## APPENDIX A:

## RESUME OF STUDY PREPARER

## WILLIAM A. STIMPSON, P.E.

Senior Traffic Engineer

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Two degrees in civil engineering and 47 years of experience in transportation and traffic engineering, specializing in traffic safety and site planning. Traffic safety work has included driver performance research, facility safety auditing, and crash litigation support. Site planning work has included plan development and review, traffic impact analysis, and access management. Has also dealt with parking, ridesharing and bicycling incentives, and freight transportation. Registered Professional Engineer in Michigan since 1980 and expert witness since 1987. Practical experience as a countywide Traffic Engineering Supervisor, 1991-93.

## 1998 to Present GIFFELS WEBSTER (formerly Clearzoning/Birchler Arroyo Associates) - Washington, Michigan Senior Traffic Engineer

Mr. Stimpson has performed traffic reviews of hundreds of site plans; prepared shared parking studies, thoroughfare plans, crash data studies, corridor safety evaluations, and access management studies; conducted and reviewed numerous traffic impact studies; and completed signal warrant evaluations and cut-through traffic studies for both public and private clients. He has also investigated individual traffic crashes relative to alleged highway-tort, premises, and/or personal liability, and has provided expert testimony as needed. Mr. Stimpson:

- Is a skilled site plan reviewer, providing valuable advice to municipalities and private developers. His comprehensive traffic review of a site plan can dramatically improve on-site circulation, access to and from the public road network, and pedestrian safety. He is also an expert in shared parking analysis, offering the ability to reduce unnecessary impervious surface area and increase site efficiency.
- Has provided traffic engineering, parking, and safety consulting services to several Michigan communities, including the cities of Novi, Rochester, Woodhaven, and Lathrup Village; townships of Shelby, Grand Blanc, and Lenox; and villages of Bingham Farms and Mattawan.
- Formulated a new comprehensive policy for traffic impact studies (subsequently adopted by several client communities); reviews such studies for our municipal clients; and prepares such studies for our private clients.
- Developed access management plans for Southfield Road in Lathrup Village; Van Dyke Avenue in Shelby Township; M-24 in Lapeer County; Novi Road in Novi; and Allen and West Roads in Woodhaven.
- Consults nationally in crash litigation matters. Has deposition and trial experience in both civil and criminal cases. Court-accepted expert witness in traffic engineering and crash causation analysis.

1995 to 1998

WILLIAM A. STIMPSON, P.E. - Rochester, Michigan Self-Employed Consultant

- Served as primary author of traffic safety manual for statewide use, under direction of the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments and sponsorship of Michigan's Office of Highway Safety Planning.
- Consulted nationally in crash litigation involving alleged personal and highway tort liability. Investigated crashes involving grade crossings, curves, trucks, pedestrians, and poor weather.
- Conducted and evaluated several traffic impact studies.

1993 to 1995 A/E GROUP, INC. - McLean, Virginia, Program Manager, Federal Highway Administration Geometric Design Lab

- Set up and managed national lab to coordinate development of Interactive Highway Safety Design Model, a suite of CAD-interactive software for visualizing and assessing the safety of prospective highway designs.
- Edited research reports, set up studies on curve speeds and roadway design consistency, evaluated research proposals for driver performance model, and wrote paper on vehicle dynamics modeling.
- Organized and chaired national workshop on accident analysis methods. Also reviewed 250 police accident reports in search of causal factors.
- Evaluated warrants for - and specified design and placement of - new signs, signals, and markings on ACHD's 1,500 miles of city streets and county roads.
- Oversaw design, construction, and/or operation of traffic signals at 260 intersections.
- Conceived and directed special traffic engineering and safety studies.
- Participated in conceptual planning and public-meeting review of all capital improvements.
- Evaluated traffic safety of all construction plans for intersections, roadways, and bridges.
- Approved traffic control plans for all significant road-related construction and maintenance.
- Evaluated traffic impacts of proposed land developments, and specified needed roadway and traffic control improvements.
- Analyzed traffic planning issues, such as downtown circulation and parking, new route and intersection alternatives, and regional pathways.

1987 to 1991

> WILLIAM A. STIMPSON, P.E. - Rochester Hills, Michigan
> Self-Employed Consultant

- As Ford Motor Company's Proving Ground Safety Consultant in 1990, reviewed all aspects of driving safety at the company's four domestic proving grounds. Recommended new traffic control devices and numerous roadside safety improvements.
- Consulted in accident litigation, investigating crashes involving a construction zone, winter conditions, grade crossings, intersection sight distance, curves, and obstacle visibility. Also analyzed mass crash data, looking for evidence of vehicle design and operational problems.
- Established relationship between driver age and frequency of vehicle rollover crashes.
- Conducted several traffic impact studies and developed site plans for two shopping centers.

1979 to 1986
GENERAL MOTORS RESEARCH LABORATORIES - Warren, Michigan, Senior Research Engineer

- Researched crash causation, traffic signal coordination, in-vehicle navigation, and freight transportation.
- Used mass accident data to determine heavy-truck accident involvement trends, and to detect statistically different safety effects of alternative automobile bumper standards.
- Demonstrated through in-traffic measurements that re-timing and coordinating a network of vehicle-actuated traffic signals can reduce fuel use by as much as $15 \%$.
- Established, for users of an in-vehicle navigation system, a relationship between excess travel and road network familiarity.
- Helped develop concept initially referred to as a "cooperative highway," where in-vehicle navigation, cellular communications, and computerized traffic control might improve travel efficiency and safety (a precursor to Intelligent Transportation Systems, or ITS).
- Developed analytic procedure for trading off receiving dock inventory and unloading costs.
- Helped develop, test, and implement a new production scheduling method proven to reduce finished vehicle logistics costs by as much a $\$ 1$ million per year per assembly plant.


## ALAN M. VOORHEES \& ASSOCIATES - McLean, Virginia <br> Associate Engineer

- Managed and participated in studies of driver response to traffic control devices under various roadway design and environmental conditions; heavy truck safety; traffic operations; and parking.
- Directed development of accident-probability model based on traffic performance, and used model to evaluate alternative road delineation systems. Research led to new national standard for broken-line striping.
- Directed study of driver response to alternative durations of the yellow traffic signal.
- Assisted in comprehensive research study leading to national policy for right-turn-on-red.
- Evaluated benefits and costs of methods for alleviating adverse aerodynamic effects of large trucks.
- Compiled and analyzed data on 600 downgrade truck accidents.
- Directed comprehensive study of fringe parking lots for carpoolers at 150 lots in four states.
- Estimated cost-effectiveness of area-wide express bus service.
- Contributed to development of U.S. Capitol Hill Master Plan.
- Evaluated traffic circulation, traffic impact, parking, and signal timing optimization.

1972 to 1974 NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM SUPPORT CENTER - The Pentagon, Transportation Analyst

- Worked as a junior Army officer in the NMCSSC, an arm of the Defense Communications Agency providing systems analysis support to the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
- Developed multi-modal transportation data bases for foreign theaters of operation.
- Consulted with senior officers of OJCS on intra-theater strategic mobility modeling needs, and directed revisions to a large multi-modal transportation simulation model.

1970 to 1971 TEXAS TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE, Texas A\&M University, College Station, Texas, Research Assistant

- Researched Highway Visual Communications Systems within TTI’s Driving Environment Program.
- Synthesized findings of diagnostic field studies of driver behavior and performance, and used findings to recommend improved roadway design and traffic control practices.
- With a research psychologist, co-authored detailed "Driver Expectancy Checklist" for roadway design (condensed checklist later published by American Association of State Highway Officials, nka as AASHTO).
- Helped conduct daytime and nighttime sign legibility tests.


## EDUCATION

B.S.E. Civil Engineering, University of Michigan

Dean's Honor List, College of Engineering; top $1 / 3$ of civil engineering graduating class
M.Eng. Civil Engineering, Texas A\&M University

Top 10\% of graduating class; Elected to Chi Epsilon, 1970, and Phi Kappa Phi, 1972
U.S. Army Transportation School - Diploma, Transportation Officer Basic Course

Familiarization with all transportation modes; top $10 \%$ of graduating class

## PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION AND AFFILIATIONS

REGISTRATION
Professional Engineer (P.E.) - State of Michigan, No. 27420 (since 1980)
AFFILIATIONS
Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Fellow (since 1994) \& Life Member (effective January 2013) ITE, Member, Transportation Forensics and Risk Management Council (fka Expert Witness Council)

## PUBLICATIONS AND NON-PROPRIETARY MAJOR REPORTS

1. "Crash-Data-Assisted Safety Evaluation of 12 Intersections in City of Novi." Prepared for City of Novi, Jun 2012.
2. "Identification of High-Crash Intersections in the City of Novi, 2006-2010." Prepared for City of Novi, Jan 2012.
3. "Aguirre v. Delta Sonic." Prepared for Packer Engineering, Inc. \& Delta Sonic Car Wash Systems, Inc., Mar 2010.
4. "Evaluation of Cronin / Greene Motorcycle Crash at Intersection of Western Avenue and $63{ }^{\text {rd }}$ Street in City of Chicago." Prepared for Packer Engineering, Inc. \& City of Chicago, Dec 2009.
5. "An Evaluation of Golf Cart Utilization for Burnham Harbor Security Patrols." Prepared for Packer Engineering, Inc. \& Hector Espitia, Esq., Nov 2009.
6. "An Evaluation of Driver, Vehicle, and Roadway Causal Factors in the Matter of Kachel v. Hetrick, et al. v. PennDOT." Prepared in association with Engineering Analysis Associates, Inc., Jul 2000.
7. "Bridge Management Data for Southeast Michigan." Prepared for Southeast Michigan Council of Governments by William A. Stimpson, P.E., Jun 1996.
8. "SEMCOG Traffic Safety Manual - First Edition." Prepared for Southeast Michigan Council of Governments by William A. Stimpson, P.E., Feb 1996.
9. Workshop on Development of the Interactive Highway Safety Design Model (IHSDM) Accident Analysis Module," co-authored with D.W. Harwood, K.M. Bauer, and J. M. Mason. Prepared for Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) by Midwest Research Institute, Nov 1995.
10. "Influence of Vehicle Dynamics on Geometric Design," co-authored with J.A. Reagan. Presented at the Transportation Research Board's (First) International Symposium on Highway Design Practices, Boston, Massachusetts, Aug 1995.
11. "Technical Summary: Horizontal Alignment Design Consistency for Rural Two-Lane Highways (Publication No. FHWA-RD-94-034, Jan 1995)." Pub. No. FHWA-RD-130. Prepared for FHWA by A/E Group, Inc., Jan 1995.
12. "The Special Intersection Study: A Public/Private Partnership to Expand System Capacity in Concert with Land Development Needs." Presented at Annual Meeting of the Intermountain Section of the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Jackson Hole, Wyoming, May 1993.
13. "Rollover Accident Frequency and Driver Age." Unpublished paper, Jun 1987.
14. "Co-ordinating Vehicle-Actuated Traffic Signals to Reduce Vehicular Fuel Consumption," co-authored by G.M. Takasaki. Traffic Engineering \& Control, Vol. 23, No. 10, Oct 1982.
15. "The Influence of the Time Duration of Yellow Traffic Signals on Driver Response," co-authored by P.L. Zador and P. J. Tarnoff. ITE Journal, Nov 1980.
16. "Corridor Parking Facilities for Carpoolers," co-authored with J. W. Flora and J. R. Wroble. Final Report on Contract DOT-FH-11-9463. Prepared for FHWA by Alan M. Voorhees \& Associates, Jun 1980.
17. "Methodologies for Evaluating TSM Actions in Bombay." Working paper prepared for municipality of Bombay, India, under World Bank-sponsored study conducted by Alan M. Voorhees \& Associates, Apr 1979.
18. "Downgrade Truck Accidents and Their Prevention," co-authored by D.T. Gallagher. Prepared for Systems Technology, Inc. \& Federal Highway Administration by Alan M. Voorhees \& Associates, Jan 1979.
19. "Impact of Park-and-Ride and Express Bus Improvements." Chapter C of Transportation System Management: an Assessment of Impacts. Prepared for Urban Mass Transportation Administration under contract UMTA-VA-060047 by Alan M. Voorhees \& Associates, Nov 1978.
20. "A Cost-Effectiveness Evaluation of Devices for Reducing the Adverse Aerodynamic Effects of Large Trucks," coauthored by S.R. Shapiro. Prepared for Systems Technology, Inc. \& Federal Highway Administration by Alan M. Voorhees \& Associates, Aug 1978.
21. "The Traffic Safety Effectiveness of Selected Delineation Treatments Applied to Two-Lane Rural Highways." Winner of Honorable Mention in Past Presidents' Award competition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Aug 1978.
22. "Study of the Effectiveness of Lane Markings for Traffic Safety," co-authored with M.L. Altman. Prepared for Illinois Department of Transportation by Alan M. Voorhees \& Associates, Apr 1978.
23. "Field Evaluation of Selected Delineation Treatments on Two-Lane Rural Highways," co-authored by H.W. McGee, W.K. Kittelson, and R.H. Ruddy. Report Nos. FHWA-RD-77-118, 119. Prepared for Federal Highway Administration by Alan M. Voorhees \& Associates, Oct 1977.
24. "Predicting the Traffic Safety Effects of Alternative Roadway Delineation Treatments," co-authored by W.K. Kittelson. AMV Tech Notes, Alan. M. Voorhees \& Associates, Mar 1977.
25. "Methods for Field Evaluation of Roadway Delineation Treatments," co-authored by W.K. Kittelson and W.D. Berg. Transportation Research Record 630, 1977.
26. "Right-Turn-On-Red," Vols. I and II, co-authored with H.W. McGee, J. Cohen, G.F. King, and R.F. Morris. Report Nos. FHWA-RD-76-89, 90. Prepared for Federal Highway Admin. by Alan M. Voorhees \& Associates, May 1976.
27. "The Effects of Larger Trucks on Highway Operations and Design," co-authored with C.R. Keller. AMV Tech Notes, Alan M. Voorhees \& Associates, Sep 1975.
28. "Data Base Development for the Transportation Requirements and Capabilities Simulator Model (TRACS)." National Military Command System Support Center, Nov 1974.
29. "TRACS: A Computer Model of Intra-theater Strategic Mobility," co-authored by B.D. Nussbaum. Presented at $44^{\text {th }}$ National Meeting of Operations Research Society of America, San Diego, California, Nov 1973.
30. "Three Schemes for Improved Line-Haul Bus Rapid Transit." Traffic Engineering, Feb 1973.
31. "Driver Expectancy Checklist - A Design Review Tool," co-authored by N.C. Ellis. Prepared by Texas Transportation Institute and published by American Association of State Highway Officials, 1972.
32. "A New Warning Sign." TexITE, Vol. XVIII, No. 1, Sep 1971.
33. "A Critical Review of Climbing Lane Design Practices," co-authored by J.C. Glennon. Highway Research Record 371, 1971.
34. "Highway Engineering Tips." Prepared for Multi-State Policy Committee of Project HPR-2(108), Diagnostic Studies of Highway Visual Communication Systems. Prepared by Texas Transportation Institute, 1970.

## OTHER HONORS

- Honorable Mention, Institute of Transportation Engineers Past Presidents' Award, 1978
- Defense Communications Agency Certificate of Achievement, 1974


## MILITARY SERVICE

- 2LT, US Army Reserve, 1970-1973, and 1LT, US Army Reserve, 1973-1976
- Active duty in the Pentagon, 1972-1974 (see Experience section, above)


## SELECTED SHORT COURSES

- SIMSCRIPT II. 5 computer simulation language
- Computerized control of traffic signals
- Applied multivariate analysis (Princeton University)
- Highway Capacity Software 2000
- Roundabout design, operation, and analysis (M. Wallwork)
- Access Management Guidebook - Train the Trainer (MDOT)
- Syncho 6 / SimTraffic software
- Designing Pedestrian Facilities for Accessibility
- ADA Standards for Accessible Design


## APPENDIX B:

CITY OF BIRMINGHAM FORM B - FULL TRAFFIC STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM B - FULL TRAFFIC STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE
Applicant: $\qquad$ Case\#: $\qquad$
Date: $\qquad$ Address: $\qquad$

## 1. Proposed Project

Brief description of the proposed project: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Use of building(s): $\qquad$ Gross square footage: $\qquad$
Net square footage:
Number of parking spaces: $\qquad$
Site plan attached: $\qquad$

## 2. Existing Traffic

Provide Map 1 depicting recent a.m. and p.m. peak hour turning movement counts at all critical intersections within the project's impact area. Critical intersections should be defined in consultation with the City's Traffic Consultant. In general, small projects will have critical intersection within 0.5 to 1 mile from the site. Large projects may have an impact area expending two or more miles form the site.

Provide Map 2 depicting all roadways within the impact area of the project, the number of lanes on each road, and the most recent a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour and ADT counts on each road that are available from the City or Road Commission.

Using methodologies in the Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209, by the Transportation Research Board, provide tables below depicting the existing stopped time delay per vehicle and Level of Service for each critical intersection during a.m. and p.m. peak hours:

## Intersection:

A.M. Peak Hour:
Ex. Stopped Time Delay/Vehicle:

## P.M. Peak Hour:

Ex. Stopped Time Delay/Vehicle: Level of Service: $\qquad$

Intersection:
A.M. Peak Hour: $\qquad$ P.M. Peak Hour:

Ex. Stopped Time Delay/Vehicle:
Level of Service: $\qquad$
Ex. Stopped Time Delay/Vehicle: Level of Service: $\qquad$

## Intersection:

A.M. Peak Hour: $\qquad$ P.M. Peak Hour:

Ex. Stopped Time Delay/Vehicle:
Level of Service: $\qquad$
Level of Service: $\qquad$

## 3. Background Growth and Other Development Traffic

Determine the historical growth rate of traffic on roadways in the impact area by examining traffic counts over the last 3 to 5 years. Once an annual growth rate has been identified, apply the growth rate to existing traffic for the number of years until project completion. Show the background growth assignment on Map 4.

In some cases it may be necessary to assign trips for other large projects in the impact area to the road network in conjunction with or in lieu of using a background growth rate. This would be done to more accurately reflect future conditions. Consult with the City's Traffic Consultant.

Using the Highway Capacity Manual, provide tables as below depicting the Stopped Time Delay and Level of Service for each critical intersection for the existing plus background/other development scenario. For multiphase projects, provide a separate table for each phase.

## Intersection 1

A.M. Peak Hour: $\qquad$ P.M. Peak Hour:

Ex. Stopped Time Delay/Vehicle:
Level of Service: $\qquad$ Ex. Stopped Time Delay/Vehicle: Level of Service: $\qquad$
A.M. Peak Hour: $\qquad$ P.M. Peak Hour:

Dev. Scenario Stopped Time Delay/Vehicle:
Dev. Stopped Time Delay/Vehicle:
Dev. Scenario Level of Service:

## Intersection 2

A.M. Peak Hour: $\qquad$
Ex. Stopped Time Delay/Vehicle:
Level of Service: $\qquad$
P.M. Peak Hour: $\qquad$
Ex. Stopped Time Delay/Vehicle:
Level of Service: $\qquad$
A.M. Peak Hour: $\qquad$ P.M. Peak Hour:

Dev. Scenario Stopped Time Delay/Vehicle: $\qquad$ Dev. Stopped Time Delay/Vehicle:
Dev. Scenario Level of Service:
Dev. Scenario Level of Service: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

## 4. Project Traffic

Determine the number of trips generated by the proposed project, identify the directional distribution of the trips and assign the trips to the road network. Show the directional distribution on Map 5.

On Map 6, show the assignment of a.m. and p.m. peak hour trips from the project and show the number of a.m. and p.m. peak hour trips for the total of existing background/other development and project traffic.

Provide Map 7 (see below) for each critical intersection showing separately: number of turning movements made by existing traffic; existing plus background/other development; and existing plus background/other development plus project.

Using the Highway Capacity Manual, provide a table showing the stopped time delay and level of service for each critical intersection for the total traffic scenario (existing plus background/other plus project). Use the same form as example in section 3 above. For multi-phase projects, provide a separate table for each phase.

## 5. Driveway Movements (a.m. and p.m. peak hours)

| Driveway: | Driveway: |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left In: | Left In: |
| Right In: | Right In: |
| Left Out: | Left Out: |
| Right Out | Right Out: |
| Driveway | Driveway: |
| Left In: | Left In: |
| Right In: | Right In: |
| Left Out: | Left Out: |
| Right Out | Right Out: |

## 6. Recommended Improvements

Attach a separate sheet outlining recommended improvements to intersections and roadways necessary to accommodate future volumes. Provide appropriate capacity analyses to demonstrate the impact of the improvement(s).

## 7. Transportation Standards

Using the City Design and Construction standards or where appropriate, County Road Commission and Michigan Department of Transportation standards, identify and evaluate the following:

Passing lanes: $\qquad$

Tapers:
Turn Lanes: $\qquad$
Vehicle stacking analysis (if drive-up facilities are proposed): $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## 8. Sight Distance

Provide evaluations of sight distances at project driveways to demonstrate that they meet applicable City, County or State criteria.
*All maps and tables referenced above should be provided in the applicant's traffic study.
**Some projects with a low a.m. peak hour trip generation my not require Level of Service analysis for the a.m. peak hour. Consult with the City' Traffic Consultant.

Map 7
CRITICAL INTERSECTION
PHASE $\qquad$ (if applicable)

C C C

## B B B

A A A

| $\overline{\text { C B A }}$ | A B C |
| :--- | :--- |
| C B A | A B C |
| C B A | A B C |
|  |  |

A A A

B B B C C C

A = Existing traffic
$B=$ Existing plus background/other traffic
$\mathrm{C}=$ Existing plus background/other plus project traffic

Note: In addition to the above information, the Petitioner must acknowledge and address all of the pertinent goals, objectives, requirements and standards enumerated in the Birmingham Master Traffic Study.

## APPENDIX C

SIGNAL TIMING AT OLD WOODWARD AND BROWN

Table C-1. Signal Phase Durations (in Seconds) at Old Woodward and Brown

| Scenario | AM Peak Hour (Dial 2) |  | PM Peak Hour (Dial 3) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Phase 2 (Brown) | Phase 4 (Old WW) | Phase 2 (Brown) | Phase 4 (Old WW) |
| Permit of 12-07-15 | 36 | 44 | 44 | 36 |
| 2016 Synchro <br> "Existing" | 36 | 44 | 44 | 36 |
| 2016 Synchro <br> "Optimized" | 37 | 53 | 44 | 46 |
| 2017 Synchro <br> "Existing" | 36 | 44 | 44 | 36 |

## OAKLAND COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION <br> TRAFEIC-SAFETY DEPARTMENT <br> SIGNAL WORK ORDER

LOCATION: BROWN \& OLD WOCOWARED BATE: $12-7-15$
CITY/TOWNSHIP: BIRMWGHAM BY: RACHEL JONES COUNTY H: 278 STATE: $\qquad$ CHARGES: $\quad 50741-0981$

PLEASE PERFORM THE FOLLOWING:
$\qquad$ electrical device: $\qquad$ INSTALL $\qquad$ MODERNIZE $\qquad$ MAINTENANCE ___ UNDERGROUND: $\qquad$ EDISON OK: $\qquad$ YES $\qquad$ No JOB: $\qquad$ COORDINATE WIDISTRICT 7: $\qquad$

$\qquad$ CHANGE BREAKOUT OR PROM: $\qquad$
CHANGE HOURS OF OPERATION:
OLD: $\qquad$
NEW: $\qquad$
REPROGRAMTBC (TRAFFIC EvENTS; DST)
$\qquad$ INSTALL INTERCONNECT: $\qquad$ THC $\qquad$ MINITROL $\qquad$ TONE MET OK: $\qquad$ YES $\qquad$ NO
$\qquad$ NO CHANGE - RECORD CORRECTION $X$ OTHER: 3. PMASE DATA - 3. PED TIMWAS


ROAD COMMISSION FOR OAKLAND COUNTY. WATERFORD, MICHIGAN PROGRAM LOG FOR EAGLE SIGNAL COMPANY EPAC300 V.234a CONTROLLER

INTERSECTION $\qquad$ OLD WOODWARD

CITYIVILLAGEITOWNSHIP: $\qquad$ BIRMINGHAM
COUNTY: 278 MOT\#:_____
drawn by: Rachel Jones approved by: $\qquad$ DATE DRAWN: 12.17115

INSTALLED BY: $\qquad$ DATE INSTLD: $\qquad$
HOURS OF OPERATION: $\qquad$ DAYS: 24 HRS

HOURS OF FLASHING: NONE

2. UTILITIES - 1. ACCESS

CODE.............................................................: 1642 CODE: Four digits (0000 - 9999)

## 4. UNIT DATA - 5. RING STRUCTURE

***** NOTE: INSERT ALL RING \#'S FIRST, THEN NOT \& CONCUR *****
****


```
CODES:
```

RING
PHNXT CONCUR PH Phases To Be Concurrent ( $0=$ NO, $1=$ YES)

For vehicle channel $\&$ ped channel, enter "1" under channel\# shown.
3. PHASE DATA - 1. BASIC TIMINGS

| Phase | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | RANGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Green |  | 5 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $000-99$ |
| Passage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $0.0-9.9$ |
| Maximum \#1 |  | 32 |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $000-999$ |
| Maximum \#2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $000-999$ |  |  |
| Yellow Clearance | 3.5 | $3-5$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $3.0-9.9$ |  |  |  |
| Red Clearance | 2.5 | $2-5$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $0.0-9.9$ |  |  |  |

ROAD COMMISSION FOR OAKLAND COUNTY，WATEREORD，MICHIGAN PROGRAMLOG FOR EAGLE SIGNAL COMPANY EPAC $300 . Y .2 .34$ ．CONTROLLER．

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | （1） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3．PHASE DATA－2．DENSITY TIMINGS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phase | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | RANGE（SEC） |
| Seconds／Actuation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ． |  |  |  |  | ， |  | 0．0－9．9 |
| Maximum Initlal |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 00－99 |
| Time B4 Reduction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 00－99 |
| Cars B4 Reduction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | T |  |  |  |  |  |  | 00.99 |
| Time To Reduce |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  | 00－99 |
| Minimum Gap |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0．0－9．9 |
|  |  | 茀 |  |  | 葠 | \＃ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 鉘 |  |  |  |  |

3．PHASE DATA－3．PEDESTRIAN TIMINGS

| Phase | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | RANGE（SEC） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Walk |  | 7 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 00.99 |
| Pedest Clearance |  | 19 |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 00－99 |
| Flashing Walk |  | $i$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extend Ped Clear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Act Rest in Walk |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

3．PHASE DATA－4．INITIALIZE \＆NON ACTUATED RESPONSE

| Phase | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initlal |  | 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NA Response |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CODES： | 0 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Initial | none |  | inactive |  |  | red |  |  | yellow |  |  | green |  |  |  |  |
| NA Response | none |  | to 1 |  |  | ＋02 |  |  | both |  |  | －－－－－ |  |  |  |  |

3．PHASE DATA－5．VEHICLE \＆PEDESTRIAN RECALLS

| Phase | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Recall |  | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian Recall |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CODES： | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle | none |  |  | 1 call |  |  | min |  | max |  |  | soft |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian |  |  |  | 1 ca |  |  | ped |  | bo |  | N．A． | －．．－－－ |  |  |  |  |

3．PHASE DATA－6．NONLOCK \＆MISC CONTROLS

| Phase | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nonlock Memory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dual Entry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Last Car Passage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conditional Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

4．UNIT DATA－1．STARTUP \＆MISCELLANEOUS
Start up time Auto ped clear Stop time reset
$: 10$
$: 0$
$: 0$
（00－99）


$$
\begin{aligned}
& (0=\mathrm{fI}, 1=\mathrm{red}) \\
& (2.0-9.9)
\end{aligned}
$$

$0=$ No， 1 Yes）

4．UNIT DATA－8．I／O MISCELLANEOUS

| Ring\＃ | $\mathbf{1}$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | CONN | MODE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Input Response | 1 |  |  |  | ＂D＂ |  |
| Output Select | 1 |  |  |  | ＂D＂ |  |

[^0]
## ROAD COMMISSION FOR OAKLAND COUNTY WATEREORD, MICHIGAN PROGRAMLOG.FOR EAGLE SIGNAL COMPANY EPAC 300 V.2.34a CONTROLLER

## 5. COORDINATION DATA - 3. DIALISPLIT DATA

LEVEL 2
DIAL 1 / SPLIT 1 CYCLE LENGTH: 80 SEC

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  | 36 |  | 44 |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  | 1 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |

DIAL 1 / SPLIT 2 CYCLE LENGTH:

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DIAL 1 / SPLIT 3 CYCLE LENGTH:

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DIAL 1 / SPLIT 4 CYCLE LENGTH:

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DIAL 2 / SPLIT 1 CYCLE LENGTH: 80

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  | 36 |  | 44 |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  | 1 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |

DIAL 2 / SPLIT 2 CYCLE LENGTH:

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DIAL 2 / SPLIT 3 CYCLEE LENGTH:

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DIAL $2 /$ SPLIT 4 CYCLE IENGTH:

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

LEVEL 1

| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME | 65 |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |
| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TIME |  |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |
| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TIME |  |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RIIG 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |
| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TIME |  |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |


| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME | 25 |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |
| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TIME |  |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |
| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TIME |  |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |
| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TIME |  |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |

## ROAD COMMISSION.FOR QAKLAND COUNTY, WATEREORD. MICHIGAN PROGRAMLOG FOR EAGLE SIGNAL COMRANY EPAC 300 V. $2.34 a$ CONTROLLER

## 5. COORDINATION DATA - 3. DIALISPLIT DATA

LEVEL 2
DIAL 3 /SPLIT 1 CYCLE LENGTH: 80

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  | 44 |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  | 1 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |

DIAL 3 / SPLIT 2 CYCLE LENGTH:

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DIAL 3 / SPLIT 3 CYCLE LENGTH:

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DIAL 3 / SPLIT 4 CYCLE LENGTH:

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

LEVEL 1

| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME | 25 |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |
| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TIME |  |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |
| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TIME |  |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |
| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TIME |  |  |  |
| SEQUENGE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |


| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |
| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TIME |  |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |
| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TIME |  |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |
| OFFSET | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TIME |  |  |  |
| SEQUENCE |  |  |  |
| RING 2 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 3 LAG |  |  |  |
| RING 4 LAG |  |  |  |

DIAL 4 / SPLIT 3 CYCLE LENGTH:

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DIAL 4 / SPLIT 4 CYCLE LENGTH:

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DIAL 4 / SPLIT 2 CYCLE LENGTH:

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DIAL 4 / SPLIT 1 CYCLE LENGTH:

| PHASE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ROAD COMMISSION FOR OAKLAND COUNTY. WATERFORD, MICHIGAN PROGRAM LOG FOR EAGLE SIGNAL COMPANY EPAC300 V.2.34aCONTRÓLLER.
6. TIME BASE DATA - 2. SET TIME / DATE

```
-- DATE -
MM/DDMY
```

$\qquad$

CYCLEZERO: $24: 00$ (HH:MM - EVENT)
6. TIME BASE DATA - 3. TRAFFIC EVENTS

| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { PRO } \\ \text { DAY } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | TIME <br> H H:MM | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { COORD } \\ & \text { PATRN } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | MAX 2 PHASE \#S |  |  |  |  |  | OMITPHASE \#S |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| *** | * ****D | Disio |  |  | *** | *** | *** |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{*}{ }^{*}$ |  |
| 01 | 00:00 | 11111- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02 | 00:00 | 11111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02 | 07:00 | 21111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02. | 10:00 | 11111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02 | 15:00 | 31111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02 | 19:00 | 11111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 19:00 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | , |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | , | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 1 1. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

REFERENCE DATA
PRO DAY = 01-99
(Program day)
HH:MM = $\mathbf{2 4}$ Hour clock

PATTERN: (D/S/O)
FLASH $=5 / 51$
FREE $=0 / 0 / 4$

MAX2 \& OMITS:
Call free, set pattern to 0\%\%.
$\mathrm{D}=$ DIAL $\#$
$\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{SPLIT}$ \#
0 = OFFSET \#

## ROAD COMMISSION FOR OAKLAND COUNTY. WATERFORD, MICHIGAN PROGRAM LOG FOR EAGLE SIGNAL COMPANY EPAC300 V.2.34a CONTROLLLER.



SIGNAL PHASING


## APPENDIX D:

BUS SERVICE NEAR SITE


Figure D-1. SMART Bus Stops in South-Central Birmingham


Figure D-2. SW Corner of Old Woodward and Merrill: Existing SB Bus Stop and Bike Parking


Figure D-3. Above Location Showing Single Existing Bike Rack and Delivery Truck Using Bus Bay


Figure D-4. Existing SB Bus Shelter Just South of Daines


Figure D-5. Existing NB Bus Stop on Old Woodward Opposite Daines


Figure D-6. Existing NB Bus Stop Shown on SMART Map at Brown Is Actually Opposite Merrill

APPENDIX E:

## SUMMARY OF PARKING DECK OCCUPANCY DATA

PROVIDED BY SP+

Table E-1. Use of Pierce Street Parking Deck in July 2016

| Hour | Weekday Spaces |  |  |  |  |  | Weekend Spaces |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tue 7/19 | Wed 7/20 | Thu 7/21 | Fri 7/22 | Average | Available | Sat 7/23 | Sun $7 / 24$ | Average | Available |
| 12:00 AM |  | 111 | 79 | 102 | 97 | 609 |  | 30 | 30 | 676 |
| 1:00 AM |  | 95 | 58 | 80 | 78 | 628 |  | 27 | 27 | 679 |
| 2:00 AM |  | 90 | 54 | 70 | 71 | 635 |  | 24 | 24 | 682 |
| 3:00 AM |  | 86 | 53 | 68 | 69 | 637 |  | 24 | 24 | 682 |
| 4:00 AM | 24 | 88 | 54 | 67 | 58 | 648 | 20 | 24 | 22 | 684 |
| 5:00 AM | 11 | 11 | 14 |  | 12 | 694 | 10 |  | 10 | 696 |
| 6:00 AM | 16 | 18 | 21 |  | 18 | 688 | 16 |  | 16 | 690 |
| 7:00 AM | 34 | 42 | 40 |  | 39 | 667 | 22 |  | 22 | 684 |
| 8:00 AM | 142 | 142 | 140 |  | 141 | 565 | 33 |  | 33 | 673 |
| 9:00 AM | 294 | 327 | 312 |  | 311 | 395 | 45 |  | 45 | 661 |
| 10:00 AM | 452 | 516 | 477 |  | 482 | 224 | 51 |  | 51 | 655 |
| 11:00 AM | 528 | 589 | 559 |  | 559 | 147 | 55 |  | 55 | 651 |
| 12:00 PM | 614 | 616 | 595 |  | 608 | 98 | 53 |  | 53 | 653 |
| 1:00 PM | 664 | 651 | 619 |  | 645 | 61 | 56 |  | 56 | 650 |
| 2:00 PM | 631 | 638 | 625 |  | 631 | 75 | 58 |  | 58 | 648 |
| 3:00 PM | 567 | 567 | 609 |  | 581 | 125 | 58 |  | 58 | 648 |
| 4:00 PM | 531 | 539 | 541 |  | 537 | 169 | 59 |  | 59 | 647 |
| 5:00 PM | 453 | 498 | 472 |  | 474 | 232 | 53 |  | 53 | 653 |
| 6:00 PM | 365 | 403 | 413 |  | 394 | 312 | 44 |  | 44 | 662 |
| 7:00 PM | 394 | 458 | 447 |  | 433 | 273 | 42 |  | 42 | 664 |
| 8:00 PM | 418 | 494 | 436 |  | 449 | 257 | 40 |  | 40 | 666 |
| 9:00 PM | 353 | 371 | 363 |  | 362 | 344 | 38 |  | 38 | 668 |
| 10:00 PM | 230 | 253 | 230 |  | 238 | 468 | 37 |  | 37 | 669 |
| 11:00 PM | 148 | 134 | 162 |  | 148 | 558 | 33 |  | 33 | 673 |

Table E-2. Use of Pierce Street Parking Deck in March 2017

| Hour | Weekday Spaces |  |  |  |  |  | Weekend Spaces |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tue 3/07 | Wed 3/08 | Thu 3/09 | Fri 3/10 | Average | Available | Sat 3/11 | Sun 3/12 | Average | Available |
| 12:00 AM |  | 50 | 76 | 20 | 49 | 657 |  | 131 | 131 | 575 |
| 1:00 AM |  | 35 | 60 | 42 | 46 | 660 |  | 82 | 82 | 624 |
| 2:00 AM |  | 35 | 53 | 52 | 47 | 659 |  | 60 | 60 | 646 |
| 3:00 AM |  | 36 | 52 | 54 | 47 | 659 |  | 58 | 58 | 648 |
| 4:00 AM | 19 | 33 | 51 | 55 | 40 | 667 | 48 | 56 | 52 | 654 |
| 5:00 AM | 11 | 10 | 11 |  | 11 | 695 | 12 |  | 12 | 694 |
| 6:00 AM | 21 | 21 | 22 |  | 21 | 685 | 17 |  | 17 | 689 |
| 7:00 AM | 47 | 46 | 39 |  | 44 | 662 | 30 |  | 30 | 676 |
| 8:00 AM | 137 | 174 | 120 |  | 144 | 562 | 66 |  | 66 | 640 |
| 9:00 AM | 318 | 427 | 290 |  | 345 | 361 | 126 |  | 126 | 580 |
| 10:00 AM | 497 | 592 | 437 |  | 509 | 197 | 226 |  | 226 | 480 |
| 11:00 AM | 553 | 651 | 506 |  | 570 | 136 | 305 |  | 305 | 401 |
| 12:00 PM | 670 | 702 | 565 |  | 646 | 60 | 370 |  | 370 | 336 |
| 1:00 PM | 688 | 635 | 635 |  | 653 | 53 | 423 |  | 423 | 283 |
| 2:00 PM | 638 | 601 | 646 |  | 628 | 78 | 426 |  | 426 | 280 |
| 3:00 PM | 574 | 574 | 585 |  | 578 | 128 | 383 |  | 383 | 323 |
| 4:00 PM | 521 | 528 | 578 |  | 542 | 164 | 348 |  | 348 | 358 |
| 5:00 PM | 456 | 458 | 504 |  | 473 | 233 | 312 |  | 312 | 394 |
| 6:00 PM | 346 | 384 | 427 |  | 386 | 320 | 288 |  | 288 | 418 |
| 7:00 PM | 344 | 407 | 465 |  | 405 | 301 | 327 |  | 327 | 379 |
| 8:00 PM | 311 | 369 | 469 |  | 383 | 323 | 360 |  | 360 | 346 |
| 9:00 PM | 226 | 263 | 359 |  | 283 | 423 | 328 |  | 328 | 378 |
| 10:00 PM | 117 | 163 | 230 |  | 170 | 536 | 267 |  | 267 | 439 |
| 11:00 PM | 78 | 106 | 26 |  | 70 | 636 | 186 |  | 186 | 520 |

Table E-3. Use of Peabody Street Parking Deck in July 2016

| Hour | Weekday Spaces |  |  |  |  |  | Weekend Spaces |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tue 7/19 | Wed 7/20 | Thu 7/21 | Fri 7/22 | Average | Available | Sat 7/23 | Sun 7/24 | Average | Available |
| 12:00 AM |  | 86 | 33 | 36 | 52 | 385 |  | 291 | 291 | 146 |
| 1:00 AM |  | 86 | 32 | 36 | 51 | 386 |  | 103 | 103 | 334 |
| 2:00 AM |  | 86 | 32 | 37 | 52 | 385 |  | 42 | 42 | 395 |
| 3:00 AM |  | 86 | 32 | 36 | 51 | 386 |  | 41 | 41 | 396 |
| 4:00 AM | 18 | 15 | 32 | 36 | 25 | 412 | 19 | 41 | 30 | 407 |
| 5:00 AM | 12 | 15 | 12 |  | 13 | 424 | 12 |  | 12 | 425 |
| 6:00 AM | 27 | 33 | 25 |  | 28 | 409 | 14 |  | 14 | 423 |
| 7:00 AM | 38 | 44 | 42 |  | 41 | 396 | 15 |  | 15 | 422 |
| 8:00 AM | 94 | 104 | 103 |  | 100 | 337 | 6 |  | 6 | 431 |
| 9:00 AM | 200 | 256 | 245 |  | 234 | 203 | 38 |  | 38 | 399 |
| 10:00 AM | 293 | 390 | 370 |  | 351 | 86 | 39 |  | 39 | 398 |
| 11:00 AM | 333 | 140 | 409 |  | 294 | 143 | 55 |  | 55 | 382 |
| 12:00 PM | 356 | 423 | 430 |  | 403 | 34 | 84 |  | 84 | 353 |
| 1:00 PM | 362 | 428 | 431 |  | 407 | 30 | 112 |  | 112 | 325 |
| 2:00 PM | 352 | 424 | 421 |  | 399 | 38 | 126 |  | 126 | 311 |
| 3:00 PM | 311 | 418 | 408 |  | 379 | 58 | 123 |  | 123 | 314 |
| 4:00 PM | 281 | 404 | 398 |  | 361 | 76 | 141 |  | 141 | 296 |
| 5:00 PM | 197 | 323 | 230 |  | 250 | 187 | 157 |  | 157 | 280 |
| 6:00 PM | 163 | 202 | 208 |  | 191 | 246 | 180 |  | 180 | 257 |
| 7:00 PM | 148 | 181 | 177 |  | 169 | 268 | 203 |  | 203 | 234 |
| 8:00 PM | 112 | 120 | 130 |  | 121 | 316 | 228 |  | 228 | 209 |
| 9:00 PM | 46 | 81 | 72 |  | 66 | 371 | 251 |  | 251 | 186 |
| 10:00 PM | 35 | 61 | 42 |  | 46 | 391 | 279 |  | 279 | 158 |
| 11:00 PM | 70 | 40 | 41 |  | 50 | 387 | 282 |  | 282 | 155 |

Table E-4. Use of Peabody Street Parking Deck in March 2017

| Hour | Weekday Spaces |  |  |  |  |  | Weekend Spaces |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tue 3/07 | Wed 3/08 | Thu 3/09 | Fri 3/10 | Average | Available | Sat 3/11 | Sun 3/12 | Average | Available |
| 12:00 AM |  | 39 | 38 | 57 | 45 | 392 |  | 45 | 45 | 392 |
| 1:00 AM |  | 39 | 36 | 56 | 44 | 393 |  | 27 | 27 | 410 |
| 2:00 AM |  | 39 | 34 | 56 | 43 | 394 |  | 26 | 26 | 411 |
| 3:00 AM |  | 39 | 34 | 56 | 43 | 394 |  | 26 | 26 | 411 |
| 4:00 AM | 106 | 39 | 34 | 56 | 59 | 378 | 10 | 26 | 18 | 419 |
| 5:00 AM | 12 | 12 | 12 |  | 12 | 425 | 10 |  | 10 | 427 |
| 6:00 AM | 40 | 35 | 43 |  | 39 | 398 | 10 |  | 10 | 427 |
| 7:00 AM | 62 | 55 | 55 |  | 57 | 380 | 15 |  | 15 | 422 |
| 8:00 AM | 110 | 110 | 113 |  | 111 | 326 | 54 |  | 54 | 383 |
| 9:00 AM | 296 | 294 | 274 |  | 288 | 149 | 111 |  | 111 | 326 |
| 10:00 AM | 412 | 409 | 385 |  | 402 | 35 | 137 |  | 137 | 300 |
| 11:00 AM | 420 | 430 | 427 |  | 426 | 11 | 125 |  | 125 | 312 |
| 12:00 PM | 428 | 434 | 426 |  | 429 | 8 | 146 |  | 146 | 291 |
| 1:00 PM | 421 | 437 | 429 |  | 429 | 8 | 172 |  | 172 | 265 |
| 2:00 PM | 417 | 434 | 436 |  | 429 | 8 | 188 |  | 188 | 249 |
| 3:00 PM | 413 | 432 | 420 |  | 422 | 15 | 143 |  | 143 | 294 |
| 4:00 PM | 407 | 413 | 394 |  | 405 | 32 | 133 |  | 133 | 304 |
| 5:00 PM | 333 | 305 | 314 |  | 317 | 120 | 133 |  | 133 | 304 |
| 6:00 PM | 230 | 212 | 225 |  | 222 | 215 | 130 |  | 130 | 307 |
| 7:00 PM | 185 | 186 | 230 |  | 200 | 237 | 133 |  | 133 | 304 |
| 8:00 PM | 120 | 163 | 178 |  | 154 | 283 | 152 |  | 152 | 285 |
| 9:00 PM | 81 | 98 | 144 |  | 108 | 329 | 163 |  | 163 | 274 |
| 10:00 PM | 55 | 66 | 105 |  | 75 | 362 | 119 |  | 119 | 318 |
| 11:00 PM | 41 | 40 | 67 |  | 49 | 388 | 66 |  | 66 | 371 |

APPENDIX F:

MAY 2016 PEAK-HOUR TRAFFIC COUNTS AT OLD WOODWARD \& BROWN

Project:: City of
Birmingham Traffic Signal Optimization Study Corridor:: Maple Road \& Old Woodward Ave.
Weather:: Sunny, Dry Deg's 60
Video VCU ID\#:: SCU 34G

## Traffic Data Collection (MI) 7504 Sawgrass Drive www.tdccounts.com <br> Washington, Michigan, United States 48094 <br> Ph. (586) 786-5407 <br> Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: S. Old
Woodward Avenue \& E.
Brown Street
Site Code: TMC 11
Start Date: 05/05/2016
Page No: 1

| Start Time | S. Old Woodward Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  | urni <br> brown S <br> estbou |  | ovem | men | Dat <br> S. Old W <br> N | oodwar <br> rthbou | Avenue |  | E. Brown Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. <br> Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. <br> Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. <br> Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. <br> Total |  |
| 7:00 AM | 3 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 4 | 19 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 5 | 18 | 24 | 3 | 47 | 12 | 34 | 7 | 0 | 53 | 144 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 14 | 5 | 5 | 19 | 4 | 25 | 1 | 3 | 30 | 6 | 27 | 26 | 4 | 59 | 13 | 38 | 8 | 4 | 59 | 167 |
| 7:30 AM | 4 | 17 | 2 | 2 | 23 | 4 | 26 | 5 | 8 | 35 | 9 | 33 | 32 | 4 | 74 | 19 | 36 | 10 | 6 | 65 | 197 |
| 7:45 AM | 5 | 22 | 2 | 10 | 29 | 8 | 31 | 5 | 3 | 44 | 11 | 34 | 48 | 1 | 93 | 22 | 53 | 6 | 5 | 81 | 247 |
| Hourly Total | 12 | 70 | 10 | 18 | 92 | 20 | 101 | 11 | 17 | 132 | 31 | 112 | 130 | 12 | 273 | 66 | 161 | 31 | 15 | 258 | 755 |
| 8:00 AM | 6 | 37 | 13 | 6 | 56 | 4 | 36 | 1 | 7 | 41 | 19 | 30 | 44 | 1 | 93 | 35 | 63 | 15 | 4 | 113 | 303 |
| 8:15 AM | 6 | 26 | 11 | 10 | 43 | 9 | 45 | 6 | 5 | 60 | 18 | 36 | 53 | 0 | 107 | 35 | 61 | 15 | 3 | 111 | 321 |
| 8:30 AM | 5 | 36 | 12 | 8 | 53 | 8 | 41 | 5 | 7 | 54 | 11 | 51 | 54 | 1 | 116 | 19 | 59 | 11 | 3 | 89 | 312 |
| 8:45 AM | 7 | 33 | 12 | 11 | 52 | 6 | 37 | 2 | 5 | 45 | 16 | 51 | 60 | 0 | 127 | 25 | 47 | 13 | 1 | 85 | 309 |
| Hourly Total | 24 | 132 | 48 | 35 | 204 | 27 | 159 | 14 | 24 | 200 | 64 | 168 | 211 | 2 | 443 | 114 | 230 | 54 | 11 | 398 | 1245 |
| 9:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ${ }^{* * *}$ BREAK $^{* * *}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00 AM | 15 | 33 | 8 | 12 | 56 | 15 | 20 | 9 | 10 | 44 | 14 | 58 | 36 | 4 | 108 | 29 | 46 | 14 | 8 | 89 | 297 |
| 11:15 AM | 14 | 46 | 9 | 7 | 69 | 14 | 40 | 9 | 9 | 63 | 15 | 65 | 44 | 4 | 124 | 19 | 55 | 17 | 10 | 91 | 347 |
| $11: 30 \text { AM }$ | 21 | 45 | 18 | 7 | 84 | 15 | 39 | 12 | 23 | 66 | 7 | 56 | 48 | 7 | 111 | 30 | 52 | 32 | 14 | 114 | 375 |
| 11:45 AM | 22 | 30 | 14 | 7 | 66 | 25 | 38 | 10 | 19 | 73 | 17 | 60 | 45 | 3 | 122 | 41 | 73 | 27 | 11 | 141 | 402 |
| Hourly Total | 72 | 154 | 49 | 33 | 275 | 69 | 137 | 40 | 61 | 246 | 53 | 239 | 173 | 18 | 465 | 119 | 226 | 90 | 43 | 435 | 1421 |
| 12:00 PM | 18 | 46 | 14 | 12 | 78 | 25 | 34 | 6 | 22 | 65 | 18 | 52 | 37 | 14 | 107 | 44 | 69 | 22 | 20 | 135 | 385 |
| $12: 15 \text { PM }$ | 10 | 47 | 12 | 13 | 69 | 13 | 33 | 6 | 29 | 52 | 18 | 61 | 28 | 11 | 107 | 50 | 67 | 19 | 28 | 136 | 364 |
| 12:30 PM | 22 | 50 | 20 | 11 | 92 | 19 | 25 | 8 | 15 | 52 | 16 | 62 | 40 | 11 | 118 | 34 | 78 | 18 | 27 | 130 | 392 |
| 12:45 PM | 21 | 46 | 23 | 10 | 90 | 20 | 27 | 5 | 37 | 52 | 20 | 63 | 36 | 17 | 119 | 42 | 65 | 16 | 24 | 123 | 384 |
| Hourly Total | 71 | 189 | 69 | 46 | 329 | 77 | 119 | 25 | 103 | 221 | 72 | 238 | 141 | 53 | 451 | 170 | 279 | 75 | 99 | 524 | 1525 |
| *** BREAK *** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4:00 PM | 6 | 37 | 17 | 4 | 60 | 12 | 39 | 10 | 12 | 61 | 5 | 45 | 39 | 2 | 89 | 41 | 66 | 7 | 2 | 114 | 324 |
| 4:15 PM | 9 | 33 | 15 | 6 | 57 | 17 | 40 | 11 | 5 | 68 | 11 | 57 | 43 | 2 | 111 | 47 | 65 | 10 | 8 | 122 | 358 |
| 4:30 PM | 13 | 43 | 16 | 7 | 72 | 20 | 46 | 10 | 11 | 76 | 11 | 61 | 49 | 4 | 121 | 59 | 71 | 13 | 7 | 143 | 412 |
| 4:45 PM | 5 | 36 | 13 | 7 | 54 | 9 | 41 | 14 | 15 | 64 | 7 | 39 | 29 | 1 | 75 | 35 | 85 | 16 | 11 | 136 | 329 |
| Hourly Total | 33 | 149 | 61 | 24 | 243 | 58 | 166 | 45 | 43 | 269 | 34 | 202 | 160 | 9 | 396 | 182 | 287 | 46 | 28 | 515 | 1423 |
| 5:00 PM | 8 | 51 | 18 | 18 | 77 | 17 | 44 | 11 | 20 | 72 | 13 | 46 | 35 | 3 | 94 | 59 | 96 | 19 | 8 | 174 | 417 |
| 5:15 PM | 8 | 46 | 10 | 2 | 64 | 16 | 43 | 8 | 10 | 67 | 15 | 59 | 32 | 4 | 106 | 77 | 83 | 17 | 10 | 177 | 414 |
| 5:30 PM | 16 | 47 | 11 | 4 | 74 | 19 | 50 | 6 | 14 | 75 | 8 | 59 | 32 | 3 | 99 | 35 | 95 | 15 | 14 | 145 | 393 |
| 5:45 PM | 12 | 41 | 14 | 3 | 67 | 8 | 33 | 9 | 10 | 50 | 9 | 56 | 45 | 3 | 110 | 44 | 78 | 15 | 13 | 137 | 364 |
| Hourly Total | 44 | 185 | 53 | 27 | 282 | 60 | 170 | 34 | 54 | 264 | 45 | 220 | 144 | 13 | 409 | 215 | 352 | 66 | 45 | 633 | 1588 |
| Grand Total | 256 | 879 | 290 | 183 | 1425 | 311 | 852 | 169 | 302 | 1332 | 299 | 1179 | 959 | 107 | 2437 | 866 | 1535 | 362 | 241 | 2763 | 7957 |
| Approach \% | 18.0 | 61.7 | 20.4 | - | - | 23.3 | 64.0 | 12.7 | - | - | 12.3 | 48.4 | 39.4 | - | - | 31.3 | 55.6 | 13.1 | - | - | - |
| Total \% | 3.2 | 11.0 | 3.6 | - | 17.9 | 3.9 | 10.7 | 2.1 | - | 16.7 | 3.8 | 14.8 | 12.1 | - | 30.6 | 10.9 | 19.3 | 4.5 | - | 34.7 | - |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | $-$ | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | $-$ | 2 | 5 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Cars | 234 | 741 | 275 | - | 1250 | 285 | 802 | 163 | - | 1250 | 281 | 1049 | 899 | - | 2229 | 812 | 1417 | 335 | $-$ | 2564 | 7293 |
| \% Cars | 91.4 | 84.3 | 94.8 | - | 87.7 | 91.6 | 94.1 | 96.4 | - | 93.8 | 94.0 | 89.0 | 93.7 | - | 91.5 | 93.8 | 92.3 | 92.5 | - | 92.8 | 91.7 |
| Light Goods Vehicles | 17 | 94 | 9 | - | 120 | 21 | 40 | 5 | - | 66 | 11 | 81 | 48 | - | 140 | 42 | 98 | 19 | - | 159 | 485 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Light Goods } \\ \text { Vehicles } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 6.6 | 10.7 | 3.1 | - | 8.4 | 6.8 | 4.7 | 3.0 | - | 5.0 | 3.7 | 6.9 | 5.0 | - | 5.7 | 4.8 | 6.4 | 5.2 | - | 5.8 | 6.1 |
| Buses | 2 | 25 | 0 | $-$ | 27 | 2 | 1 | 0 | - | 3 | 0 | 29 | 1 | - | 30 | 0 | 3 | 2 | - | 5 | 65 |
| \% Buses | 0.8 | 2.8 | 0.0 | - | 1.9 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.1 | - | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | - | 0.2 | 0.8 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 2 | 16 | 6 | - | 24 | 2 | 8 | 1 | - | 11 | 5 | 16 | 9 | - | 30 | 11 | 15 | 6 | - | 32 | 97 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0.8 | 1.8 | 2.1 | - | 1.7 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.6 | - | 0.8 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 0.9 | - | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.7 | - | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Articulated Trucks | 1 | 1 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 8 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.1 | - | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 4 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | 0.7 | - | - | - | - | 1.9 | - | - | - | - | 2.1 | - | - |

Project:: City of
Birmingham Traffic Signal Optimization Study Corridor:: Maple Road \& Old Woodward Ave.
Weather:: Sunny, Dry Deg's 60
Video VCU ID\#:: SCU 34G

Traffic Data Collection
Traffic Data Collection (MI) 7504 Sawgrass Drive www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: S. Old
Woodward Avenue \& E.
Brown Street
Site Code: TMC_11
Start Date: 05/05/2016
Page No: 4

| Start Time | S. Old Woodward Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | E. Brown Street <br> Westbound |  |  |  |  | S. Old Woodward Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | E. Brown Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. <br> Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total |  |
| 8:00 AM | 6 | 37 | 13 | 6 | 56 | 4 | 36 | 1 | 7 | 41 | 19 | 30 | 44 | 1 | 93 | 35 | 63 | 15 | 4 | 113 | 303 |
| 8:15 AM | 6 | 26 | 11 | 10 | 43 | 9 | 45 | 6 | 5 | 60 | 18 | 36 | 53 | 0 | 107 | 35 | 61 | 15 | 3 | 111 | 321 |
| 8:30 AM | 5 | 36 | 12 | 8 | 53 | 8 | 41 | 5 | 7 | 54 | 11 | 51 | 54 | 1 | 116 | 19 | 59 | 11 | 3 | 89 | 312 |
| 8:45 AM | 7 | 33 | 12 | 11 | 52 | 6 | 37 | 2 | 5 | 45 | 16 | 51 | 60 | 0 | 127 | 25 | 47 | 13 | 1 | 85 | 309 |
| Total | 24 | 132 | 48 | 35 | 204 | 27 | 159 | 14 | 24 | 200 | 64 | 168 | 211 | 2 | 443 | 114 | 230 | 54 | 11 | 398 | 1245 |
| Approach \% | 11.8 | 64.7 | 23.5 | - | - | 13.5 | 79.5 | 7.0 | - | - | 14.4 | 37.9 | 47.6 | - | - | 28.6 | 57.8 | 13.6 | - | - | - |
| Total \% | 1.9 | 10.6 | 3.9 | - | 16.4 | 2.2 | 12.8 | 1.1 | - | 16.1 | 5.1 | 13.5 | 16.9 | - | 35.6 | 9.2 | 18.5 | 4.3 | - | 32.0 | - |
| PHF | 0.857 | 0.892 | 0.923 | - | 0.911 | 0.750 | 0.883 | 0.583 | - | 0.833 | 0.842 | 0.824 | 0.879 | - | 0.872 | 0.814 | 0.913 | 0.900 | - | 0.881 | 0.970 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cars | 22 | 113 | 46 | - | 181 | 25 | 150 | 13 | - | 188 | 63 | 147 | 202 | - | 412 | 104 | 216 | 50 | - | 370 | 1151 |
| \% Cars | 91.7 | 85.6 | 95.8 | - | 88.7 | 92.6 | 94.3 | 92.9 | - | 94.0 | 98.4 | 87.5 | 95.7 | - | 93.0 | 91.2 | 93.9 | 92.6 | - | 93.0 | 92.4 |
| Light Goods Vehicles | 1 | 15 | 1 | - | 17 | 1 | 7 | 1 | - | 9 | 1 | 14 | 8 | - | 23 | 10 | 12 | 2 | - | 24 | 73 |
| \% Light Goods Vehicles | 4.2 | 11.4 | 2.1 | - | 8.3 | 3.7 | 4.4 | 7.1 | - | 4.5 | 1.6 | 8.3 | 3.8 | - | 5.2 | 8.8 | 5.2 | 3.7 | - | 6.0 | 5.9 |
| Buses | 0 | 3 | 0 | - | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | - | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 10 |
| \% Buses | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | - | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | - | 0.5 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.5 | - | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | - | 4 | 11 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 4.2 | 0.8 | 2.1 | - | 1.5 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 0.0 | - | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | - | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 3.7 | - | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | 35 | - | - | - | - | 24 | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | 11 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | $-$ | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |

Project:: City of
Birmingham Traffic Signal Optimization Study Corridor:: Maple Road \& Old Woodward Ave.
Weather:: Sunny, Dry Deg's 60
Video VCU ID\#:: SCU 34G

Traffic Data Collection
Traffic Data Collection (MI) 7504 Sawgrass Drive www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: S. Old
Woodward Avenue \& E.
Brown Street
Site Code: TMC_11
Start Date: 05/05/2016
Page No: 8

| Start Time | S. Old Woodward Avenue Southbound |  |  |  |  | E. Brown Street Westbound |  |  |  |  | S. Old Woodward Avenue Northbound |  |  |  |  | E. Brown Street Eastbound |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Int. } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. <br> Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total |  |
| 5:00 PM | 8 | 51 | 18 | 18 | 77 | 17 | 44 | 11 | 20 | 72 | 13 | 46 | 35 | 3 | 94 | 59 | 96 | 19 | 8 | 174 | 417 |
| 5:15 PM | 8 | 46 | 10 | 2 | 64 | 16 | 43 | 8 | 10 | 67 | 15 | 59 | 32 | 4 | 106 | 77 | 83 | 17 | 10 | 177 | 414 |
| 5:30 PM | 16 | 47 | 11 | 4 | 74 | 19 | 50 | 6 | 14 | 75 | 8 | 59 | 32 | 3 | 99 | 35 | 95 | 15 | 14 | 145 | 393 |
| 5:45 PM | 12 | 41 | 14 | 3 | 67 | 8 | 33 | 9 | 10 | 50 | 9 | 56 | 45 | 3 | 110 | 44 | 78 | 15 | 13 | 137 | 364 |
| Total | 44 | 185 | 53 | 27 | 282 | 60 | 170 | 34 | 54 | 264 | 45 | 220 | 144 | 13 | 409 | 215 | 352 | 66 | 45 | 633 | 1588 |
| Approach \% | 15.6 | 65.6 | 18.8 | - | - | 22.7 | 64.4 | 12.9 | - | - | 11.0 | 53.8 | 35.2 | - | - | 34.0 | 55.6 | 10.4 | - | - | - |
| Total \% | 2.8 | 11.6 | 3.3 | - | 17.8 | 3.8 | 10.7 | 2.1 | - | 16.6 | 2.8 | 13.9 | 9.1 | - | 25.8 | 13.5 | 22.2 | 4.2 | - | 39.9 | - |
| PHF | 0.688 | 0.907 | 0.736 | - | 0.916 | 0.789 | 0.850 | 0.773 | - | 0.880 | 0.750 | 0.932 | 0.800 | - | 0.930 | 0.698 | 0.917 | 0.868 | - | 0.894 | 0.952 |
| Motorcycles | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 2 |
| \% Motorcycles | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | - | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Cars | 40 | 168 | 51 | - | 259 | 56 | 165 | 32 | - | 253 | 41 | 190 | 137 | - | 368 | 206 | 333 | 65 | - | 604 | 1484 |
| \% Cars | 90.9 | 90.8 | 96.2 | - | 91.8 | 93.3 | 97.1 | 94.1 | - | 95.8 | 91.1 | 86.4 | 95.1 | - | 90.0 | 95.8 | 94.6 | 98.5 | - | 95.4 | 93.5 |
| Light Goods Vehicles | 4 | 11 | 1 | - | 16 | 4 | 4 | 1 | - | 9 | 4 | 20 | 6 | - | 30 | 8 | 14 | 0 | - | 22 | 77 |
| \% Light Goods Vehicles | 9.1 | 5.9 | 1.9 | - | 5.7 | 6.7 | 2.4 | 2.9 | - | 3.4 | 8.9 | 9.1 | 4.2 | - | 7.3 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 0.0 | - | 3.5 | 4.8 |
| Buses | 0 | 4 | 0 | - | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | - | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 11 |
| \% Buses | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | - | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | - | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | - | 0.2 | 0.7 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | - | 5 | 11 |
| \% Single-Unit Trucks | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.9 | - | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 2.9 | - | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.7 | - | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 1.5 | - | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 3 |
| \% Bicycles on Road | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | - | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | - | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - |
| \% Bicycles on Crosswalk | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | 1.9 | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | - | - | - | 6.7 | - | - |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | 27 | - | - | - | - | 53 | - | - | - | - | 13 | - | - | - | - | 42 | - | - |
| \% Pedestrians | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | 98.1 | $-$ | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | 93.3 | - | - |

## APPENDIX G:

SHARED PARKING ANALYSIS USING CITY PARKING RATIOS INPUTS \& OUTPUTS

Table G-1. Selected ULI Parking Ratios Adjusted to Match Birmingham Requirements

| ULI-Recommended Parking Ratios AND Applicable City of Birmingham Parking Ratios ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spaces required per unit land use |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Weekday |  | Weekend |  | Unit |
|  | Visitor | Employee | Visitor | Employee |  |
| Community Shopping Center (<400 ksf) | 2.90 | 0.70 | 3.20 | 0.80 | /ksf GLA |
| Regional Shopping Center (400 to 600 ksf ) | Linear 2.9 | x<3.2 |  |  | /ksf GLA |
| Super Regional Shopping Center (>600 ksf) | 3.20 | 0.80 | 3.60 | 0.90 | /ksf GLA |
| Fine/Casual Dining Restaurant | 15.25 | 2.75 | 17.00 | 3.00 | /ksf GLA |
| Family Restaurant | 9.00 | 1.50 | 12.75 | 2.25 | /ksf GLA |
| Fast Food Restaurant | 12.75 | 2.25 | 12.00 | 2.00 | /ksf GLA |
| Nightclub | 15.25 | 1.25 | 17.50 | 1.50 | /ksf GLA |
| Cineplex | 0.19 | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.01 | /seat |
| Performing Arts Theater | 0.30 | 0.07 | 0.33 | 0.07 | /seat |
| Arena | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.03 | /seat |
| Pro Football Stadium | 0.30 | 0.01 | 0.30 | 0.01 | /seat |
| Pro Baseball Stadium | 0.31 | 0.01 | 0.34 | 0.01 | /seat |
| Health Club | 6.60 | 0.40 | 5.50 | 0.25 | /ksf GLA |
| Convention Center | 5.50 | 0.50 | 5.50 | 0.50 | /ksf GLA |
| Hotel-Business | 1.00 | 0.04 | 1.00 | 0.04 | /room |
| Hotel-Leisure | 0.90 | 0.25 | 1.00 | 0.18 | /room |
| Restaurant/Lounge | 13.33 |  | 13.33 |  | /ksf GLA |
| Conference Ctr/Banquet ( 20 to 50 sq ft/guest room) | 22.22 |  | 22.22 |  | /ksf GLA |
| Convention Space (>50 sq ft/guest room) | 20.00 |  | 10.00 |  | /ksf GLA |
| Residential, Rental, Shared Spaces * | 0.15 | 1.50 | 0.15 | 1.50 | /unit |
| Residential, Owned, Shared Spaces* | 0.15 | 1.7 | 0.15 | 1.7 | /unit |
| Office <25 ksf | 0.30 | 3.5 | 0.03 | 0.35 | /unit |
| Office 25 to 100 ksf | Linear 0.3 | x<0.25 |  |  | /ksf GLA |
| Office 100 to 500 ksf | Linear 0.2 | <x<0.2 |  |  | /ksf GLA |
| Office >500 ksf | 0.20 | 2.60 | 0.02 | 0.26 | /ksf GLA |
| Data Processing Office | 0.25 | 5.75 | 0.03 | 0.58 | /ksf GLA |
| Medical/Dental Office | 3.00 | 1.50 | 3.00 | 1.50 | /ksf GLA |
| Bank (Branch) with Drive-In | 3.00 | 1.60 | 3.00 | 1.60 | /ksf GLA |

* 1.0 space reserved for residents' sole use; remainder may be shared.
${ }^{\dagger}$ Giffels Webster edit:
Red = Uses present in proposed boutique hotel. Parking ratios shown in red are those specified in (or equivalent to) those found in the Birmingham Zoning Ordinance. Ratios remaining black are those recommended by ULI.

Note: Conference Ctr category applies if only the proposed Banquet Rm is considered ( $=31.8 \mathrm{sf} / \mathrm{room}$ ).

Table G-2. Parking Demand Study Prepared by Others for Aparium Hotel Proposed in Tempe, Arizona PARKING DEMAND STUDY
TEMPE, AZ

| HOTEL KEYS | 165 |
| :--- | :--- |
| AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (1) | 1.35 |
| RESTAURANT / BAR SEATS | 125 |
| BALLROOM / MEETING SEATS | 250 |


| AVERAGE HOTEL PARKING BY DAY OF WEEK (NIGHTLY HOTEL (NIGHT) (2) | MONDAY | TUESDAY | WEDNESDAY | THURSDAY | FRIDAY | SATURDAY | SUNDAY | AVERAGE | PEAK | MAX |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HOTEL OCCUPANCY (3) | 69.5\% | 79.4\% | 79.1\% | 70.8\% | 65.9\% | 66.6\% | 50.1\% | 68.7\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| ROOMS OCCUPIED | 115 | 131 | 131 | 117 | 109 | 110 | 83 | 113 | 165 | 165 |
| ANTICIPATED DRIVE PERCENTAGE (4) | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% |
| TOTAL PARKING REQUIREMENT | 46 | 52 | 52 | 47 | 43 | 44 | 33 | 45 | 83 | 99 |
| AVERAGE DINNER COVERS / DAY | 116 | 134 | 134 | 119 | 140 | 141 | 91 | 125 | 125 | 125 |
| ANTICIPATED DRIVE PERCENTAGE (ADDITIONAL) (4) | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 25\% | 40\% |
| TOTAL PARKING REQUIREMENT | 23 | 27 | 27 | 24 | 28 | 28 | 18 | 25 | 31 | 50 |
| AVERAGE EVENT COVERS / DAY | 30 | 35 | 35 | 31 | 29 | 29 | 22 | 30 | 250 | 250 |
| ANTICIPATED DRIVE PERCENTAGE (ADDITIONAL) (4) | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 20\% | 35\% |
| TOTAL PARKING REQUIREMENT | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4.5 | 50 | 87.5 |
| TOTAL EVENING PARKING REQUIREMENT | 74 | 84 | 84 | 75 | 76 | 77 | 55 | 75 | 164 | 237 |


| AVERAGE HOTEL PARKING BY DAY OF WEEK (DAY) HOTEL (DAY) | MONDAY | TUESDAY | WEDNESDAY | THURSDAY | FRIDAY | SATURDAY | SUNDAY | AVERAGE | PEAK | MAX |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMBER OF STAYS LONGER THAN ONE NIGHT (6) | 30 | 34 | 34 | 30 | 28 | 28 | 21 | 29 | 43 | 43 |
| ANTICIPATED DRIVE PERCENTAGE (4) | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 40\% | 50\% | 60\% |
| TOTAL PARKING REQUIREMENT (DAY) | 12 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 12 | 21 | 26 |
| AVERAGE BREAKFAST COVERS / DAY | 38 | 43 | 43 | 39 | 36 | 36 | 27 | 37.5 | 125 | 125 |
| ANTICIPATED DRIVE PERCENTAGE (ADDITIONAL) (4) | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 20\% | 40\% |
| TOTAL PARKING REQUIREMENT | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 25 | 50 |
| AVERAGE LUNCH COVERS / DAY | 63 | 72 | 72 | 64 | 60 | 61 | 46 | 62.5 | 125 | 125 |
| ANTICIPATED DRIVE PERCENTAGE (ADDITIONAL) (4) | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 25\% | 40\% |
| TOTAL PARKING REQUIREMENT | 13 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 13 | 31 | 50 |
| AVERAGE POOL BAR COVERS / DAY | 46 | 58 | 58 | 88 | 122 | 122 | 102 | 85 | 85 | 85 |
| ANTICIPATED DRIVE PERCENTAGE (ADDITIONAL) (4) | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 20\% | 40\% |
| TOTAL PARKING REQUIREMENT | 7 | 9 | 9 | 13 | 18 | 18 | 15 | 13 | 17 | 34 |
| AVERAGE EVENT COVERS / DAY | 30 | 35 | 35 | 31 | 29 | 29 | 22 | 30 | 250 | 250 |
| ANTICIPATED DRIVE PERCENTAGE (ADDITIONAL) (4) | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 15\% | 20\% | 35\% |
| TOTAL PARKING REQUIREMENT | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4.5 | 50 | 87.5 |
| TOTAL DAY PARKING REQUIREMENT | 42 | 48 | 48 | 49 | 51 | 52 | 40 | 47 | 145 | 247 |


| PARKING BY TIME OF DAY | $\mathbf{6 : 0 0}$ AM | $\mathbf{9 : 0 0}$ AM | $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0}$ PM | $\mathbf{3 : 0 0}$ PM | $\mathbf{6 : 0 0}$ PM | $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 ~ P M ~}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0}$ AM |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| ZONING REQUIREMENT | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 | 365 |
| ANTIPICATED MAX | 149 | 237 | 197 | 197 | 237 | 237 | 99 |
| ANTICIPATED PEAK | 108 | 158 | 120 | 120 | 164 | 164 | 83 |
| ANTICIPATED AVERAGE | 51 | 56 | 42 | 42 | 75 | 75 |  |

GENERAL: Information including number of restaurant, bar and meeting seats is subject to change and based on program estimates
(1) Average length of stay based on typical hotel
(2) Assumes a typically check for hotel is in the evening and not before 3pm; Check out by 11 am
(3) Based on historical average occupancy in Tempe per day of week
(4) Percentages provided by ABM parking
(5) Parking requirement by day is determined by stays longer than one night

Table G-3. Parking Demand Summary from ULI Shared Parking Model (3/30/17)

Project: Brmingham Boutique Hotel
Description: Using City of Birmingham Parking Ratlos and GW's Assumed Mode Adjustments and Noncaptive Ratios

SHARED PARKING DEMAND SUMMARY


Table G-4. Peak Month Parking Demand by Hour (3/30/17)

## Project: Birmingham Boutique Hotel

Description: Using City of Birmingham Parking Ratios and GWs Assumed Mode Adjustments and Noncaptive Ratios

| June |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weekday Estimated Peak-Hour Parking Demand |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Monthly Adi] | 6 AM | 7 AM | 8 AM | 9 AM |  | 11 AM | 12 PM | 1 PM | 2PM | 3PM | 4PM |  | 6 PM | 7PM | 8PM |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Overall Pk } \\ \hline 9 \mathrm{PM} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { AM Peak Hr } \\ \hline 9 \mathrm{AM} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { PM Peak Hr } \\ \hline 5 \mathrm{PM} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Eve Peak Hr } \\ \hline 9 \text { PM } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel-Business | 100\% | 60 | 57 | 50 | 44 | 38 | 38 | 35 | 35 | 38 | 38 | 41 | 44 | 47 | 47 | 50 | 54 | 60 | 63 | 63 | 54 |  |  | $\bigcirc \quad 54$ |
| Restaurantliounge | 95\% | - | 3 | 9 | 3 | 3. | 1 | 29 | 29 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 16 | 17 | 20 | 19 | 17 | 12 | 9 | 19 | 3 | 9 | 19 |
| Conference Ctr/Banquet (20 to 50 sq itlguest room) | 100\% | $\bigcirc$ | $-$ | 17 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 28 | $\cdots$ | - | 56 | 34 | 56 | 56 |
| Employee | 100\% | - | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
|  | Customer | 60 | 60 | 76 | 81 | 75 | 73 | 100 | 100 | 84 | 77 | 80 | 109 | 119 | 120 | 126 | 129 | 105 | 75 | 72 | 129 | 81 | 109 | 129 |
| TOTAL DEMAND | Employee | --- | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | - 3 | - | - 1 | 1 | 1 | - 1 | . | - | 1 | 4 | $\cdots$ | 1 |
|  | Reserved | - | $\cdots$ | $-$ | $-$ | $-$ | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | $\cdots$ | - | - | - | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | - | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | - | $\cdots-$ |
|  |  | 60 | 61 | 80 | 85 | 80 | 78 | 105 | 105 | 89 | 82 | 84 | 112 | 121 | 121 | 127 | 130 | 106 | 75 | 72 | 130 | 85 | 112 | 130 |
| ULI base data have been modified from default values. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 130 | 85 | 112 | 130 |

Footnote(s):

| Weekend Estimated Peane Jour Parking Demand |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Overall Pk | AM Peak Hr | PM Peak Hr | Eve Peak Hr |
|  |  | 6 AM | 7 AM | 8 AM | 9 AM | 10 AM | 11 AM | 12 PM | 1 PM | 2 PM | 3PM | 4PM | 5PM | 6PM | 7PM | 8 PM | 9 PM | 10 PM | 11 PM | 12 AM | 9 PM | 9 AM | 5 PM | 9 PM |
| Hotel-Business | 100\% | 60 | 57 | 50 | 44 | 38 | 38 | 35 | 35 | 38 | 38 | 41 | 44 | 47 | 47 | 50 | 54 | 60 | 63 | 63 | 54 | 44 | 44 | 54 |
| Restaurantliounge | 95\% | - | 3 | , | 3 | 3 | 1 | 29 | 29 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 16 | 17 | 20 | 19 | 17 | 12 | 9 | 19 | 3 | 9 | 19 |
| Conference ctilianquet (20 to 50 sq ftoguest room) | 100\% | $\cdots$ | $-$ | 17 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 28 | $-$ | - | 56 | 34 | 56 | 56. |
| Employee | 100\% | - | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| TOTAL DEMAND | Customer | 60 | 60 | 76 | 81 | 75 | 73 | 100 | 100 | 84 | 77 | 80 | 109 | 119 | 120 | 126 | 129 | 105 | 75 | 72 | 129 | 81 | 109 | 129 |
|  | Employee | - | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
|  | Reserved | - | - | - | -- | - | - | $\cdots$ | - | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | - | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | - | - | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $-$ | - | - | - | - $-\cdots-\cdots$ |
|  |  | 60 | 61 | 80 | 85 | 80 | 78 | 105 | 105 | 89 | 82 | 84 | 112 | 122 | 122 | 128 | 131 | 107 | 77 | 73 | 131 | 85 | 112 | 131 |
| ULI base data have been modified from default values. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 131 | 85 | 112 | 131 |

Weekday Month-by-Month Estimated Parking Demand


Figure G-1. Weekday Month-by-Month Parking Demand (3/30/17)

Weekend Month-by-Month Estimated Parking Demand


Figure G-2. Weekend Month-by-Month Parking Demand (3/30/17)

## APPENDIX H

ASSIGNMENTS OF SITE TRAFFIC BY TYPE


Figure H-1. Peak-Hour Apartment Trips


Figure H-2. Peak-Hour Hotel Arrival Trips (Patrons In \& Valets Out)


Figure H-3. Peak-Hour Hotel Departure Trips (Valets In \& Patrons Out)

APPENDIX I:

SYNCHRO PRINTOUTS

CURRENT TRAFFIC



FUTURE BACKGROUND TRAFFIC



FUTURE TOTAL TRAFFIC

|  | $4$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 5 | $4$ | 4 | 4 | 1 | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4中 |  | 4 | F |  | 1 | 4 | 7 | ${ }^{7}$ | p |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 58 | 248 | 123 | 15 | 177 | 30 | 262 | 205 | 69 | 58 | 183 | 130 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 58 | 248 | 123 | 15 | 177 | 30 | 262 | 205 | 69 | 58 | 183 | 130 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 0.98 |  | 0.95 | 0.98 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 0.99 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1800 | 1782 | 1800 | 1765 | 1765 | 1800 | 1765 | 1765 | 1765 | 1748 | 1748 | 1800 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 66 | 282 | 140 | 18 | 213 | 36 | 301 | 236 | 79 | 64 | 201 | 143 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Cap, veh/h | 160 | 634 | 319 | 304 | 548 | 93 | 398 | 838 | 596 | 460 | 447 | 318 |
| Artive On Green | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.47 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 275 | 1690 | 851 | 850 | 1460 | 247 | 926 | 1765 | 1256 | 940 | 940 | 669 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 254 | 0 | 234 | 18 | 0 | 249 | 301 | 236 | 79 | 64 | 0 | 344 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/n | 1394 | 0 | 1423 | 850 | 0 | 1707 | 926 | 1765 | 1256 | 940 | 0 | 1609 |
| Q Serve(g_s) 5 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 25.7 | 6.5 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 11.4 |
| Cycle Q Clear (9_c), 5 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 37.1 | 6.5 | 2.8 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 11.4 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.26 |  | 0.60 | 1.00 |  | 0.14 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.42 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 579 | 0 | 533 | 304 | 0 | 640 | 398 | 838 | 596 | 460 | 0 | 764 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.44 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.39 | 0.76 | 0.28 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.45 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 579 | 0 | 533 | 304 | 0 | 640 | 398 | 838 | 596 | 460 | 0 | 764 |
| HCM Piatoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 19.1 | 0.0 | 18.7 | 22.9 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 26.4 | 12.7 | 11.8 | 15.8 | 0.0 | 14.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 2.4 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 12.6 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%), veh/In | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 7.9 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 5.5 |
| LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh | 21.5 | 0.0 | 21.3 | 23.2 | 0.0 | 20.1 | 39.1 | 13.6 | 12.2 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 15.9 |
| LnGrp LOS | C |  | C | C |  | C | D | B | B | B |  | B |
| Approach Vol, vehi/h |  | 488 |  |  | 267 |  |  | 616 |  |  | 408 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 21.4 |  |  | 20.3 |  |  | 25.8 |  |  | 16.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 44.0 |  | 36.0 |  | 44.0 |  | 36.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ) , S |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 38.0 |  | 30.0 |  | 38.0 |  | 30.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time ( g c $\mathrm{c}+11$ ), s |  | 39.1 |  | 14.5 |  | 13.4 |  | 13.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time ( $p_{-} \mathrm{C}$ ), s |  | 0.0 |  | 1.0 |  | 1.1 |  | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |
| ntersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 21.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ntersection

Int Delay, s/veh 1.6

| Movement | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NEL | NER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | † |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | $\overline{1}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 257 | 114 | 0 | 293 | 0 | 114 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 257 | 114 | 0 | 293 | 0 | 114 |
| Conficting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | . |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 91 | 91 | 87 | 87 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 282 | 125 | 0 | 337 | 0 | 124 |



| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NELn1 NWT | SET SER |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 702 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane VIC Ratio | 0.177 | - | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 11.2 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \% \%ile Q(veh) | 0.6 | - | - | - |




| Mnor Lane/Major Mvml | NWL | NWT EBLn1 | SET | SER |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1165 | -422 | - | - |  |
| HCM Lane VIC Ratio | 0.001 | -0.028 | - | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.1 | -13.8 | - | - |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tilie Q(veh) | 0 | -0.1 | - | - |  |



SimTraffic Simulation Summary

## Summary of All Intervals

| Slart Time | 7.50 |
| :--- | ---: |
| End Time | 9.00 |
| Total Time (min) | 70 |
| Time Recorded (min) | 60 |
| \# of Intervals | 4 |
| \# of Recorded Intervals | 3 |
| Vehs Entered | 3734 |
| Vehs Exited | 3747 |
| Starting Vehs | 54 |
| Ending Vehs | 41 |
| Travel Distance (mi) | 788 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 60.4 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 26.3 |
| Total Stops | 3449 |
| Fuel Used (gal) | 36.5 |

## Interval \#O Information Seeding

| Start Time | $7: 50$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| End Time | $8: 00$ |
| Total Time (min) | 10 |
| Volumes adjusted by Growth Factors. |  |
| No data recorded this interval. |  |

## Interval \#1 Information Pre

| Start Time | $8: 00$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| End Time | $8: 15$ |
| Total Time (min) | 15 |
| Volumes adjusted by Growth Factors, Anti PHF. |  |
|  |  |
| Vehs Entered |  |
| Vehs Exited | 908 |
| Starting Vehs | 898 |
| Ending Vehs | 54 |
| Traval Distance (mi) | 64 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 191 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 14.5 |
| Total Stops | 6.3 |
| Fuel Used (gal) | 840 |


| Slart Time 8:15 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| End Time |  |
| Total Time (min) |  |
| Volumes adjusted by PHF, Growth Factors. |  |
| Vehs Entered | 1052 |
| Vehs Exited | 1037 |
| Starting Vehs | 64 |
| Ending Vehs | 79 |
| Travel Distance (mi) | 224 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 17.7 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 8.0 |
| Total Stops | 1006 |
| Fuel Used (gal) | 10.5 |

Interval \#3 Information Post

| Start Time | $8: 30$ |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| End Time | $9: 00$ |
| Total Time (min) | 30 |
| Volumes adjusted by Growth Factors, Anli PHF. |  |
| Vehs Entered |  |
| Vehs Exited | 1774 |
| Starting Vehs | 1812 |
| Ending Vehs | 79 |
| Travel Distance (mi) | 41 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 373 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 28.2 |
| Total Stops | 12.0 |
| Fuel Used (gall) | 1603 |

## Intersection: 1: Old Woodward Avenue \& Garage

| Movement | EB | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | LR | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 29 | 55 |
| Average Queve (ft) | 5 | 5 |
| 95th Queue (t) | 23 | 29 |
| Link Distance (t) | 85 | 153 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (fi) |  |  |
| Storage BIR Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Valet Bay \& Old Woodward Avenue

| Movement | SE | NE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | TR | R |
| Maximum Queue ( (t) | 50 | 102 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 8 | 36 |
| 95th Queue (ti) | 31 | 67 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 31 | 89 |
| Upstream Bik Time (\%) | 1 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 5 | 0 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 8: Pierce Street \& Maple Road

| Movement | EB | WB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | TR | L | T | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 287 | 49 | 139 | 74 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 85 | 26 | 72 | 35 |
| 95 Quth Queue (ft) | 186 | 53 | 142 | 65 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 272 |  | 118 | 290 |
| Upstream Bik Time (\%) | 0 |  | 2 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 |  | 14 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 25 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 9 | 7 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 52 | 4 |  |

## Queuing and Blocking Report

## Intersection: 19: Old Woodward Avenue \& Merrill Street

| Movement | EB | NB | NB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | LR | L | T | TR |
| Maximum Queue ( ft ) | 53 | 71 | 138 | 97 |
| Average Queue ( f ) | 30 | 19 | 44 | 30 |
| 95th Queue (it) | 60 | 54 | 100 | 72 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 333 |  | 153 | 324 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist ( t ) |  | 75 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 | 4 |  |
| Queuing Penally (veh) |  | 1 | 2 |  |

Intersection: 20: Old Woodward Avenue \& Brown Street

| Movement | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | LT | TR | L | TR | L | T | R | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (it) | 201 | 172 | 31 | 141 | 125 | 327 | 52 | 71 | 88 |
| Average Queue (fi) | 138 | 80 | 8 | 90 | 89 | 111 | 20 | 28 | 57 |
| 95th Queve (ti) | 194 | 156 | 29 | 136 | 134 | 245 | 48 | 66 | 91 |
| Link Distance (t) | 541 |  |  | 288 |  | 444 |  |  | 72 |
| Upstream Bik Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3 |
| Queuing Penally (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 11 |
| Storage Bay Dist (fit) |  | 300 | 75 |  | 75 |  | 200 | 150 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 16 | 19 | 5 |  | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penaty (veh) |  |  |  | 2 | 54 | 15 |  | 0 | 2 |

Network Summary
Network wide Queuing Penalty: 362

|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 1 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SER |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  | \% | $\dagger$ |  | 7 | $\uparrow$ | $\stackrel{7}{7}$ | \% | f |  |
| Traffic Volume (vehi/h) | 77 | 380 | 232 | 37 | 193 | 70 | 187 | 256 | 49 | 68 | 218 | 154 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 77 | 380 | 232 | 37 | 193 | 70 | 187 | 256 | 49 | 68 | 218 | 154 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Ad (A_pbT) | 0.99 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 0.99 |  | 0.93 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.80 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Adj Sat Flow, vehhhin | 1800 | 1782 | 1800 | 1782 | 1782 | 1800 | 1765 | 1765 | 1765 | 1765 | 1765 | 1800 |
| Adj Flow Rate, vehh | 87 | 427 | 261 | 42 | 219 | 80 | 201 | 275 | 53 | 74 | 237 | 167 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 171 | 783 | 479 | 288 | 587 | 214 | 232 | 662 | 431 | 332 | 350 | 246 |
| Artive On Green | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 244 | 1648 | 1008 | 680 | 1236 | 451 | 879 | 1765 | 1148 | 933 | 932 | 657 |
| Grp Volume(v) veh/h | 410 | 0 | 365 | 42 | 0 | 299 | 201 | 275 | 53 | 74 | 0 | 404 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 1491 | 0 | 1409 | 680 | 0 | 1687 | 879 | 1765 | 1148 | 933 | 0 | 1589 |
| $Q$ Serve(g_s), s | 7.3 | 0.0 | 14.7 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 13.0 | 9.2 | 2.4 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 17.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear (9_c), s | 16.4 | 0.0 | 14.7 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 30.0 | 9.2 | 2.4 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 17.0 |
| Prop in Lane | 0.21 |  | 0.72 | 1.00 |  | 0.27 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.41 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 763 | 0 | 669 | 288 | 0 | 801 | 232 | 662 | 431 | 332 | 0 | 596 |
| VIC Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0.55 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.37 | 0.87 | 0.42 | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.68 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 763 | 0 | 669 | 288 | 0 | 801 | 232 | 662 | 431 | 332 | 0 | 596 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(1) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 15.0 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 13.4 | 35.4 | 18.5 | 16.4 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 21.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 2.7 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 32.4 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 6.1 |
| Initia! Q Delay(d3), stweh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ( $50 \%$ ), veh/n | 7.1 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 6.5 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 8.4 |
| LnGrp Delay ${ }^{\text {d }}$ ( , /iveh | 17.8 | 0.0 | 18.1 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 14.7 | 67.8 | 20.4 | 17.0 | 25.4 | 0.0 | 27.1 |
| LnGrp LOS | B |  | B | C |  | B | E | C | B | C |  | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 775 |  |  | 341 |  |  | 529 |  |  | 478 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 17.9 |  |  | 15.7 |  |  | 38.1 |  |  | 26.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | c |  |
| timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+$ Rc), $s$ |  | 36.0 |  | 44.0 |  | 36.0 |  | 44.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{Rc}$ ) s |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Selting (Gmax), s |  | 30.0 |  | 38.0 |  | 30.0 |  | 38.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1) s |  | 32.0 |  | 18.4 |  | 19.0 |  | 20.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.0 |  | 1.7 |  | 1.1 |  | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |
| miersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 24.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | c |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 3: Valet Bay \& Old Woodward Avenue

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh $\quad 1.5$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | SET | SER | NWL | NWT | NEL | NER |
| Lane Configurations | 今 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | F |
| Traffic Vol, vehih | 323 | 117 | 0 | 403 | 0 | 117 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 323 | 117 | 0 | 403 | 0 | 117 |
| Conficting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | . | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 91 | 91 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Mumt Flow | 351 | 127 | 0 | 443 | 0 | 127 |



| Minor Lane/Maior Mumt | NELn1 | NWT | SET | SER |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 642 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.498 | - | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay ( $s$ ) | 12 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.7 | - | - | - |




| Minor Lane/Major Mvmi | NELn1 | NWL | NWT | SET | SER |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 398 | 1094 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.017 | 0.004 | - | - | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 14.2 | 8.3 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | A | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tlle Q(veh) | 0.1 | 0 | - | - | - |



## SimTraffic Simulation Summary

## Summary of All Intervals

| Start Time | $4: 50$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| End Time | $6: 00$ |
| Total Time (min) | 70 |
| Time Recorded (min) | 60 |
| \# of Intervals | 4 |
| \# of Recorded Intervals | 3 |
| Vehs Entered | 4481 |
| Vehs Exited | 4497 |
| Starting Vehs | 80 |
| Ending Vehs | 64 |
| Travel Distance (mi) | 961 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 94.1 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 51.9 |
| Total Stops | 5049 |
| Fuel Used (gal) | 49.9 |

Interval \#0 Information Seeding

| Start Time | $4: 50$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| End Time | $5: 00$ |
| Total Time (min) | 10 |
| Volumes adjusted by Growth Factors. |  |
| No dala recorded this interval. |  |

## Interval \#1 Information Pre

| Start Time | $5: 00$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| End Time | $5: 15$ |
| Total Time (min) | 15 |
| Volumes adjusted by Growth Factors, Anti PHF. |  |
| Vehs Entered | 1125 |
| Vehs Exited | 1116 |
| Starting Vehs | 80 |
| Ending Vehs | 89 |
| Travel Distance (mi) | 241 |
| Travel Time (hr) | 21.8 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 11.3 |
| Total Stops | 1274 |
| Fuel Used (gal) | 12.0 |



## Intersection: 1: Garage \& Old Woodward Avenue

| Movement | SE | NW | NW | NE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | TR | L | T | LR |
| Maximum Queue ( t ) | 135 | 19 | 31 | 30 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 41 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| 95ih Queue (ft) | 113 | 6 | 10 | 25 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 119 |  | 30 | 94 |
| Upstream Bik Time (\%) | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 75 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penally (veh) |  | 0 | 0 |  |

Intersection: 3: Valet Bay \& Old Woodward Avenue

| Movement | SE | NE |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | TR | R |
| Maximum Queue (fi) | 68 | 102 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 23 | 58 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 49 | 104 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 30 | 87 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 10 | 7 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 44 | 0 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 8: Pierce Street \& Maple Road

| Movement | EB | WB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | TR | L | T | LR |
| Maximum Queue (fi) | 306 | 49 | 99 | 228 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 147 | 32 | 50 | 58 |
| 95th Queue (fi) | 277 | 58 | 104 | 162 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 272 |  | 72 | 291 |
| Upstream Bik Time (\%) | 11 |  | 2 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 |  | 11 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 25 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 16 | 7 |  |
| Queuling Penalty (veh) |  | 85 | 4 |  |

## Intersection: 19: Old Woodward Avenue \& Merrill Street

| Movement | EB | NB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | L | T | TR |
| Maximum Queue ( t ) | 94 | 109 | 119 | 136 |
| Average Queue ( ft ) | 58 | 41 | 41 | 43 |
| 95th Queue ( ft ) | 90 | 75 | 89 | 96 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 324 |  | 119 | 339 |
| Upstream Bik Time (\%) |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist ( ft$)$ | 75 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 3 | 1 |  |

Intersection: 20: Old Woodward Avenue \& Brown Street

| Movement | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | TR | L | TR | L | T | R | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue ( ft$)$ | 407 | 319 | 100 | 249 | 125 | 437 | 241 | 67 | 95 |
| Average Queue (ti) | 206 | 160 | 44 | 106 | 92 | 136 | 26 | 36 | 70 |
| 95 th Queue (fi) | 324 | 283 | 94 | 184 | 135 | 301 | 98 | 70 | 85 |
| Link Distance (fit) | 527 |  |  | 264 |  | 444 |  |  | 68 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 20 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 91 |
| Storage Bay Dist ( f ) |  | 300 | 75 |  | 75 |  | 200 | 150 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 1 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 40 | 16 |  | 1 | 20 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 4 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 123 | 38 |  | 4 | 14 |

Network Summary
Network wide Queuing Penalty: 844


[^0]:    Connector＂$D$＂： $0=$ Standard 8 $1=$ Alternate

