT could use these messages in the l-10 corridor to supplement existing traveler information dissemination and alerting from existing, traditional ITS components such as DMS.

[^39]December 2017, available at https://www.mcgurrin.com/docs/dual_mode.pdf

HDR recommends that TxDOT consider implementing DSRC RSEs to be co-located with existing DMS equipment on the I-10 corridor. By utilizing these existing locations, TxDOT could tap into existing power and communications networks at minimal costs. Ultimately, HDR believes that investing in DSRC technology is recommended as it represents a relatively low risk opportunity for TxDOT while maximizing the existing and previous investments. For example, in the future if 5 G technologies or some other communication protocol rises to dominance such as Miracast Wi-Fi, these radio units can be "retuned" to operate as Wi-Fi routers or can have cellular modems added to transform them into 5G transponders. As new Dynamic Mobility Applications and Connected Vehicle applications are developed, having some coverage in the l-10 Corridor will enable TxDOT to implement these applications and further improve safety and mobility of travelers and workers. For example, one application previously tested by US DOT but has yet to be deployed due in part to DSRC coverage issues is the Response Emergency Staging Uniform Management and Evacuation application (R.E.S.C.U.M.E.). Among other things, this application provides real-time alerts to first responders and work crews when oncoming vehicles are determined to be a threat of entering an active incident zone. Establishing some coverage is a significant step to enabling these kinds of applications. The following table summarizes the proposed locations for DSRC RSEs along the I-10 Corridor.

Table 4. Proposed RSE Locations along I-10 Corridor

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| RSE ID | Cross-Street Reference | RSE ID |  | Cross-Street Reference |
| RSE 1 | Piedras | RSE 13 | Horizon |  |
| RSE 2 | Raynolds | RSE 14 | Eastlake |  |
| RSE 3 | Airway | RSE 15 | Lomaland |  |
| RSE 4 | Lee Trevino | RSE 16 | McRae |  |
| RSE 5 | Americas | RSE 17 | Airway |  |
| RSE 6 | Van Horn | RSE 18 | Trowbridge |  |
| RSE 7 | McRae | RSE 19 | Piedras |  |
| RSE 8 | Buena Vista | RSE 20 | Prospect |  |
| RSE 9 | Mesa | RSE 21 | Executive Center |  |
| RSE 10 | Artcraft | RSE 22 | Resler |  |
| RSE 11 | Vinton | RSE 23 | Artcraft |  |
| RSE 12 |  | RSE 24 | Vinton |  |

Table 5 presents a conceptual-level cost estimate of the proposed RSEs along I-10 that would establish an initial coverage. This cost estimate is based on installing 25 RSEs with connectivity to existing power and communications backhaul. Other assumptions include:

- The RSEs can be mounted onto the existing DMS infrastructure
- The RSE cost per unit does not increase from \$1,400.
- The yearly maintenance includes a check on each RSE quarterly and major support and maintenance of 2 units per year ( 10 percent of the units).

Table 5. RSE Installation and Operation Costs for Recommended Locations

| Item | C | Cost | Total | Justification |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| RSE Radio | 25 | $\$ 1,400$ | $\$ 35,000$ | Quote |
| RSE Mounting Brackets and <br> Ethernet Wire, and POE Injector | 25 | $\$ 370$ | $\$ 9,300$ | Quote |
| RSE Installation Support |  |  | $\$ 421,800$ | Based Upon Wyoming CV <br> Regional Pilot Costs |
| Yearly Maintenance |  |  | $\$ 56,300$ | Based Upon Wyoming CV <br> Regional Pilot Costs and <br> Assumptions |
| 25\% Contingency |  |  | $\$ 130,600$ | 25\% Contingency |

(ii) Facilitating Commercial Vehicle Movements

Although they have been considered as parts of long-range planning efforts in multiple states, there are very few exclusive truck lanes that exist today in the United States. Two instances can be found in California on northbound and southbound I-5 in Los Angeles County and southbound I-5 in Kern County. These lanes are all less than 2.5 miles in length and are used to address specific needs of separating slower traffic on a grade and forcing truck traffic to merge downstream of a junction. Many highways restrict truck use to certain lanes but allow other vehicles to use all lanes, eliminating many of the benefits associated with exclusive truck lanes. Corridors such as I-10 near El Paso are ideal locations for this traffic management technique due to high traffic volumes and truck percentages, especially during peak periods.

As a potential pilot project, TxDOT could deploy temporary dedicated lanes on I-10 for through truck traffic. These exclusive lanes will provide freight vehicles with dedicated interchanges with entrance and exit ramps from the ports of entry and major intersections on the l-10 corridor, especially to the various industrial areas in El Paso. The length and location of the Pilot truck lanes will be determined based on existing conditions, roadway capacity, and feasibility. The utilization of lower cost temporary barriers could be utilized in order to provide a definite separation of the exclusive lanes while allowing TxDOT the flexibility to evaluate multiple potential configurations and locations. Where applicable,
signage could be used to indicate the entry point to the dedicated lanes and the point at which trucks merge back in with traditional traffic. Existing traffic patterns within the corridor should be analyzed to ensure that any signing modifications or detour routes needed throughout the Pilot project are provided to both truck traffic and general-purpose traffic. If permanent dedicated truck lanes are implemented, one long term goal may include the construction of dedicated highway ramps for truck traffic at key locations where local truck traffic is high. If an incident occurs on the general-purpose lanes, the exclusive truck lanes will continue to provide free flowing access, reduce delivery travel time and increase fuel efficiency. If an incident occurs on an exclusive truck lane, general purpose traffic will not be affected.

The effectiveness of this Pilot project could be enhanced if paired with the Truck Platooning Pilot. Exclusive truck lanes allow for simplified testing of truck platooning techniques by eliminating the variables involved with general traffic patterns and distracted drivers. A combined dedicated truck lane and truck platooning pilot would provide a unique opportunity to gain insight on the potential impacts that these traffic management methods may have on transportation in the future.

## (b) Dynamic Lane Assignment

While roadways have typically been designed to last up to 50 years, emerging transportation technologies have the potential to make long-term development decisions more difficult than ever. Agencies must anticipate major changes to travel behavior and infrastructure needs as advancements continue to be made with connected and autonomous vehicles. Dynamic lane assignment strategies are being proposed as a way to plan for a variety of potential future states. The concept of dynamic lane assignment allows for various types of traffic to travel efficiently on a roadway by allocating specific travel lanes based on a variety of factors such as a vehicle's type, passenger load, and technological capabilities. The assignments can be dynamically managed to account for the throughput level as well as expected and unexpected congestion. This flexibility allows the lane configuration to be effective through all phases of technological development.

A potential pilot implementation of dynamic lane assignments would help the El Paso region explore the potential benefits of this unique traffic management technique. The lane assignments could be modified to address the specific needs of the l-10 corridor. For example, high occupancy vehicle and dedicated transit lanes could be implemented during peak hours to encourage more efficient modes of transportation. The direction of travel could be made to be reversible for some lanes during strategic periods of time such as major sporting events. Once vehicle technology continues to advance, lanes could be assigned to autonomous and connected vehicles as well as platooning freight vehicles. Lane assignments could be adjusted at any time in order to keep up with the needs of the transportation system.

The implementation of dynamic lane assignments has the potential to provide predictable travel times for commuters, improve transportation operations, and accommodate for future transportation technologies. Future plans for dynamic lanes include more advanced ideas such as dynamic lane quantities and widths and future advancements in pavement, striping, and lighting technologies.

Long-term benefits of dynamic lane assignment include potentially drastic safety and capacity improvements as well as cost savings from reduced capacity expansion needs.
(c) Truck Parking and Port of Entry (POE) Reservation System

TXDOT could implement a truck parking and port of entry (POE) reservation pilot system along the I10 corridor. This system would utilize smart truck parking signs which would display available parking spaces near the l-10 corridor between the Anthony Travel Center and Fabens Area Rest Areas. These smart truck parking signs would display available truck parking spots at designated truck parking lots (segments). This system would need to be developed in coordination with local area businesses such as private operated travel centers and plazas, large big-box retailers and other area businesses to ensure that there is capacity to handle the truck parking spots as well as installing technology to automatically determine parking availability. Currently, there are a number of technology solutions on the market that can be installed to track the number of available parking spots. The trucks could use these parking spaces as a way to make local deliveries more efficient and reduce the driving time and emissions emitted by trucks trying to find available overnight parking.

In addition, these parking spaces could be used as a staging area for border crossing. Trucks that are parked at these locations could wait until they receive their reserved border inspection time and then travel to the POE at that time. Allowing for trucks to be parked before moving through their POE could reduce driver time in the truck, reduce fuel consumption, reduce idling time at the border and reduce truck emissions.

If this system were to be contemplated, a baseline of data would need to be gathered, if not already known, to determine the additional driving time, costs and emissions looking for a parking spot as well as the time, costs and emissions generated waiting to pass through the POE. This data would then need to be compared to the pilot generated data to determine if there has been any measurable decrease in time, cost and emissions. If there is a positive effect on time, cost and emissions, the pilot could be potentially expanded.

## (d) Speed Harmonization and Queue Warning

The objective of speed harmonization is to minimize the variability in vehicle speed that results from incidents, weather or road conditions, or general congestion in order to reduce the negative impacts of the event on the transportation network. This application could utilize V2V and V2I communication technology to collect information that helps identify when traffic conditions are being affected by an event of some kind and speed harmonization may need to be implemented. However, it could also be implemented using the existing vehicle detection and ITS components in the I-10 corridor. Once real-time speeds and vehicle volume are determined, a TMC application formulates a response plan for upstream traffic that includes speed and lane recommendation strategies and communicates the plan to upstream traffic through an effective manner. This information is then manifested to the traveling public using DMS or V2I communications. TxDOT may need to supplement the existing DMS signage along l-10 to facilitate Speed Harmonization.

The effectiveness of the speed harmonization is directly dependent on the compliance level of the advisory speed limits that are communicated to the travelers. Successful past variable speed limit implementations used various techniques to maximize speed limit compliance such as advisory mandatory limits as well as enforcement through automatic and photo radar systems. An effective speed harmonization system will reduce crashes, decrease speed and speed variance, increase travel time reliability, and potentially cause an increase to the throughput.

A similar application would be to provide travelers with Queue Warnings, again using existing DMS and V2l technologies. Queue warning provides travelers with warnings related to existing and future queuing conditions. The goal is to minimize the negative effects of queues, most notably safety concerns such as rear-end collisions and introducing shockwaves that cause upstream traffic disruption. Vehicles within the queue automatically broadcast information about the status of the queue to the upstream traffic or the surrounding infrastructure via V2V and V2I communications or through triggering an existing Bluetooth or other vehicle detection monitor. Recently, new technologies, such as the iCone ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ are being used for queue warnings in work zones. The key data transmitted through queue warnings includes deceleration rates, the disabled status of vehicles, and lane location. By providing travelers with this information in a timely manner, secondary collisions and traffic flow shockwaves will be minimized.

## 6. Summary and Conclusions

The l-10 Corridor is a heavily traveled corridor by both passenger and commercial vehicles and experiences heavy congestion, especially during peak periods. There is a significant amount of existing ITS technologies that are deployed along the corridor that provide a solid basis for traffic operations and congestion relief. At the same time, many of these ITS components are aging and are becoming outdated. As resources permit, TxDOT should aggressively seek opportunities to upgrade existing ITS components including:

- Expanding coverage, density (number of pairs), and bandwidth of fiber-optics along the corridor.
- Converting existing DMS to multi-color LED from monochrome text.
- Replacing analog CCTV cameras with digital, IP-based camera systems.
- Implementing vehicle detection, counting, and classification through software- based systems based upon digital video images instead of additional radar, Bluetooth, or other vehicle detection systems.
- Integration of trip planning and real-time traffic conditions across all available modes within the corridor.
- Ensuring that streetlight replacements include provisions and capabilities for mounting additional sensors at future dates (i.e., include five or seven-pin peripheral ports).

We recommend that TxDOT invest and deploy a modest number of V2I Roadside Equipment using connected vehicle Dedicated Short Range Communications radios to be co-located at existing DMS locations. This equipment could be used to provide additional Traveler Information Messages, Road Hazard Warnings, and to capture information from vehicle-broadcasted Basic Safety Messages. Implementing this relatively small number of RSEs would provide TxDOT an opportunity to prepare for the rapidly emerging V 2 V and V 21 technologies as well as the next generation of autonomous vehicles that is expected to include V 2 V and V 2 I communications of some sort.

TxDOT could further leverage existing ITS assets and the recommended V2I technologies through implementation of speed harmonization, queue warnings, dynamic lane control, and exclusive truck lanes/platooning.

### 6.1 5G

TxDOT will want to consider deploying a 5G network in order to test connected vehicle to everything (C-V2X) technology along the I-10 corridor in conjunction with other stakeholders. 5G is the latest enabling technology that allows communication between devices, while C-V2X is a critical application that allows for the connectivity between vehicles and everything else. C-V2X, which was standardized
in 2017, is designed to connect vehicles to each other, to roadside infrastructure, to other road-users and to cloud-based services.

The goal of the 5G C-V2X project would be to determine:

- Whether the use of C-V2X technology in conjunction with a 5G network can reduce congestion;
- Whether the use of C-V2X technology in conjunction with a 5G network can increase traffic speed and throughput;
- Whether the use of C-V2X technology in conjunction with a 5G network can reduce traffic incidents, accidents and fatalities.

A portion of the l-10 corridor in El Paso has been identified as having the potential for a deployment of 5G C-V2X technology to test the various V2X technologies. The corridor, which stretches from Schuster Avenue to Copia Street is approximately 4 miles. A 5G cell network covering the span of I10 from Schuster Avenue to Copia Street utilizing different types of cells, Picocells or Microcells, is being proposed for the pilot project.

Based on past deployments of cellular technology, the City of El Paso and the l-10 corridor is not expected to have 5 G cellular service deployed until 2021. The almost 2 -year timeframe should allow for a project plan to be put together and stakeholders engaged and committed. In addition, grant funding that could pay for some of the cost of the pilot project could be applied for. Launching a pilot project in the spring or summer of 2021 should not be out of the realm of possibilities. TxDOT will want to determine, in conjunction with the project partners, the length of the pilot, which could run for months in order to properly assess the technology in all type of driving conditions. Performance measurements to accurately assess the impact of the pilot would include:

- Number of vehicles connected and participating in the pilot
- Measuring the signal speed, both sending and receiving data, from the 5G cells
- Speed of traffic along the l-10 corridor to determine whether there has been an increase/decrease in overall throughput and travel times
- Capturing other traffic data including measuring traffic incidents (near misses that may be determined by analyzing driving data), traffic accidents and fatalities


### 6.2 Electrification Corridor

TxDOT will want to consider deploying an electric vehicle electrification pilot project along the l-10 corridor. The goal of the pilot would be to gather data to determine:

- Whether the addition of additional charging stations will lead to an increase in the number of electric vehicles that are owned and operated in El Paso.
- Whether public installation of charging stations will spur additional investment from private electric vehicle charging station operators
- Whether the additional increase in electric vehicles has a measurable impact on lowering emissions in the l-10 corridor area.

Three different use cases for deploying electric vehicle charging stations have been developed including installing charging stations at rest stops on I-10, converting an I-10 lane as HOV EV lane and installing charging stations at major area employers along the $\mathrm{l}-10$ corridor.

### 6.3 I-10 Rest Area Electric Vehicle Charging Station Pilot

Rest stops on I-10 at the Anthony Travel Center and Fabens Area Rest Areas were selected for installing electric vehicle charging stations over others because they are owned and operated by TxDOT, have a high enough volume of vehicles due to easy access to l-10, and are at a location that encourages vehicles to remain idle for a period of time. Constructing charging infrastructure in facilities where travelers are already stopping and potentially dwelling for a substantial amount of time, provides an opportunity to offer both consumer facing and commercial facing charging facilities.

### 6.4 I-10 HOV EV Lanes Pilot

While the concept of managed lanes is growing in El Paso, there is an opportunity to combine the use of HOV lanes with Electric Vehicles as a way to incentive the increased purchase and use of Electric Vehicles along the I-10 corridor. Along a 4-mile corridor on I-10, from Schuster Ave to Copia St., TxDOT should dedicate one lane in either direction as a dedicated HOV EV lane. The use of HOV EV lanes would reduce current and future traffic congestions for drivers of electric vehicles that drive in the HOV EV lane. If successful, the length of the HOV EV lanes could be expanded beyond Schuster Avenue and Copia Street to further encourage adoption of electric vehicles.

### 6.5 Install Charging Stations at Major Area Employers along the l-10 Corridor Pilot

 In addition to installing charging stations at rest areas along the I-10 corridor, TxDOT should consider partnering with major local area employers, near the I-10 corridor, to deploy electric vehicle charging stations. TxDOT, in conjunction with major employers, both public and private, should deploy electric vehicle charging stations at work locations throughout El Paso near the l-10 corridor. Considerations for TxDOT to determine the right employer partners would include:- Number of employees
- Proximity to l-10
- Number of visitors/customers
- Other attributes

Major industries to consider are healthcare organizations, education and Fort Bliss. In addition, other companies in the electric industry may also be good employer partners for this pilot.

### 6.6 UAS Incident Management

TxDOT may want to consider developing a pilot for the use of Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) to aid in the event of a traffic incident or accident along the l-10 corridor. Significant regulatory requirements, both from a federal and state level, limit the type of pilot project that can be
recommended. Regulations from a federal standpoint are governed under the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) which controls how a vehicle operates within the airspace, and at the state level, Texas regulations and laws control who can use UAVs and for what specific activities or purposes they can be used with privacy being a significant concern. While these rules and regulations are being updated based on technology development and feedback from industry and learnings from approved pilots, the suggested pilots should be able to comply with both federal and state regulatory requirements as they exist today.

While regulatory considerations are important when considering an UAS pilot project, current technology constraints also acts as a limiting factor. Current mobile UASs allow for aerial drones to operate up to 1 hour in a range of up to 6 miles with sustained winds of less than 40 miles per hour. These mobile systems are intended to be used by people at an incident scene. In addition to mobile systems, stationary systems allow for drones to be deployed from a fixed point, which can reduce the time it take so deploy a drone from a mobile location. These stationary systems can come with a tethered which allows for the drone to remain in a fixed position but allows for a longer use based on a battery management system remaining on the ground. In addition, stationary systems also have the flexibility to release a drone to fly, similar to a mobile drone system, but allows for the drone to be housed in a weather-protected port while it is being stored and charged.

Currently, there are a number of UASs being tested in a variety of different use cases around North America. In Ontario, the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) Traffic Safety and Operational Support Command has been using UAS since 2012 to enhance search and rescue operations and map collision scenes for the Highway Safety Division (HSD). In North Carolina, the state is utilizing UAS to support construction inspections and reconstruct accident scenes in order to open travel lanes more quickly. In Texas, the Texas Department of Public Safety has developed a UAS program with systems in operation across Texas. The Texas program has provided support to local law-enforcement to develop UAS programs and has developed a policy for how those operations should take place.

The first pilot project would involve the use of a mobile UAS along the I-10 corridor when there is a traffic incident or accident. The UAS is operated by a pilot on-scene and is used to gain a higher vantage point of the incident, allowing a better view of the on-ground details. These systems have been successful in this use, as they can give the first responders a better situational awareness of the area, better understand the extent of the accident, better detect the extent of spilled fluids and accident debris, and give a clearer picture of the position and location of evidence available for reconstruction.

The second pilot project would involve the deployment of stationary UASs along the $\mathrm{I}-10$ corridor where they can be deployed in the event of a traffic incident or accident. The second pilot is a system of stationary UASs located along the corridor that could deploy quickly in response to an accident to give a better understanding of an incident scene. In this scenario, the vehicle would only operate vertically from the base station and would rely on the high resolution of the camera to capture the imagery from an incident. This system could cut the time required to get a camera on an incident,
but it would also come at the expense of the greater detail that would come from a first responder operating the UAV.

A ConOps or Operational Deployment Protocol will need to be developed specifically for use along the El Paso l-10 corridor. This will inform the basic operation of the program, who is responsible for what, how communications and coordination between agencies will be managed, and different operational protocols for different scenarios. Additionally, it should define how the UAS program is integrated with the existing Traffic Management Center and operations. Finally, performance measures such as vehicle control and operation, communication, image quality, response time and maintenance should all be analyzed during the pilot.

### 6.7 Truck Platooning

TxDOT has an opportunity to develop a truck platooning pilot to improve safety, reduce environmental impacts, and alleviate congestion along the l-10 corridor. The El Paso area is home to the third busiest truck border port in the United States and serves as a commercial freight, truck and air hub for the region. Truck freight uses the I-10 corridor and surrounding street network and is distributed throughout El Paso in one of four ways: 1) through trips; 2) POE destinations; 3) local destinations; and 4) intermodal destinations such as rail yards and the airport.

Many states prohibit truck platooning through following-too-closely (FTC) statutes but over 20 states, including Texas, have enacted FTC exemptions to allow for truck platooning. While the regulatory environment is open for piloting, testing and innovation, the technology component which will allow for the safe usage of truck platooning technology is just being developed. Platooning technology allows multiple vehicles to virtually couple such that vehicles can accelerate and brake simultaneously based on the steering, acceleration, and braking inputs of the lead vehicle. The connection between vehicles can be done via dedicated short-range communications or 5G connected vehicle technology, with the vehicle controls for platooning vehicles being automated. In addition, Vehicle-to-Vehicle (V2V) safety applications utilize communication between vehicles to prevent crashes while Vehicle-to-Infrastructure (V2I) safety applications integrate roadside communication infrastructure and vehicle data to enhance safety to drivers. Truck platooning is expected to improve capacity through reduced headways, decrease collisions, and increase fuel economy due to increased connectivity and automating among vehicles. Platooning technology requires trucks that are of similar size, that are new models and include required technology, and by similar manufacturers that allow shared use of proprietary technology.

There are a number of truck platooning pilot project that have either been completed or are currently underway. Several companies have completed demonstrations in Texas, Michigan, North Carolina, Florida, and other locations. Volvo Trucks North America and FedEx are running truck platoons in North Carolina and report fuel savings when operating along long distances on interstate environments. In addition, Peloton Technology recently unveiled technology for truck platooning that allows a single driver to drive a pair of vehicles. Peloton's proprietary technologies link pairs of heavy trucks for connected driving that improves aerodynamics, fuel economy and safety, using V2V
communications and radar-based active braking systems, combined with vehicle control algorithms. While still in development, truck platooning technology may be ready for a pilot project in the l-10 corridor in the near term.

I-10 is uniquely located across a major metropolitan area, along a regional and national east-west corridor, and adjacent to the U.S.-Mexico border. These characteristics provide opportunities for truck platooning use cases that will improve efficiency for truckers, commercial companies, and the local economy.

### 6.8 Drayage Operations

There are over 2 dozen drayage operations, freight that is shipped over relatively short distances, along l-10 in El Paso. Truck platooning will provide coordinated travel reliability that enhances efficiency. Through the use of a dynamic freight staging application, vehicles within a specified area will communicate their origins and destinations. The system will analyze the information provided and coordinate Dynamic Freight Staging. Dynamic freight staging will introduce the capability to group trucks at their origin or destination for a short period of time before, during or after a delivery. Drivers and shippers will be incentivized to use this service by the time and fuel savings afforded through signal priority. The application could be designed with the capability to build in reservation of delivery windows at El Paso International Airport and other area freight facilities.

### 6.9 Border Operations

Cross-border truck volumes continue to increase with hundreds of thousands of trucks passing through the El Paso border each year. Through enhanced coordination of multiple trucks traveling similar paths and distances, truck platoons can improve cross-border travel reliability and efficiency. With an eye towards future Port of Entry (POE) Reservation, truck platoons could reduce queuing at border crossings. This deployment will build off of the improvements in drayage operations with signals along Airway Boulevard and Montana Avenue to be upgraded to include new controllers and DSRC. Through dynamic matching based on origin and destination, trucks will be organized into nonautonomous "guided platoons" or road trains of three to five vehicles with similar routes. This use case will showcase many of the benefits of semi-autonomous platooning without the need for cooperative adaptive cruise control, a technology that has yet to become adopted widespread. The establishment of platoons will also serve as a basis for enacting signal priority, which will be requested through cellular technology.

### 6.10Long Haul Trucking

Approximately 55 miles of the 880-mile I-10 corridor are located in the study area. Through the use of cooperative adaptive cruise control, trucks equipped with proper technology and of suitable size and condition will be able to form platoons at the eastern and western ends of the study area. At the western end of the study area, Exit 0 in Anthony, Texas provides Flying J Travel Plaza, Pilot Travel Center, and Love's Travel Stop suitable for truck staging. At this location trucks coming from the west can stop, rest, and connect in a platoon for the travel east through the study area. At the eastern end of the study area, Exit 49 in Fabens, Texas provides Fast Trak travel center with amenities for
truckers. At this location trucks from the east can stop, rest, and connect in a platoon for the travel west through El Paso. Long haul trucking will benefit from fuel savings during platooning across this approximately 55 mile stretch of interstate. The associated benefit to El Paso will be improved air quality from fewer emissions from trucks passing through the region.

Truck platooning deployments will rely on a combination of public and private partnerships. Traffic signal improvements along Airway Boulevard and Montana Avenue to include new controllers and DSRC will be a public sector responsibility while implementation of 5G technology will require investments from the private sector. Performance measures identified for the proposed truck platooning pilot would analyze the following data before and after the pilot to determine whether there has been a measurable change:

- Number of crashes
- Fuel usage
- Delivery time
- Emissions


## Appendix H

## Break Out Projects

BREAK OUT PROJECTS

| Segment-Project ID | Project Description | Location/Limits | Improvement type | County | Construction Costs |  | Engineering Costs |  | RoW Costs |  | Preliminary Cost Estimates |  | Length (mi) | Lanes | Timeframe |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A | Corridor reconstruction | NM State Line to Looo 375 | Add mainlanes, relocate ramps, reconstruct interchanges | El Paso | \$ | 197,500,000.00 | \$ | 15,000,000.00 | \$ | 37,500,000.00 | \$ | 250,000,000.00 | 6.4 | 12 | Long |
| 1-B | Shared use path | Antonio St to Vinton Rd | Add shared use path | El Paso | \$ | 7,900,000.00 | \$ | 600,000.00 | \$ | 1,500,000.00 | \$ | 10,000,000.00 | 2.8 | N/A | Long |
| 1-C | Los Mochis Dr underpass | I-10 at Los Mochis Dr | Construct new underpass | El Paso | \$ | 23,700,000.00 | \$ | 1,800,000.00 | \$ | 4,500,000.00 | \$ | 30,000,000.00 | 0.1 | N/A | Mid |
| 1-D | Pedestrian bridge | I-10 at Canutillo High School | Add pedestrian bridge across mainlanes | El Paso | \$ | 7,900,000.00 | \$ | 600,000.00 | \$ | 1,500,000.00 | \$ | 10,000,000.00 | 0.2 | N/A | Long |
| 1-E | Corridor reconstruction | Loop 375 to Thorn Ave | Add mainlanes, relocate ramps, reconstruct interchanges | El Paso | \$ | 158,000,000.00 | \$ | 12,000,000.00 | \$ | 30,000,000.00 | \$ | 200,000,000.00 | 4.0 | 14 | Mid |
| 1-F | Thorn Ave interchange | 1-10 at Thorn Ave | Reconstruct interchange and add bypasses | El Paso | \$ | 23,700,000.00 | \$ | 1,800,000.00 | \$ | 4,500,000.00 | \$ | 30,000,000.00 | 0.5 | 2 | Mid |
| 1-G | Adaptive lanes | Thorn Ave to Executive Center Blva | Construct adaptive lanes and flyovers | El Paso | \$ | 59,250,000.00 | \$ | 4,500,000.00 | \$ | 11,250,000.00 | \$ | 75,000,000.00 | 5.8 | 2 | Mid |
| 1-H | Mesa St interchange | $\mathrm{l}-10$ at Mesa St | Reconstruct interchange | El Paso | \$ | 39,500,000.00 | \$ | 3,000,000.00 | \$ | 7,500,000.00 | \$ | 50,000,000.00 | 0.5 | N/A | Long |
| 1-1 | Frontage roads and ramps | US 85 to Executive Center Blva | Add frontage roads and relocate ramps | El Paso | \$ | 39,500,000.00 | \$ | 3,000,000.00 | \$ | 7,500,000.00 | \$ | 50,000,000.00 | 2.0 | 4 | Mid |
| 2-A | Corridor reconstruction | Executive Center Blva to Schuster Ave | Shift mainlane alignment, add mainlanes and adaptive lanes, add frontage roads, relocate ramps, reconstruct interchanges | El Paso | \$ | 197,50,000.00 | \$ | 15,000,000.00 | \$ | 37,500,000.00 | \$ | 250,000,000.00 | 2.0 | 17 | Long |
| 2-B | Corridor reconstruction | Schuster Ave to Copia St | Shift mainlane alignment, add mainlanes and adaptive lanes, add frontage roads, relocate ramps, reconstruct interchanges | El Paso | \$ | 553,000,000.00 | \$ | 42,000,000.00 | \$ | 105,000,000.00 | \$ | 700,000,000.00 | 4.0 | 20 | Mid |
| 3-A | Corridor reconstruction | Copia St to Paisano Dr | Shift mainlane alignment, add mainlanes and adaptive lanes, add frontage roads and CD roads, relocate ramps, reconstruct interchanges | El Paso | \$ | 355,50,000.00 | \$ | 27,000,000.00 | \$ | 67,500,000.00 | \$ | 450,000,000.00 | 1.7 | 20 | Long |
| 3-B | Corridor reconstruction | Paisano Dr to Airway Blva | Shift mainlane alignment, add mainlanes and adaptive lanes, relocate ramps, reconstruct interchanges | El Paso | \$ | 276,500,000.00 | \$ | 21,000,000.00 | \$ | 52,500,000.00 | \$ | 350,000,000.00 | 1.9 | 22 | Long |
| 3-6 | Corridor reconstruction | Airway Blvd to Yarbrough Dr | Shift mainlane alignment, add mainlanes and adaptive lanes, relocate ramps, reconstruct interchanges | El Paso | \$ | 355,50,000.00 | \$ | 27,000,000.00 | \$ | 67,500,000.00 | \$ | 450,000,000.00 | 3.3 | 18 | Long |
| 3-D | Corridor reconstruction | Yarbrough Dr to Eastlake Blvd | Shift mainlane alignment, add mainlanes and adaptive lanes, add adaptive lane flyovers and reconstruct DCs, relocate ramps, reconstruct interchanges | El Paso | \$ | 553,000,000.00 | \$ | 42,000,000.00 | \$ | 105,000,000.00 | \$ | 700,000,000.00 | 6.5 | 18 | Long |
| 4.A | Eastlake Blvd interchange | 1-10 at Eastlake Bivd | Reconstruct interchange | El Paso | \$ | 39,500,000.00 | \$ | 3,000,000.00 | \$ | 7,500,000.00 | \$ | 50,000,000.00 | 0.5 | 2 | Long |
| 4.B | Corridor reconstruction | Eastlake Blva to Horizon Blva | Add mainlanes, relocate ramps | El Paso | \$ | 79,000,000.00 | \$ | 6,000,000.00 | \$ | 15,000,000.00 | \$ | 100,000,000.00 | 2.4 | 6 | Long |
| 4.6 | Horizon Blvd interchange | $1-10$ at Horizon Blva | Reconstruct interchange | El Paso | \$ | 39,500,000.00 | \$ | 3,000,000.00 | \$ | 7,500,000.00 | \$ | 50,000,000.00 | 0.5 | 2 | Long |
| 4.D | Corridor reconstruction | Horizon Blvd to Darrington Rd | Add mainlanes, relocate ramps | El Paso | \$ | 79,000,000.00 | \$ | 6,000,000.00 | \$ | 15,000,000.00 | \$ | 100,000,000.00 | 4.9 | 4 | Long |
| $4 . \mathrm{E}$ | New interchange | MM 40-41 | Construct new interchange | El Paso | \$ | 23,700,000.00 | \$ | 1,800,000.00 | \$ | 4,500,000.00 | \$ | 30,000,000.00 | 0.1 | N/A | Mid |
| $4 . \mathrm{F}$ | Darrington Rd interchange | 1-10 at Darrington Rd | Reconstruct interchange | El Paso | \$ | 23,700,000.00 | \$ | 1,800,000.00 | \$ | 4,500,000.00 | \$ | 30,000,000.00 | 0.1 | N/A | Long |
| 4.G | Frontage roads | Darrington Rd to FM 3380 | Add frontage roads | El Paso | \$ | 118,500,000.00 | \$ | 9,000,000.00 | \$ | 22,500,000.00 | \$ | 150,000,000.00 | 13.0 | 4 | Long |
| 4-H | Mainlane reconstruction | Darringtoon Ra to FM 3380 | Add mainlanes, relocate ramps | El Paso | \$ | 118,500,000.00 | \$ | 9,000,000.00 | \$ | 22,500,000.00 | \$ | 150,000,000.00 | 13.0 | 4 | Long |
| 4.1 | Fabens Rd interchange | $1-10$ at Fabens Rd | Reconstruct interchange | El Paso | \$ | 23,700,000.00 | \$ | 1,800,000.00 | \$ | 4,500,000.00 | \$ | 30,000,000.00 | 0.1 | N/A | Long |
| ${ }^{4 . J}$ | FM 3380 interchange | $1-10$ at FM 3380 | Reconstruct interchange | EIPaso | \$ | 23,700,000.00 | \$ | 1,800,000.00 | \$ | 4,500,000.00 | \$ | 30,000,000.00 | 0.1 | N/A | Long |
| Corridor Wide | Truck parking | TBD | Add truck parking facility | El Paso |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mid |
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## Appendix I

## Interim Improvements

## INTERIM IMPROVEMENTS

| Segment-Project ID | Project Description | Location/Limits | Improvement Type | County |  | Preliminary Cost Estimates | Length (mi) | Timeframe |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A | Pavement rehabilitation | Transmountain Dr to Northern Pass Dr | Rehabilitate mainlane pavement | El Paso | \$ | 1,000,000.00 | 1.4 | Short |
| 1-B | Pavement rehabilitation | Thorn Ave to US 85 | Rehabilitate mainlane pavement | El Paso | \$ | 10,000,000.00 | 3.5 | Short |
| 3-A | Pavement reconstruction | Copia St to Raynolds St | Reconstruct mainlane pavement | El Paso | \$ | 12,000,000.00 | 1.1 | Short |
| 3-B | Ramp removal | EB Chelsea St exit ramp | Remove ramp | El Paso | \$ | 1,000,000.00 | 0.1 | Short |
| 3-C | Cross street removal | I-10 at Chelsea St | Remove cross street | El Paso | \$ | 1,000,000.00 | 0.1 | Short |
| 3-D | Ramp removal | WB Paisano Dr entrance ramp | Remove ramp | El Paso | \$ | 1,000,000.00 | 0.1 | Short |
| 3-E | Pavement reconstruction | Raynolds St to Robert E Lee Rd | Reconstruct mainlane pavement | El Paso | \$ | 24,000,000.00 | 2.2 | Short |
| 3-F | Robert E Lee Rd interchange | I-10 at Robert E Lee Rd | Intersection operational improvements | El Paso | \$ | 1,000,000.00 | 0.1 | Short |
| 3-G | Airway Blvd interchange | I-10 at Airway Blvd | Intersection operational improvements | El Paso | \$ | 500,000.00 | 0.1 | Short |
| 3-H | McRae Blvd interchange | I-10 at McRae Blvd | Intersection operational improvements | El Paso | \$ | 1,000,000.00 | 0.1 | Short |
| 3-1 | Pavement reconstruction | McRae Blvd to Lomaland Dr | Reconstruct mainlane pavement | El Paso | \$ | 17,000,000.00 | 1.7 | Short |
| 3-J | Yarbrough Dr interchange | $\mathrm{I}-10$ at Yarbrough Dr | Intersection operational improvements | El Paso | \$ | 1,000,000.00 | 0.1 | Short |
| 3-k | Lee Trevino Dr interchange | I-10 at Lee Trevino Dr | Intersection operational improvements | El Paso | \$ | 500,000.00 | 0.1 | Short |
| 3-L | Zaragoza Rd interchange | $\mathrm{I}-10$ at Zaragoza Rd | Intersection operational improvements | El Paso | \$ | 1,000,000.00 | 0.1 | Short |
| 4-A | Eastlake Blvd interchange | I-10 at Eastlake Blvd | Intersection operational improvements | El Paso | \$ | 1,000,000.00 | 0.1 | Short |
| 4-B | Horizon Blvd interchange | I-10 at Horizon Blvd | Intersection operational improvements | El Paso | \$ | 1,000,000.00 | 0.1 | Short |
| 4-C | Ramp capacity | WB Eastlake Blvd Entrance | Add capacity to ramp | El Paso | \$ | 5,000,000.00 | 0.2 | Mid |
| 4-D | Ramp capacity | WB Horizon Blvd Entrance | Add capacity to ramp | El Paso | \$ | 5,000,000.00 | 0.2 | Mid |
| 4-E | Ramp capacity | EB Horizon Blvd Exit | Add capacity to ramp | El Paso | \$ | 5,000,000.00 | 0.2 | Mid |
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## Appendix J

## ASEDs

## Annual Scope \& Estimate Documentation Spreadsheet

Date:
District:
County:


Project No.:
Highway:
UTP Authority: FEASIBILITY

Consultant (if applicable): $\qquad$
TxDOT Project Manager: Hugo Hernandez
TxDOT Project Manager Office: APD
CCSJ: 2121-01-095 CSJ:
Construct Categories: Not Funded for Construction FY of Current Costs: $\quad \underline{2018}$ Est Let FY: $\underline{2025}$

Limits From: New Mexico State Line (MM 0 )
Limits To: Executive Center Blvd (MM 16)
Current DCIS Scope:
Revised Scope: Add 1 additional lane and reconstruct I-10.


Estimate:

| I. | Design | \$54,562,800 | (Noti incuded in toial cosis) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II. | Earthwork and Landscape Subtotal | \$104,610,000 |  |
| III. | Subgrade Treatments and Base Subtotal | \$94,140,000 |  |
| IV. | Surface Courses and Pavement Subtotal | \$169,480,000 |  |
| V. | Structures Subtotal | \$405,440,000 |  |
| VI. | Miscellaneous Construction Subtotal | \$97,720,000 |  |
| VII. | Lighting, Signing, Markings and Signals Subtotal | \$37,990,000 |  |
| VIII. | Force Accounts | \$0 |  |
| IX. | Toll Integration | \$0 |  |
| VIII. | Right of Way \& Environmental Mitigation | \$90,938,000 | (Not incuded in total cosis) |
| IX. | Utility Bid Items (separate Row csJ) | \$90,938,000 |  |
| $\square \mathrm{Ne}$ | w Project Current Estimate Total | \$909,380,000 |  |

Estimate Type Feasibility Study Feasibility Study \% Complete 50\%_ Percent Change

Inflated Current Estimate
\$1,196,682,041
 Inflation is calculated at 4\% per fiscal year.

Explanation of Change from Last Year's Total
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\square$


## Removals

| Item No. | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Description } \\ \text { Code } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 104 | 6001 | REMOVING CONC (PAV) | SY | 2,128,860 | \$ 12.00 | \$ 25,546,320 |
| 104 | 6022 | REMOVING CONC (CURB AND GUTTER) | LF | 348,000 | \$ 3.00 | \$ 1,044,000 |
| 104 | 6024 | REMOVING CONC (RETAINING WALLS) | SY | 158,667 | \$ 35.00 | \$ 5,553,333 |
| 104 | 6037 | REMOVE CONC (RAIL) | LF | 87,000 | \$ 14.00 | \$ 1,218,000 |
| 105 | 6008 | REMOVING STAB BASE AND ASPH PAV (6") | SY | 89,840 | \$ 19.00 | \$ 1,706,960 |
| 496 | 6010 | REMOV STR (BRIDGE 100-499 FT LENGTH) | EA | 14 | \$ 100,000.00 | \$ 1,400,000 |
| 496 | 6011 | REMOV STR (BRIDGE 500-999 FT LENGTH) | EA | 1 | \$ 150,000.00 | \$ 150,000 |
| 496 | 6012 | REMOV STR (BRIDGE 1000 FT OR GREATER) | EA | 7 | \$ 200,000.00 | \$ 1,400,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$ 11,405,584 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  | \$ 49,430,000 |

## Earthwork and Landscape

| Item No. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Description } \\ \text { Code } \end{array}$ | Description | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price |  | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 110 | 6001 | EXCAVATION (ROADWAY) | CY | 4,023,333 | \$ | 10.00 | \$ | 40,233,333.33 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 132 | 6007 | EMBANKMENT (FINAL)(ORD COMP)(TY D) | CY | 4,023,333 | \$ | 10.00 | \$ | 40,233,333.33 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ontingency (30\%) | \$ | 24,140,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | 104,610,000 |

## Subgrade Treatments and Base

| Item No. | Description Code | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price |  | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 275 | 6001 | CEMENT | TON | 89,840 | \$ 220.00 | \$ | 19,764,800 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 53,020 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 1,000 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 29,450 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 6,370 |  |  |  |
| 275 | 6019 | CEMENT TREAT (SUBGRADE) (6") | SY | 2,193,470 | \$ 7.50 | \$ | 16,451,025 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 1,294,600 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 24,370 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 718,940 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 155,560 |  |  |  |
| 341 | 6022 | D-GR HMA TY-C PG64-22 | TON | 482,590 | \$ 75.00 | \$ | 36,194,250 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 284,820 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 5,370 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 158,170 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 34,230 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$ | 21,723,023 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  | \$ | 94,140,000 |

## Surface Courses and Pavement

| Item No. | Description Code | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 310 | 6006 | PRIME COAT (CSS-1H) | GAL | 438,710 | \$ 6.00 | \$ 2,632,260 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 258,920 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 4,880 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 143,790 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 31,120 |  |  |
| 360 | 6007 | CONC PVMT (CONT REINF - CRCP) (13") | SY | 2,128,860 | \$ 60.00 | \$ 127,731,600 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 1,275,260 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 17,770 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 680,270 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 155,560 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$ 39,109,158 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  | \$ 169,480,000 |

## Structures

| Item No. | Description Code | Description | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price |  | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 423 | 6001 | RETAINING WALL (MSE) | SF | 1,428,000 | \$ | 75.00 | \$ | 107,100,000 |
|  |  | BRIDGE - GPITX | SF | 1,980,500 | \$ | 63.00 | \$ | 124,771,500 |
|  |  | DRAINAGE | LM | 16 | \$ | 5,000,000.00 | \$ | 80,000,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | tingency (30\%) | \$ | 93,561,450 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 405,440,000 |

## Miscellaneous Construction

| Item No. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Description } \\ \text { Code } \end{array}$ | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 450 | 6014 | RAIL (TY 551) | LF | 87,000 | 48.00 | \$ 4,176,000 |
| 529 | 6002 | CONC CURB (TY II) | LF | 348,000 | \$ 9.00 | \$ 3,132,000 |
| 531 | 6003 | CONC SIDEWALKS (6") | SY | 1,044,000 | 65.00 | \$67,860,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$22,550,400 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$97,720,000 |

## Lighting, Signing, Markings, and Signals



## Annual Scope \& Estimate Documentation Spreadsheet

Date:
District:
County:
$\frac{5 / 11 / 2018}{\text { El Paso }}$

Project No.:
Highway: $\overline{\mathrm{I}-10}$
UTP Authority: $\quad$ FEASIBILITY

Consultant (if applicable): $\qquad$
TxDOT Project Manager: Hugo Hernandez
TxDOT Project Manager Office: APD
CCSJ: 2121-01-095 CSJ:
Construct Categories: Not Funded for Construction FY of Current Costs: $\quad 2018$ Est Let FY: 2029

Limits From: Executive Center Blvd (MM 16)
Limits To: $\quad$ Chelsea St (MM 23)
Current DCIS Scope:
Revised Scope: Add 1 additional lane and reconstruct I-10.


Estimate:

| I. | Design | $\$ 45,262,200$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| II. | Earthwork and Landscape Subtotal | $\$ 109,820,000$ |
| III. | Subgrade Treatments and Base Subtotal | $\$ 46,290,000$ |
| IV. | Surface Courses and Pavement Subtotal | $\$ 83,120,000$ |
| V. | Structures Subtotal | $\$ 449,510,000$ |
| VI. | Miscellaneous Construction Subtotal | $\$ 41,560,000$ |
| VII. | Lighting, Signing, Markings and Signala costs) |  |
| VIII. | Force Accounts | $\$ 24,070,000$ |
| IX. | Toll Integration | $\$ 0$ |
| VIII. | Right of Way \& Environmental Mitigation | $\$ 0$ |
| IX. | Utility Bid Items (separate Row csJ) | $\$ 113,155,500$ |
| $\square$ | New | $\$ 113,155,500$ |

Estimate Type Feasibility Study
Feasibility Study \% Complete _50\%
Last ASED Amount $\qquad$
Percent Change $\qquad$ [(Current-Last Yr's)/Last Yrs]
Inflation is calculated at $4 \%$ per
\$1,161,317,956 fiscal year.

Explanation of Change from Last Year's Total
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\square$
$\qquad$
$\left.\begin{array}{cccc}\text { Bob Beliek } & \text { Date } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Eddie Valtier } \\ \text { Area Engineer }\end{array} & \text { Date } \\ \text { Director of TP\&D }\end{array}\right]$

## Removals

| Item No. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Description } \\ \text { Code } \end{array}$ | Description | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price |  | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 104 | 6001 | REMOVING CONC (PAV) | SY | 1,047,620 | \$ | 12.00 | \$ | 12,571,440 |
| 104 | 6022 | REMOVING CONC (CURB AND GUTTER) | LF | 148,000 | \$ | 3.00 | \$ | 444,000 |
| 104 | 6024 | REMOVING CONC (RETAINING WALLS) | SY | 123,778 | \$ | 35.00 | \$ | 4,332,222 |
| 104 | 6037 | REMOVE CONC (RAIL) | LF | 37,000 | \$ | 14.00 | \$ | 518,000 |
| 105 | 6008 | REMOVING STAB BASE AND ASPH PAV (6") | SY | 44,180 | \$ | 19.00 | \$ | 839,420 |
| 496 | 6010 | REMOV STR (BRIDGE 100-499 FT LENGTH) | EA | 10 | \$ | 100,000.00 | \$ | 1,000,000 |
| 496 | 6011 | REMOV STR (BRIDGE 500-999 FT LENGTH) | EA | 4 | \$ | 150,000.00 | \$ | 600,000 |
| 496 | 6012 | REMOV STR (BRIDGE 1000 FT OR GREATER) | EA | 14 | \$ | 200,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ngency (30\%) | \$ | 6,931,524.67 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 30,040,000 |

## Earthwork and Landscape

| Item No. | Description Code | Description | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price |  | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 110 | 6001 | EXCAVATION (ROADWAY) | CY | 4,223,556 | \$ | \$ 10.00 | \$ | 42,235,555.56 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 132 | 6007 | EMBANKMENT (FINAL)(ORD COMP)(TY D) | CY | 4,223,556 | \$ | \$ 10.00 | \$ | 42,235,555.56 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Oontingency (30\%) | \$ | 25,341,333.33 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | 109,820,000 |

## Subgrade Treatments and Base

| Item No. | Description Code | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 275 | 6001 | CEMENT | TON | 44,180 | \$ 220.00 | \$ 9,719,600 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 31,820 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 640 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 8,530 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 3,190 |  |  |
| 275 | 6019 | CEMENT TREAT (SUBGRADE) (6") | SY | 1,078,380 | \$ 7.50 | \$ 8,087,850 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 776,890 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 15,550 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 208,160 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 77,780 |  |  |
| 341 | 6022 | D-GR HMA TY-C PG64-22 | TON | 237,270 | \$ 75.00 | \$ 17,795,250 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 170,920 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 3,430 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 45,800 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 17,120 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \#\#\#\#\#\#\#\#\#\#\#\# |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  | \$ 46,290,000 |

## Surface Courses and Pavement

| Item No. | Description Code | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 310 | 6006 | PRIME COAT (CSS-1H) | GAL | 215,690 | \$ 5.00 | \$ 1,078,450 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 155,380 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 3,110 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 41,640 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 15,560 |  |  |
| 360 | 6007 | CONC PVMT (CONT REINF - CRCP) (13") | SY | 1,047,620 | \$ 60.00 | \$ 62,857,200 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 768,660 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 9,460 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 191,720 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 77,780 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$ 19,180,695.00 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  | \$ 83,120,000 |

## Structures

| Item No. | Description Code | Description | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price |  | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 416 | 6009 | DRILL SHAFT ( 66 IN) | LF | 133,400 | \$ | 685.00 | \$ | 91,379,000 |
| 423 | 6001 | RETAINING WALL (MSE) | SF | 714,000 | \$ | 75.00 | \$ | 53,550,000 |
| 423 | 6022 | RETAINING WALL (SOIL NAIL) (FACIA) | SF | 400,000 | \$ | 48.00 | \$ | 19,200,000 |
|  |  | BRIDGE - GPITX | SF | 1,623,239 | \$ | 63.00 | \$ | 102,264,057 |
|  |  | BRIDGE - GPIDSB | SF | 439,422 | \$ | 101.00 | \$ | 44,381,622 |
|  |  | DRAINAGE | LM | 7 | \$ | 5,000,000.00 | \$ | 35,000,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ingency (30\%) |  | \#\#\#\#\#\#\#\#\#\#\# |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 449,510,000 |

## Miscellaneous Construction

| Item No. | Description Code | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 450 | 6014 | RAIL (TY 551) | LF | 37,000 | \$ 48.00 | \$ 1,776,000 |
| 529 | 6002 | CONC CURB (TY II) | LF | 148,000 | \$ 9.00 | \$ 1,332,000 |
| 531 | 6003 | CONC SIDEWALKS (6") | SY | 444,000 | \$ 65.00 | \$ 28,860,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$ 9,590,400.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ 41,560,000 |

## Lighting, Signing, Markings, and Signals



## Annual Scope \& Estimate Documentation Spreadsheet

Date:
District:
County:
$\frac{5 / 11 / 2018}{\text { El Paso }}$

Project No.:
Highway:
UTP Authority: FEASIBILITY

Consultant (if applicable): $\qquad$
TxDOT Project Manager: Hugo Hernandez
TxDOT Project Manager Office: APD
CCSJ: 2121-01-095 CSJ:
Construct Categories: Not Funded for Construction FY of Current Costs: $\quad \underline{2018}$ Est Let FY: $\underline{2035}$

Limits From: Chelsea St (MM 23)
Limits To: Loop 375 (MM 35)
Current DCIS Scope:
Revised Scope: Reconstruct I-10 and conduct operational improvements


Estimate:

| I. | Design | \$53,579,400 | (Noti incuded in toial cosis) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II. | Earthwork and Landscape Subtotal | \$252,140,000 |  |
| III. | Subgrade Treatments and Base Subtotal | \$74,130,000 |  |
| IV. | Surface Courses and Pavement Subtotal | \$133,770,000 |  |
| V. | Structures Subtotal | \$332,990,000 |  |
| VI. | Miscellaneous Construction Subtotal | \$67,400,000 |  |
| VII. | Lighting, Signing, Markings and Signals Subtotal | \$32,560,000 |  |
| VIII. | Force Accounts | \$0 |  |
| IX. | Toll Integration | \$0 |  |
| VIII. | Right of Way \& Environmental Mitigation | \$133,948,500 | (Noti inculded in total cosis) |
| IX. | Utility Bid Items (separate Row csJ) | \$133,948,500 | (Noti inculded in toala cosis) |
| $\square \mathrm{Ne}$ | w Project Current Estimate Total | \$892,990,000 |  |

Estimate Type Feasibility Study
Feasibility Study \% Complete _50\%
Last ASED Amount
Percent Change
Inflated Current Estimate
\$1,739,455,664
[(Current-Last Yr's)/Last Yrs]
Inflation is calculated at 4\% per fiscal year.

Explanation of Change from Last Year's Total
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\square$


## Removals

| Item No. | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Description } \\ \text { Code } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 104 | 6001 | REMOVING CONC (PAV) | SY | 1,680,380 | \$ 12.00 | \$ 20,164,560 |
| 104 | 6022 | REMOVING CONC (CURB AND GUTTER) | LF | 240,000 | \$ 3.00 | \$ 720,000 |
| 104 | 6024 | REMOVING CONC (RETAINING WALLS) | SY | 170,000 | \$ 35.00 | \$ 5,950,000 |
| 104 | 6037 | REMOVE CONC (RAIL) | LF | 60,000 | \$ 14.00 | \$ 840,000 |
| 105 | 6008 | REMOVING STAB BASE AND ASPH PAV (6") | SY | 70,760 | \$ 19.00 | \$ 1,344,440 |
| 496 | 6010 | REMOV STR (BRIDGE 100-499 FT LENGTH) | EA | 13 | \$ 82,146.00 | \$ 1,067,898 |
| 496 | 6011 | REMOV STR (BRIDGE 500-999 FT LENGTH) | EA | 2 | \$ 136,175.00 | \$ 272,350 |
| 496 | 6012 | REMOV STR (BRIDGE 1000 FT OR GREATER) | EA | 9 | \$ 188,400.00 | \$ 1,695,600 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$ 9,616,454 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  | \$ 41,680,000 |

## Earthwork and Landscape

| Item No. | Description Code | Description | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price |  | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 110 | 6001 | EXCAVATION (ROADWAY) | CY | 9,697,556 | \$ | \$ 10.00 | \$ | 96,975,555.56 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 132 | 6007 | EMBANKMENT (FINAL)(ORD COMP)(TY D) | CY | 9,697,556 | \$ | \$ 10.00 | \$ | 96,975,555.56 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Oontingency (30\%) | \$ | 58,185,333 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | 252,140,000 |

## Subgrade Treatments and Base

| Item No. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Description } \\ \text { Code } \end{array}$ | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 275 | 6001 | CEMENT | TON | 70,760 | \$ 220.00 | \$ 15,567,200 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 38,870 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 2,050 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 23,010 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 6,830 |  |  |
| 275 | 6019 | CEMENT TREAT (SUBGRADE) (6") | SY | 1,727,220 | \$ 7.50 | \$ 12,954,150 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 948,970 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 49,860 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 561,720 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 166,670 |  |  |
| 341 | 6022 | D-GR HMA TY-C PG64-22 | TON | 380,000 | \$ 75.00 | \$ 28,500,000 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 208,780 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 10,970 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 123,580 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 36,670 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$ 17,106,405 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  | \$74,130,000 |

## Surface Courses and Pavement

| Item No. | Description Code | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 310 | 6006 | PRIME COAT (CSS-1H) | GAL | 345,470 | \$ 6.00 | \$ 2,072,820 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 189,800 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 9,980 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 112,350 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 33,340 |  |  |
| 360 | 6007 | CONC PVMT (CONT REINF - CRCP) (13") | SY | 1,680,380 | \$ 60.00 | \$ 100,822,800 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 935,640 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 43,020 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 535,050 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 166,670 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$ 30,868,686 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  | \$ 133,770,000 |

## Structures

| Item No. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Description } \\ \text { Code } \end{array}$ | Description | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price |  | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 423 | 6001 | RETAINING WALL (MSE) | SF | 1,530,000 | \$ | 75.00 | \$ | 114,750,000 |
|  |  | BRIDGE - GPITX | SF | 1,371,266 | \$ | 63.00 | \$ | 86,389,758 |
|  |  | DRAINAGE | LM | 11 | \$ | 5,000,000.00 | \$ | 55,000,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | tingency (30\%) | \$ | 76,841,927 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 332,990,000 |

## Miscellaneous Construction

| Item No. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Description } \\ \text { Code } \end{array}$ | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 450 | 6014 | RAIL (TY 551) | LF | 60,000 | \$ 48.00 | \$ 2,880,000 |
| 529 | 6002 | CONC CURB (TY II) | LF | 240,000 | 9.00 | \$ 2,160,000 |
| 531 | 6003 | CONC SIDEWALKS (6") | SY | 720,000 | 65.00 | \$46,800,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$15,552,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$67,400,000 |

## Lighting, Signing, Markings, and Signals



## Annual Scope \& Estimate Documentation Spreadsheet

Date:
District:
County:
$\frac{5 / 11 / 2018}{\text { El Paso }}$

Project No.:
Highway: $\overline{\mathrm{I}-10}$
UTP Authority: $\quad$ FEASIBILITY

Consultant (if applicable): $\qquad$
TxDOT Project Manager: Hugo Hernandez
TxDOT Project Manager Office: APD
CCSJ: 2121-01-095 CSJ:
Construct Categories: Not Funded for Construction FY of Current Costs: $\quad 2018$ Est Let FY: 2035

Limits From: Loop 375 (MM 35)
Limits To: Tornillo Rd (MM 58)
Current DCIS Scope:
Revised Scope: Add 1 additional lane and reconstruct I-10.


Estimate:

| I. | Design | $\$ 52,869,000$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| II. | Earthwork and Landscape Subtotal | $\$ 30,650,000$ |
| III. | Subgrade Treatments and Base Subtotal | $\$ 186,160,000$ |
| IV. | Surface Courses and Pavement Subtotal | $\$ 338,720,000$ |
| V. | Structures Subtotal | $\$ 143,850,000$ |
| VI. | Miscellaneous Construction Subtotal | $\$ 134,340,000$ |
| VII. | Lighting, Signing, Markings and Sigal costs) |  |
| VIII. | Force Accounts | $\$ 47,430,000$ |
| IX. | Toll Integration | $\$ 0$ |
| VIII. | Right of Way \& Environmental Mitigation | $\$ 0$ |
| IX. | Utility Bid Items (separate Row csJ) | $\$ 88,115,000$ |
| $\square$ | New Project | $\$ 88,115,000$ |

Estimate Type Feasibility Study
Feasibility Study \% Complete _50\%
Last ASED Amount $\qquad$
Percent Change $\qquad$ [(Current-Last Yr's)/Last Yrs] Inflation is calculated at 4\% per
\$1,716,392,522 fiscal year.

Explanation of Change from Last Year's Total
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\square$
$\qquad$
$\left.\begin{array}{cccc}\text { Bob Beliek } & \text { Date } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Eddie Valtier } \\ \text { Area Engineer }\end{array} & \text { Date } \\ \text { Director of TP\&D }\end{array}\right]$

## Removals

| Item No. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Description } \\ \text { Code } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 104 | 6001 | REMOVING CONC (PAV) | SY | 4,255,720 | \$ 12.00 | \$ 51,068,640 |
| 104 | 6022 | REMOVING CONC (CURB AND GUTTER) | LF | 478,400 | \$ 3.00 | \$ 1,435,200 |
| 104 | 6024 | REMOVING CONC (RETAINING WALLS) | SY | 68,000 | \$ 35.00 | \$ 2,380,000 |
| 104 | 6037 | REMOVE CONC (RAIL) | LF | 119,600 | \$ 14.00 | \$ 1,674,400 |
| 105 | 6008 | REMOVING STAB BASE AND ASPH PAV (6") | SY | 177,660 | \$ 19.00 | \$ 3,375,540 |
| 496 | 6010 | REMOV STR (BRIDGE 100-499 FT LENGTH) | EA | 6 | \$ 82,146.00 | \$ 492,876 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$ 18,127,997 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  | \$ 78,560,000 |

## Earthwork and Landscape

| Item No. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Description } \\ \text { Code } \end{array}$ | Description | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price |  | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 110 | 6001 | EXCAVATION (ROADWAY) | CY | 1,178,667 |  | \$ 10.00 | \$ | 11,786,666.67 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 132 | 6007 | EMBANKMENT (FINAL)(ORD COMP)(TY D) | CY | 1,178,667 |  | \$ 10.00 | \$ | 11,786,666.67 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$ | 7,072,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | 30,650,000 |

## Subgrade Treatments and Base

| Item No. | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Description } \\ \text { Code } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 275 | 6001 | CEMENT | TON | 177,660 | \$ 220.00 | \$ 39,085,200 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 111,930 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 5,150 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 57,850 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 2,730 |  |  |
| 275 | 6019 | CEMENT TREAT (SUBGRADE) (6") | SY | 4,338,030 | \$ 7.50 | \$ 32,535,225 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 2,733,320 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 125,530 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 1,412,510 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 66,670 |  |  |
| 341 | 6022 | D-GR HMA TY-C PG64-22 | TON | 954,390 | \$ 75.00 | \$ 71,579,250 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 601,340 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 27,620 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 310,760 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 14,670 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$ 42,959,903 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  | \$ 186,160,000 |

## Surface Courses and Pavement

| Item No. | Description Code | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 310 | 6006 | PRIME COAT (CSS-1H) | GAL | 867,630 | \$ 6.00 | \$ 5,205,780 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 546,670 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 25,110 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 282,510 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 13,340 |  |  |
| 360 | 6007 | CONC PVMT (CONT REINF - CRCP) (13") | SY | 4,255,720 | \$ 60.00 | \$ 255,343,200 |
|  |  | Mainlanes |  | 2,706,740 |  |  |
|  |  | Ramps |  | 122,960 |  |  |
|  |  | Frontage Roads |  | 1,359,350 |  |  |
|  |  | Cross Streets |  | 66,670 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$ 78,164,694 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  | \$ 338,720,000 |

## Structures

| Item No. | Description Code | Description | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price |  | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 423 | 6001 | RETAINING WALL (MSE) | SF | 612,000 | \$ | 75.00 | \$ | 45,900,000 |
|  |  | BRIDGE - GPITX | SF | 115,024 | \$ | 63.00 | \$ | 7,246,512 |
|  |  | DRAINAGE - RURAL | LM | 23 | \$ | 2,500,000.00 | \$ | 57,500,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | tingency (30\%) | \$ | 33,193,954 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 143,850,000 |

## Miscellaneous Construction

| Item No. | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Description } \\ \text { Code } \end{array}$ | Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 450 | 6014 | RAIL (TY 551) | LF | 119,600 | \$ 48.00 | \$ 5,740,800 |
| 529 | 6002 | CONC CURB (TY II) | LF | 478,400 | \$ 9.00 | \$ 4,305,600 |
| 531 | 6003 | CONC SIDEWALKS (6") | SY | 1,435,200 | \$ 65.00 | \$ 93,288,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Contingency (30\%) | \$ 31,000,320 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ 134,340,000 |

## Lighting, Signing, Markings, and Signals

| Item No. | Description Code | Description | Unit | Quantity |  | Unit Price |  | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lighting | LM | 23 | \$ | 500,000.00 | \$ | 11,325,758 |
|  |  | ITS | LM | 23 | \$ | 1,000,000.00 | \$ | 22,651,515 |
|  |  | Intersections | EA | 10 | \$ | 250,000.00 | \$ | 2,500,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 仡 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ngency (30\%) | \$ | 10,943,182 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47,430,000 |

## Appendix K

## Benefit-Cost Analysis

## Results Summary of the Benefit-Cost Analysis

| Impact Categories | NPV Over 20 Years of Operations |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Undiscounted | 7\% |
| Benefits |  |  |
| Travel Time Savings | \$1,071.4 M | \$209.9 M |
| Vehicle Operating Cost Savings | (\$146.9 M) | (\$28.8 M) |
| Avoided Trucking Costs | \$274.4 M | \$53.8 M |
| Safety Improvement Benefits | \$295.2 M | \$61.4 M |
| Emission Reduction Benefits | (\$2.1 M) | (\$0.5 M) |
| O\&M Cost Savings | (\$45.4 M) | (\$9.4 M) |
| PV Benefits | \$1,446.6 M | \$286.4 M |
| Costs |  |  |
| Capital Costs | \$3,437.9 M | \$1,335.3 M |
| PV Costs | \$3,437.9 M | \$1,335.3 M |
| Net Present Value (NPV) | (\$1,991.3 M) | (\$1,048.9 M) |

Summary of Key Financial Metrics. All Values in Millions of 2018

| Key Financial Metrics | Undiscounted | $7 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total Benefits | $\$ 1,446.62 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 286.42 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Total Costs | $\$ 3,437.89 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 1,335.31 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Net Present Value (NPV) | $(\$ 1,991.27 \mathrm{M})$ | $(\$ 1,048.89 \mathrm{M})$ |
| Return on Investment (ROI) | $-58 \%$ | $-79 \%$ |
| Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) | 0.42 | 0.21 |
| Payback Period (years) | $>20$ yrs | $>20 \mathrm{yrs}$ |
| Internal Rate of Return (IRR) | $-7.2 \%$ |  |


| Internal Rate of Return (IRR) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Key Quantified Impacts | Total Over Study Period |  |
|  | Unit | Value |
| Travel Impacts |  |  |
| Avoided Auto Travel Distance | miles | -433,012,848 |
| Avoided Truck Travel Distance | miles | -42,825,446 |
| Avoided Auto Travel Time | hours | 46,722,903 |
| Avoided Truck Travel Time | hours | 4,620,946 |
| Safety Impacts per KABCO Scale |  |  |
| K - Killed | accidents | 22 |
| A - Incapacitating | accidents | 57 |
| B - Non-Incapacitating | accidents | 393 |
| C - Possible Injury | accidents | 708 |
| O - No Injury | accidents | 4,430 |
| Environmental Impacts |  |  |
| Avoided $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ Emission | tons | -172,997 |
| Avoided NOx Emission | tons | -93.55 |
| Avoided VOC Emission | tons | -7.77 |
| Avoided PM Emission | tons | -3.38 |
| Avoided $\mathrm{SO}_{2}$ Emission | tons | -1.27 |

Cumulative Present Value of Total Benefits and Costs (Discounted at 7\%)


Annual Benefits and Costs (Discounted at 7\%)


Demand Assumptions Table


| sumptions Table |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Travel Time Savings |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Passenger Vehicle Occupancy - All Travel | people / vehicle | 2020-2053 | 1.67 | US DOT, BCA Guidance January 2020; 2017 National Household Travel Survey |
| Truck Vehicle Occupancy |  |  | 1.00 | Assuming trucks only have the driver |
| Value of Time for Automobile Driver and Passenger | 2018\$/ hour | 2020-2053 | \$16.60 | US DOT, BCA Guidance January 2020; Revised Departmental Guidance on Valuation of Travel Time in Economic Analysis. |
| Value of Time for Truck Driver |  |  | \$29.50 |  |
| Vehicle Operating Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Operating Costs for Light Duty Vehicles | 2018\$ / mile | 2020-2053 | \$0.41 | US DOT, BCA Guidance January 2020; American Automobile Association, Your Driving |
| Avoided Trucking Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Average Marginal Cost of Trucking | 2018\$ / hour | 2020-2053 | \$71.78 | Value based on Average Marginal Cost per Hour. Data from: An Analysis of the Operational Cost of Trucking: 2019 Update. American Transportation Research Institute. November 2019 |
| Safety |  |  |  |  |
| KABCO Accident Valuation |  |  |  |  |
| K - Killed | 2018\$ / event | 2020-2053 | \$9,600,000 | Guidance on Treatment of the Economic Value of a Statistical Life in U.S. Department of Transportation Analyses (2016) https://www.transportation.gov/officepolicy/transportation-policy/reviseddepartmental-guidance-on-valuation-of-astatistical-life-in-economic-analysis |
| A - Incapacitating |  |  | \$459,100 |  |
| B - Non-Incapacitating |  |  | \$125,000 |  |
| C - Possible Injury |  |  | \$63,900 |  |
| O- No Injury |  |  | \$3,200 |  |
| Emissions |  |  |  |  |
| Emission Factors (Autos) | grams / mile | 2020-2053 | Varies by Speed and Year | Based on MOVES average annual emission factors for passenger vehicles for El Paso County, Texas. Moves model run in March 2020. |
| Emission Factors (Trucks) | grams / mile | 2020-2053 | Varies by Speed and Year | Based on MOVES average annual emission factors for trucks for El Paso County, Texas. Moves model run in March 2020. |
| Carbon Dioxide ( $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ ) | 2018\$ / ton | 2020 | \$0.91 | US DOT, BCA Guidance January 2020; The Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule for Model Years 2021-2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks (July 2018) |
|  |  | 2021 | \$0.91 |  |
|  |  | 2022 | \$0.91 |  |
|  |  | 2023 | \$0.91 |  |
|  |  | 2024 | \$0.91 |  |
|  |  | 2025 | \$0.91 |  |
|  |  | 2026 | \$0.91 |  |
|  |  | 2027 | \$0.91 |  |
|  |  | 2028 | \$0.91 |  |
|  |  | 2029 | \$0.91 |  |
|  |  | 2030 | \$0.91 |  |
|  |  | 2031 | \$1.09 |  |
|  |  | 2032 | \$1.27 |  |
|  |  | 2033 | \$1.45 |  |
|  |  | 2034 | \$1.63 |  |
|  |  | 2035 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2036 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2037 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2038 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2039 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2040 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2041 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2042 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2043 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2044 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2045 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2046 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2047 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2048 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2049 | \$1.81 |  |
|  |  | 2050+ | \$1.81 |  |
| Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) | 20188 / ton | 2020-2053 | \$8,300 | US DOT, BCA Guidance January 2020; The Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient Vehicles Rule for MY2021-MY2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks Preliminary Regulatory Impact Analysis (October 2018)". |
| Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) | $2018 \$$ / ton | 2020-2053 | \$2,000 |  |
| Particulate Matter (PM) | $2018 \$$ / ton | 2020-2053 | \$377,800 |  |
| Sulfur Dioxide $\left(\mathrm{SO}_{2}\right)$ | 2018 / ton | 2020-2053 | \$48,900 |  |
| Emissions |  |  |  |  |
| I-10 Lane Miles (No-Build) | lane-miles / year | 2020-2053 | 626.57 | Project Team Analysis |
| I-10 Lane Miles (Build) | lane-miles / year |  | 893.34 |  |
| O\&M Cost per Lane-Mile | 2018\$ / lane-mile |  | \$10,000 |  |
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