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## 1. General

This report addresses the air quality analysis of a short 2-lane road section of Rushing Road from Chantulane Avenue to the Home Depot Drive in Denham Springs, Louisiana. Air quality analysis for road section improvement projects is a requirement for the use of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds.

The major source of procedures used for the analysis of individual intersection analysis was based on the 1997 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), the Highway Capacity Software (HCS) Release 3.1b. Chapter 9 of the HCM manual was particularly useful in the analysis. The other primary source of procedures and techniques used in this analysis was The EPA Mobile Source Emission Factor Model (MOBILE6.2). Additionally, the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, $7^{\text {th }}$ Edition was used by Neel-Schaffer to estimate trip increase.

The existing two-lane road section would be unable to meet the traffic demand over the next three years.
A retail development is planned just to the south of Rushing Road in the study area. There will be approximately 347,375 square feet of retail shopping center space, as well as an 80 -room hotel. This development would raise the roadway demand from 8,263 VPD caps to about 12,000 VPD caps near Chantulane and near 15,400 VPD caps near the Home Depot intersection in 2011, which is much beyond the roadway capacity. To solve this problem, a two-way center-turn lane is prepared to be added along this road section, as shown in Fig. 2. This retail development plans to access Rushing Road at four points, as show in Fig.1. Driveways \#1, \#2, and \#4 are to be 3-legged, unsignalized intersections and Driveway \#3 will tie into the Home Depot Drive necessitating an upgraded fullyactuated, isolated signal system.

The above mentioned road section is analyzed for the reduction in emissions that would result from the proposed geometric improvements. Peak period traffic counts (AM 7:308:30 and PM 5:00-6:00) were collected by Neel-Schaffer, Inc. personnel by a twenty-four-hour machine count. This information was made available to CRPC, as well as the turning movement counts at the intersections of Rushing Road at Chantulane Avenue and Rushing Road at the Home Depot Drive. Existing traffic volumes are presented in Fig.1. Traffic volume count data is shown in the Appendix.

## 2. Method of Analysis

The procedures for the emission reduction analysis are explained in detail below.
a. Weekday roadway volume was obtained on Rushing Road just west of the Home Depot Drive by a twenty-four hour machine count, conducted by Neel-Schaffer, Inc. personnel on Feb. 13, 2008. In addition, turning movement counts were conducted by the same company at the intersections of Rushing Road at Chantulane Avenue and Rushing Road at the Home Depot on Feb. 13 - 14, 2008. The AM (7:30-8:30) AND PM (5:00-6:00) peak hours were determined using this count data.
b. Trips generated from the new retail development were determined using ITE Trip Generation Handbook, $7^{\text {th }}$ Edition.
c. The generated trips were distributed onto adjacent roadways and intersections for both AM and PM hours.
d. The delay of unsignalized intersections was estimated by using HCS, before and after the improvement.
e. The delay of the signalized intersection was estimated by using Synchro 7 Software, before and after the improvement. The calculations performed in Synchro 7 and HCS are as shown below.

Total Delay (in veh-hours per peak hour) = Peak Hour Volume * Avg. Delay in sec/veh/3600
f. After calculating the delay, EPAs Mobile Source Emission Factor Model (MOBILE6.2) was used to obtain VOC and NOx emission factors for the different functional classifications. The MOBILE6.2 model was run using the 2.5 mph speed, which gives idling emission factors. The VOC and NOx emission factors were generated in the units of $\mathrm{gm} / \mathrm{mile}$ ( 6.310 and 1.513). These were multiplied by 2.5 to convert to $\mathrm{gm} / \mathrm{hr}$. These values were then converted to $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{hr}$ and multiplied by the total delay in veh-hrs to obtain total emissions.

For example, using MOBILE6.2 procedures, it is convenient to generate the following:

Total emission in Kg/hr = VOC emission factor * 2.5 * delay in veh-hours / 1000

The analysis showed that the proposed improvement would significantly reduce traffic delay through the network during the morning and the evening peak hours. Actually, the improvement will enhance traffic flow and reduce emissions during off-peak times as well, but the greatest benefits were observed to be during the peak hours.

## 3. Description of Road Section Conditions and Improvements

The roadway system identified for investigation includes Rushing Road between Chantulane Avenue and the Home Depot Drive, in Denham Springs, LA. In this road section, Rushing Road is an asphalt two-lane (2-lane) roadway utilizing single through lanes in each direction. The posted speed limit is 40 miles per hour. Two existing intersections and three new ones developed by the new retail service were studied in detail. They include:

Name<br>Rushing Road @ Chantulane Ave.<br>Rushing Road @ Driveway \#1<br>Rushing Road @ Driveway \#2<br>Rushing Road @ Driveway \#3 (the Home Depot)<br>Rushing Road @ Driveway \#4

| Signal Control | Status |
| :---: | :---: |
| Unsignalized | Existing |
| Unsignalized | New |
| Unsignalized | New |
| Signalized | Existing |
| Unsignalized | New |

The Chantulane Avenue and the Home Depot Drive are classified as local roads with posted speed of 25 mph . Chantulane Avenue is a center-divided two-lane (2-lane) road at the intersection with separate entrance and exit lane. There is a stop sign at the exit for both left-turn and right-turn vehicles. Home Depot Drive is a two-lane road, but widening to three lanes at the intersection, one for entrance, one for left turn and the other one for right turn.

In order to meet the urging demand increase from the new business in 2011, a two-way center-turn lane would be added on Rushing Road in this short road section. And the intersection of Rushing Road and the Home Depot would be upgraded with a fullyactuated, isolated signal system.

The LOS at the signalized intersection was improved from Level C to Level B; and the delay was reduced from 42.1 to 23.5 seconds per vehicle (sec/veh). The LOS at the four unsignalized intersections were all Level A; and the average delay of 1.34 seconds per vehicle (sec/veh), decreased by 29.5\%. Emission of VOC and NOx were both decreased by $42.7 \%$ at all the intersections. The proposed improvements would also enhance the through capacity by around $65 \%$ on Rushing Road; while the estimated cost is only $\$ 1,000,000$.

## 4. Summary

The above information can be summarized as follows. To serve the new retail development, improvements were analyzed to include a signal system upgrade and adding a two-way center-turn lane.

In this analysis, the total delay and emission calculations assume that the improvements will help traffic flow through these intersections at least five hours a day (two-hour
morning peak and three-hour afternoon peak), and 260 days a year (only weekdays considered).

The emission reduction of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) and Nitrogen Oxide ( NOx ) is summarized below.

## Rushing Rd Emission Analysis Summary

Critical Peak: PM Peak

| Intersection Location | VOC | NOx |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Chantulane | 0.00056 | 0.00013 |
| Driveway \#1 | 0.00056 | 0.00013 |
| Driveway \#2 | 0.012 | 0.0028 |
| Driveway \#3 (the Home Depot) | 0.214 | 0.051 |
| Driveway \#4 | 0.0022 | 0.00054 |
| Total | $\mathbf{0 . 2 2 9 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 5 5}$ |
| Decrease (\%) | $\mathbf{4 2 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 7}$ |

The implementation cost of the geometric improvements is very minimal while the emission benefits are very significant. This project is highly recommended based on the results of analysis.

## 5. Attachments

Considerable information is provided in the attachments following this narrative. The titles to these attachments are as follows.
a. Attachment A - Total Delay and Emission Calculation Analysis
b. Attachment B - Intersection-specific Delay and Emission Calculation Analysis
c. Attachment C - Traffic Count Information (provided by NSI)
d. HCS Output
e. MOBILE 6.2 Output Files



Fig. 2 Improvement Design

|  |  |  |  | Left Turn Lane |  | PaRISH | Livingston | 膓 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { eicorod } \\ \text { acc } \end{array}\right.$ |  |  |  |
| $\underline{0}$ | OATE | Revison ofscrip | or |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { QTEE } \\ & \text { BeET } \end{aligned}$ | staver | 832-33 |  |

## Attachment: A

Total Delay and Emission Calculation Analysis

Signalized Intersection Names:

- Rushing Road at Home Depot / Commercial Drwy. \#3


## Peak-hour Delay Improvement Analysis Critical Peak: PM

PM Peak

|  | Avg. Delay <br> s/veh |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Conditions | 42.10 | C |
| With Improvements | 23.50 | B |

Unsignalized Intersection Names:

- Rushing Road at Chantulane Avenue
- Rushing Road at Commerical Drwy. \#1
- Rushing Road at Commerical Drwy. \#2
- Rushing Road at Home Depot / Commercial Drwy. \#4


## Peak-hour Delay Improvement Analysis Critical Peak: PM

## PM Peak

|  | Avg. Delay <br> s/veh |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Conditions | 1.90 | A |
| With Improvements | 1.34 | A |

## Capital Region Planning Commission (CRPC) Intersection Emission Calculation

Names of Intersections:

- Rushing Road at Chantulane Avenue
- Rushing Road at Commerical Drwy. \#1
- Rushing Road at Commerical Drwy. \#2
- Rushing Road at Home Depot / Commercial Drwy. \#3
- Rushing Road at Home Depot / Commercial Drwy. \#4


## Total Delay Calculations of the five (5) intersections

Critical Peak: PM

PM Peak

|  | Avg. Delay <br> (s/veh) | Volume <br> $(\mathrm{VPH})$ | Total Delay <br> $(\mathrm{h}-\mathrm{Hr} / \mathrm{Peak} \mathrm{Hr})$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Existing Conditions | 13.70 | 7572 | 28.82 |
| With Improvements | 7.85 | 7572 | 16.51 |

Reduction in Delay 12.31

Note: The analysis showed the proposed improvements will enhance traffic flow through the intersection, two hours during the morning peak hours and three hours during the evening peak hours. The total delay and emission calculations were performed assuming the improvements will help traffic going through the intersection five hours a day, and 260 days a year.

Emission Calculations<br>Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)<br>VOC Emission Factor: 6.310<br>Formula $=$ Delay in h-hours/hour $\times$ VOC Emission Factor<br>$\times 2.5$ (to convert gm/mile to gm/hour)<br>Hourly emission reductions $=$ Reduction in delay $\times$ VOC Emission Factor $\times 2.5$<br>$=194.19$ grams/hour<br>$=970.95 \mathrm{grams} /$ day<br>$=0.97$ kilograms $/$ day<br>$=252,447.32$ grams $/$ year<br>$=0.252$ metric tons/year<br>= 0.229 U.S.tons/year

Nitrogen Oxides ( $N O_{x}$ )
$N O_{\chi}$ Emission Factor: 1.513

Formula $=$ Delay in h-hours/hour $\times N O_{x}$ Emission Factor
$\times 2.5$ (to convert gm/mile to gm/hour)
Hourly emission reductions $=$ Reduction in delay $\times N O_{x}$ Emission Factor $\times 2.5$
$=46.56$ grams $/$ hour
$=232.81$ grams $/$ day
$=\mathbf{0 . 2 3 3}$ kilograms $/$ day
$=60,531.35$ grams $/$ year
$=0.061$ metric tons $/$ year
$=0.055$ U.S.tons $/$ year

## Attachment: B

 Intersection-specific
## Delay and Emission Calculation Analysis

Note: $\quad$ The analysis showed the proposed improvements will enhance traffic flow through the intersection, two hours during the morning peak hours and three hours during the evening peak hours. The total delay and emission calculations were performed assuming the improvements will help traffic going through the intersection five hours a day, and 260 days a year.

Intersection Names:

- Rushing Road at Chantulane Avenue


## Peak-hour Delay Improvement Analysis Critical Peak: PM

PM Peak

|  | Avg. Delay <br> s/veh |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Existing Conditions | 0.49 | A |
| With Improvements | 0.38 | A |

## Capital Region Planning Commission (CRPC) Intersection Emission Calculation

Names of Intersections:

- Rushing Road at Chantulane Avenue


## Total Delay Calculations of the five (5) intersections

Critical Peak: PM

PM Peak

|  | Avg. Delay <br> (s/veh) | Volume <br> $(\mathrm{VPH})$ | Total Delay <br> $(\mathrm{h}-\mathrm{Hr} /$ Peak Hr) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Conditions | 0.49 | 1055 | 0.14 |
| With Improvements | 0.38 | 1055 | 0.11 |
|  | Reduction in Delay | 0.03 |  |

Emission Calculations<br>Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)<br>VOC Emission Factor: 6.310<br>Formula $=$ Delay in h-hours/hour $\times$ VOC Emission Factor<br>$\times 2.5$ (to convert gm/mile to gm/hour)<br>Hourly emission reductions $=$ Reduction in delay $\times$ VOC Emission Factor $\times 2.5$<br>$=0.473$ grams $/$ hour<br>$=2.366$ grams $/$ day<br>$=0.002$ kilograms $/$ day<br>= 615.212 grams/year<br>$=0.6 \mathrm{E}-3$ metric tons/year<br>$=0.56 \mathrm{E}-3$ U.S.tons/year

Nitrogen Oxides ( $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ )
$N O_{x}$ Emission Factor: 1.513
Formula $=$ Delay in h-hours/hour $\times N O_{x}$ Emission Factor
$\times 2.5$ (to convert gm/mile to gm/hour)
Hourly emission reductions $=$ Reduction in delay $\times N O_{\chi}$ Emission Factor $\times 2.5$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =0.113 \text { grams } / \text { hour } \\
& =0.567 \text { grams } / \text { day } \\
& =147.52 \text { grams } / \text { year } \\
& =0.15 \mathrm{E}-3 \text { metric tons } / \text { year } \\
& =0.13 \mathrm{E}-3 \text { U.S.tons/year }
\end{aligned}
$$

Intersection Names:

- Rushing Road at Commercial Drwy. \#1


## Peak-hour Delay Improvement Analysis Critical Peak: PM

PM Peak

|  | Avg. Delay <br> s/veh |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Conditions | 0.41 | A |
| With Improvements | 0.31 | A |

## Capital Region Planning Commission (CRPC) Intersection Emission Calculation

Names of Intersections:

- Rushing Road at Commercial Drwy. \#1

Total Delay Calculations of the five (5) intersections
Critical Peak: PM

PM Peak

|  | Avg. Delay <br> (s/veh) | Volume <br> $(\mathrm{VPH})$ | Total Delay <br> $(\mathrm{h}-\mathrm{Hr} /$ Peak Hr) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Conditions | 0.41 | 1070 | 0.12 |
| With Improvements | 0.31 | 1070 | 0.09 |
|  | Reduction in Delay | 0.03 |  |

Emission Calculations<br>Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)<br>VOC Emission Factor: 6.310<br>Formula $=$ Delay in h-hours/hour $\times$ VOC Emission Factor<br>$\times 2.5$ (to convert gm/mile to gm/hour)<br>Hourly emission reductions $=$ Reduction in delay $\times$ VOC Emission Factor $\times 2.5$<br>$=0.473$ grams $/$ hour<br>$=2.366$ grams $/$ day<br>$=0.002$ kilograms $/$ day<br>= 615.212 grams/year<br>$=0.6 \mathrm{E}-3$ metric tons/year<br>$=0.56 \mathrm{E}-3$ U.S.tons/year

Nitrogen Oxides ( $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ )
$N O_{x}$ Emission Factor: 1.513
Formula $=$ Delay in h-hours/hour $\times N O_{x}$ Emission Factor
$\times 2.5$ (to convert gm/mile to gm/hour)
Hourly emission reductions $=$ Reduction in delay $\times N O_{\chi}$ Emission Factor $\times 2.5$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =0.113 \text { grams/hour } \\
& =0.567 \text { grams } / \text { day } \\
& =147.52 \text { grams/year } \\
& =0.15 \mathrm{E}-3 \text { metric tons } / \text { year } \\
& =0.13 \mathrm{E}-3 \text { U.S.tons/year }
\end{aligned}
$$

Intersection Names:

- Rushing Road at Commercial Drwy. \#2


## Peak-hour Delay Improvement Analysis Critical Peak: PM

PM Peak

|  | Avg. Delay <br> s/veh |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Conditions | 5.77 | A |
| With Improvements | 4.11 | A |

## Capital Region Planning Commission (CRPC) Intersection Emission Calculation

Names of Intersections:

- Rushing Road at Commercial Drwy. \#2

Total Delay Calculations of the five (5) intersections
Critical Peak: PM

PM Peak

|  | Avg. Delay <br> (s/veh) | Volume <br> $(\mathrm{VPH})$ | Total Delay <br> $(\mathrm{h}-\mathrm{Hr} /$ Peak Hr) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Conditions | 5.77 | 1395 | 2.24 |
| With Improvements | 4.11 | 1395 | 1.59 |
|  | Reduction in Delay | $\mathbf{0 . 6 4}$ |  |

Emission Calculations<br>Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)<br>VOC Emission Factor: 6.310<br>Formula $=$ Delay in h-hours/hour $\times$ VOC Emission Factor<br>$\times 2.5$ (to convert gm/mile to gm/hour)<br>Hourly emission reductions $=$ Reduction in delay $\times$ VOC Emission Factor $\times 2.5$<br>$=10.096$ grams/hour<br>$=50.48$ grams $/$ day<br>$=0.050$ kilograms $/$ day<br>= 13124.8 grams/year<br>$=0.013$ metric tons/year<br>$=0.012$ U.S.tons/year

Nitrogen Oxides ( $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ )
$N O_{x}$ Emission Factor: 1.513
Formula $=$ Delay in h-hours/hour $\times N O_{x}$ Emission Factor
$\times 2.5$ (to convert gm/mile to gm/hour)
Hourly emission reductions $=$ Reduction in delay $\times N O_{\chi}$ Emission Factor $\times 2.5$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =2.421 \text { grams } / \text { hour } \\
& =12.104 \mathrm{grams} / \text { day } \\
& =3147.04 \text { grams } / \text { year } \\
& =0.003 \text { metric tons } / \text { year } \\
& =0.0029 \text { U.S.tons } / \text { year }
\end{aligned}
$$

Intersection Names:

- Rushing Road at Home Depot / Commercial Drwy. \#3


## Peak-hour Delay Improvement Analysis Critical Peak: PM

PM Peak

|  | Avg. Delay <br> s/veh |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Conditions | 42.10 | C |
| With Improvements | 23.50 | B |

## Capital Region Planning Commission (CRPC) Intersection Emission Calculation

Names of Intersections:

- Rushing Road at Home Depot / Commercial Drwy. \#3

Total Delay Calculations of the five (5) intersections
Critical Peak: PM

PM Peak

|  | Avg. Delay <br> (s/veh) | Volume <br> $(\mathrm{VPH})$ | Total Delay <br> $(\mathrm{h}-\mathrm{Hr} /$ Peak Hr) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Conditions | 42.10 | 2224 | 26.01 |
| With Improvements | 23.50 | 2224 | 14.52 |
|  | Reduction in Delay | $\mathbf{1 1 . 4 9}$ |  |

Emission Calculations<br>Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)<br>VOC Emission Factor: 6.310<br>Formula $=$ Delay in h-hours/hour $\times$ VOC Emission Factor<br>$\times 2.5$ (to convert gm/mile to gm/hour)<br>Hourly emission reductions $=$ Reduction in delay $\times$ VOC Emission Factor $\times 2.5$<br>$=181.255$ grams/hour $=906.27$ grams/day<br>= 0.906 kilograms $/$ day<br>$=235631.16$ grams $/$ year<br>$=0.236$ metric tons/year<br>= 0.214 U.S.tons/year

Nitrogen Oxides ( $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ )
$N O_{\chi}$ Emission Factor: 1.513
Formula $=$ Delay in h-hours/hour $\times N O_{x}$ Emission Factor
$\times 2.5$ (to convert gm/mile to gm/hour)
Hourly emission reductions $=$ Reduction in delay $\times N O_{\chi}$ Emission Factor $\times 2.5$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =43.461 \text { grams } / \text { hour } \\
& =217.30 \text { grams } / \text { day } \\
& =\mathbf{0 . 2 1 7} \text { kilograms } / \text { day } \\
& =56499.2 \text { grams } / \text { year } \\
& =0.056 \text { metric tons } / \text { year } \\
& =0.051 \text { U.S.tons } / \text { year }
\end{aligned}
$$

Intersection Names:

- Rushing Road at Commercial Drwy. \#4


## Peak-hour Delay Improvement Analysis Critical Peak: PM

PM Peak

|  | Avg. Delay <br> s/veh |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Conditions | 0.62 | A |
| With Improvements | 0.39 | A |

## Capital Region Planning Commission (CRPC) Intersection Emission Calculation

Names of Intersections:

- Rushing Road at Commercial Drwy. \#4


## Total Delay Calculations of the five (5) intersections

Critical Peak: PM

PM Peak

|  | Avg. Delay <br> (s/veh) | Volume <br> $(\mathrm{VPH})$ | Total Delay <br> $(\mathrm{h}-\mathrm{Hr} /$ Peak Hr) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Conditions | 0.62 | 1828 | 0.31 |
| With Improvements | 0.39 | 1828 | 0.20 |
|  | Reduction in Delay | $\mathbf{0 . 1 2}$ |  |

Emission Calculations<br>Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)<br>VOC Emission Factor: 6.310<br>Formula $=$ Delay in h-hours/hour $\times$ VOC Emission Factor<br>$\times 2.5$ (to convert gm/mile to gm/hour)<br>Hourly emission reductions $=$ Reduction in delay $\times$ VOC Emission Factor $\times 2.5$<br>$=1.893$ grams $/$ hour<br>$=9.465$ grams $/$ day<br>= 0.009 kilograms $/$ day<br>$=2460.9$ grams $/$ year<br>$=0.0025$ metric tons/year<br>= 0.0022 U.S.tons/year

Nitrogen Oxides ( $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ )
$N O_{x}$ Emission Factor: 1.513
Formula $=$ Delay in h-hours/hour $\times N O_{x}$ Emission Factor
$\times 2.5$ (to convert gm/mile to gm/hour)
Hourly emission reductions $=$ Reduction in delay $\times N O_{x}$ Emission Factor $\times 2.5$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =0.454 \text { grams } / \text { hour } \\
& =2.270 \text { grams } / \text { day } \\
& =\mathbf{0 . 0 0 2} \text { kilograms } / \text { day } \\
& =590.07 \text { grams } / \text { year } \\
& =0.59 \mathrm{E}-3 \mathrm{metric} \text { tons } / \text { year } \\
& =0.54 \mathrm{E}-3 \text { U.S.tons } / \text { year }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Attachment: C

Traffic Count Information (provided by NSI)

Analyst: GPO
Agency:
Date: 9/15/2008
Period: 2011 AM Peak
Inter.: Rushing Rd \& Home Depot Dr Area Type: All other areas Jurisd: Delham Springs, LA
Year :
Project ID: Build+: With development, LT lns on Rushing Rd, NB LT ln E/W St: Rushing Rd N/S St: Home Depot Dr / Futr Dwy \#3
_SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY

|  |  | tboun |  |  | tboun |  | No | thbou | nd | Sou | thbo | nd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |  | T | R |  | T | R |  |
| No. Lanes |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |
| LGConfig | L | TR |  | L | TR |  | L | T | R | L | TR |  |  |
| Volume | 32 | 243 | 23 | 93 | 255 | 66 | 15 | 25 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 40 |  |
| Lane Width | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |  |  |
| RTOR Vol |  |  | 3 |  |  | 9 |  |  | 54 |  |  | 30 |  |



| Appr/ Lane Grp | Lane Group Capacity | Adj Sat Flow Rate (s) | Ratios |  | Lane Group | Approach |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | v/c | g/C | Delay LOS | Delay LOS |


| Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L | 770 | 1805 | 0.05 | 0.77 | 2.0 | A |  |  |
| TR | 1095 | 1878 | 0.26 | 0.58 | 6.3 | A | 5.8 | A |
| Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L | 822 | 1805 | 0.12 | 0.77 | 2.0 | A |  |  |
| TR | 1078 | 1848 | 0.31 | 0.58 | 6.5 | A | 5.5 | A |
| Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L | 127 | 1900 | 0.13 | 0.07 | 26.8 | C |  |  |
| T | 127 | 1900 | 0.21 | 0.07 | 27.3 | C | 27.1 | C |
| R | 108 | 1615 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 26.5 | C |  |  |
| Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L | 127 | 1900 | 0.43 | 0.07 | 29.2 | C |  |  |
| TR | 123 | 1842 | 0.44 | 0.07 | 29.4 | C | 29.3 | C |
|  | Intersection Delay $=9.6$ |  |  | (sec/veh) |  | Intersection LOS $=\mathrm{A}$ |  |  |

Analyst: GPO
Agency:
Date: 9/15/2008
Period: 2011 PM Peak
Inter.: Rushing Rd \& Home Depot Dr Area Type: All other areas Jurisd: Delham Springs, LA
Year :
Project ID: Build+: With development, LT lns on Rushing Rd, NB LT ln E/W St: Rushing Rd N/S St: Home Depot Dr / Futr Dwy \#3
_SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY


| Duration 0.25 |  | Area | Type: All ot $\qquad$ Signal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { her } \\ & \text { erat } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { areas } \\ & \text { ions_ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phase Combination | 1 | 2 | 34 |  |  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |
| EB Left | A | A | A | NB | Left | A |  |  |  |  |
| Thru |  |  | A |  | Thru | A |  |  |  |  |
| Right |  |  | A |  | Right | A |  |  |  |  |
| Peds |  |  |  |  | Peds |  |  |  |  |  |
| WB Left | A | A | A | SB | Left | A |  |  |  |  |
| Thru |  | A | A |  | Thru | A |  |  |  |  |
| Right |  | A | A |  | Right | A |  |  |  |  |
| Peds |  |  |  |  | Peds |  |  |  |  |  |
| NB Right |  |  |  | EB | Right |  |  |  |  |  |
| SB Right |  |  |  | WB | Right |  |  |  |  |  |
| Green | 6.0 | 5.0 | 49.00 .0 |  |  | 20.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Yellow | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| All Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |


| Appr/ Lane Grp | Lane Group Capacity | Adj Sat | Ratios |  | Lane Group | Approach |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Flow Rate |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ( s ) | v/c | g / C | Delay LOS | Delay LoS |


| Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L | 675 | 1805 | 0.12 | 0.72 | 4.9 | A |  |  |
| TR | 916 | 1870 | 0.79 | 0.49 | 25.7 | C | 23.6 | C |
| Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L | 427 | 1805 | 0.75 | 0.70 | 25.2 | C |  |  |
| TR | 1086 | 1872 | 0.36 | 0.58 | 11.3 | B | 17.6 | B |
| Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L | 184 | 919 | 0.47 | 0.20 | 37.3 | D |  |  |
| T | 380 | 1900 | 0.38 | 0.20 | 35.3 | D | 35.5 | D |
| R | 323 | 1615 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 33.6 | C |  |  |
| Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L | 240 | 1199 | 0.34 | 0.20 | 35.2 | D |  |  |
| TR | 359 | 1797 | 0.58 | 0.20 | 38.7 | D | 37.7 | D |
|  | Intersection Delay $=25.2$ |  |  | (sec/veh) |  | Intersection LOS = C |  |  |

Analyst: GPO Inter.: Rushing Rd \& Home Depot Dr
Agency:
Area Type: All other areas
Jurisd: Delham Springs, LA
Date: 9/15/2008
Year :
Period: 2011 AM Peak
Project ID: No Build+: With develm't, no LT lns on Rushing Rd, NB LT ln E/W St: Rushing Rd N/S St: Home Depot Dr / Futr Dwy \#3
_SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY



Eastbound

| LTR | 1288 | 1756 | 0.25 | 0.73 | 3.1 | $A$ | 3.1 | $A$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Westbound

| LTR | 1168 | 1593 | 0.38 | 0.73 | 3.9 | A | 3.9 | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L | 127 | 1900 | 0.13 | 0.07 | 28.4 | C |  |  |
| T | 127 | 1900 | 0.21 | 0.07 | 30.3 | C | 29.3 | C |
| R | 108 | 1615 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 27.4 | C |  |  |
| Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L | 127 | 1900 | 0.43 | 0.07 | 37.0 | D |  |  |
| TR | 123 | 1842 | 0.44 | 0.07 | 37.9 | D | 37.4 | D |
| Intersection Delay $=8.9$ |  |  |  | (sec/veh) |  | Intersection |  | S |

Analyst: GPO Inter.: Rushing Rd \& Home Depot Dr
Agency:
Area Type: All other areas
Date: 9/17/2008 Jurisd: Delham Springs, LA
Period: 2011 PM Peak
Year :
Project ID: No Build+: With develm't, no LT lns on Rushing Rd, NB LT ln E/W St: Rushing Rd N/S St: Home Depot Dr / Futr Dwy \#3
_SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY



Eastbound

| LTR | 1119 | 1622 | 0.72 | 0.69 | 13.5 | B | 13.5 | B |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Westbound

| LTR | 656 | 951 | 1.08 | 0.69 | 74.5 | E | 74.5 | E |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L | 170 | 896 | 0.51 | 0.19 | 46.9 | D | 40.5 | D |
| T | 361 | 1900 | 0.40 | 0.19 | 38.8 | D |  |  |
| R | 307 | 1615 | 0.21 | 0.19 | 35.7 | D |  |  |
| Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L | 226 | 1190 | 0.36 | 0.19 | 39.7 | D |  |  |
| TR | 341 | 1797 | 0.62 | 0.19 | 45.2 | D | 43.7 | D |

## Attachment: D

HCS Output

## General Information

| Analyst | NJF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | NSI |
| Date Performed | $2 / 22 / 2008$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak |

East/West Street: Rushing Road
Intersection Orientation: East-West

Site Information

| Intersection | Rushing Rd. at Chantulane |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Livingston Parish |
| Analysis Year | 2011 No Build |
|  |  |

North/South Street: Chantulane
Study Period (hrs): 0.25

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 262 | 1 | 2 | 264 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 284 | 1 | 2 | 286 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | LT |  |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |


| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 12 | 0 | 13 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 13 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | N |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  |
| Lane Configuration |  | $L T$ |  | $L T R$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~V}(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h})$ |  | 2 |  | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{m})($ veh/h) |  | 1289 |  | 596 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~V} / \mathrm{c}$ |  | 0.00 |  | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $95 \%$ queue length |  | 0.00 |  | 0.14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 7.8 |  | 11.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | A |  | $B$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | - | 11.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | - | - | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Generall Information

| Analyst | N |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | Ns |
| Date Performed | $2 / 2$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AN |
| Project Description |  |
| East/West Street: Rushing Road |  |
| Intersection Orientation | East-We |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Rushing Rd at Chantulane |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Livingston Parish |
| Analysis Year | 2011 Buld |
|  |  |

North/South Street: Chantulane
Study Period (hrs): 0.25

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 262 | 1 | 2 | 264 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 284 | 1 | 2 | 286 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | L | $T$ |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |


| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 12 | 0 | 13 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 13 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | N |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | $L$ |  | $L T R$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~V}(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h})$ |  | 2 |  | 27 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{m})($ veh/h) |  | 1289 |  | 596 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~V} / \mathrm{c}$ |  | 0.00 |  | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| $95 \%$ queue length |  | 0.00 |  | 0.14 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 7.8 |  | 11.3 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | $A$ |  | $B$ |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | - | 11.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | -- | - | $B$ |  |  |  |  |  |

General Information

| Analyst | NJF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | NSI |
| Date Performed | $2 / 22 / 2008$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak |

Project Description
East/West Street: Rushing Road
Intersection Orientation: East-West
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 587 | 8 | 21 | 342 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 638 | 8 | 22 | 371 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | LT |  |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |


| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 14 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | N |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | LT |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |
| $v$ (veh/h) |  | 22 |  | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| C (m) (veh/h) |  | 949 |  | 451 |  |  |  |  |
| v/c |  | 0.02 |  | 0.04 |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% queue length |  | 0.07 |  | 0.11 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 8.9 |  | 13.3 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | A |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | -- |  | 13.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | -- | -- |  | B |  |  |  |  |



## General Information

## Site Information

| Analyst | N.JF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | NSI |
| Date Performed | $2 / 22 / 2008$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak |


| \|ntersection |
| :--- |
| Jurisdiction |
| Analysis Year |
| North/South Street: Drive \#1 |
| Study Period (hrs): 0.25 |

Study Period (hrs): 0.25
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 274 | 1 | 4 | 265 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 297 | 1 | 4 | 288 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | LT |  |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |


| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | N |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | $L T$ |  | $L T R$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h})$ |  | 4 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{m})(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h})$ |  | 1275 |  | 624 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~V} / \mathrm{c}$ |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| $95 \%$ queue length |  | 0.01 |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 7.8 |  | 10.8 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | $A$ |  | $B$ |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | - | 10.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | - | - | $B$ |  |  |  |  |  |

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY

General Information

| Analyst | NJF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | NSI |
| Date Performed | $2 / 22 / 2008$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AMPeak |

## Site Information

| $\sqrt{\text { Intersection }}$ |
| :--- |
| Jurisoliction |
| Analysis Year |
| North/South Street: Drive $\# 1$ |
| Study Period (hrs): 0.25 |

Rushing Rd. at Drive \#1
Livingston Parish
2011 Build

Project Description
East/West Street: Rushing Road
Intersection Orientation: East-West

North/South Street: Drive \#1
Study Period (hrs): 0.25

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | , | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 274 | 1 | 4 | 265 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 297 | 1 | 4 | 288 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Two Way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | L | $T$ |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |


| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | N |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | $L$ |  | $L T R$ |  |  |  |  |
| V (veh/h) |  | 4 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{m})(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h})$ |  | 1275 |  | 672 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| $95 \%$ queue length |  | 0.01 |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 7.8 |  | 10.4 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | $A$ |  | $B$ |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | -- | - | 10.4 |  |  |  | $B$ |  |

General Information

| Analyst | NJF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | NSI |
| Date Performed | $2 / 22 / 2008$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak |

## Site Information

Intersection
Jurisdiction
Analysis Year

Rushing Rd. at Drive \#1 Livingston Parish
2011 No Bulld Project Description East/West Street: Rushing Road

North/South Street: Drive \#1
Study Period (hrs): 0.25

| Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 598 | 3 | 13 | 358 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 649 | 3 | 14 | 389 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | LT |  |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 5 | 0 | 10 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | N |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | LT |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |
| v (veh/h) |  | 14 |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{m})$ (veh/h) |  | 944 |  | 360 |  |  |  |  |
| v/c |  | 0.01 |  | 0.04 |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% queue length |  | 0.05 |  | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 8.9 |  | 15.4 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | A |  | C |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | -- |  | 15.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | -- | -- |  | C |  |  |  |  |


| TVO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMMARY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General linformation |  | Site Information |  |
| Analyst | INJF | Intersection | Rushing Rd. at Drive \#1 |
| Agency/Co. | NSI | Jurisdiction | Livingston Parish |
| Date Performed | 2/22/2008 | Analysis Year | 2011 Build |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak |  |  |
| Project Description |  |  |  |
| East/West Street: Rushing Road |  | North/South St |  |
| Intersection Orientation: East-West |  | Study Period (h |  |


| Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 598 | 3 | 13 | 358 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 649 | 3 | 14 | 389 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Two Way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | L | T |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |


| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 5 | 0 | 10 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | $N$ |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | L |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |
| $v$ (veh/h) |  | 14 |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| C (m) (veh/h) |  | 944 |  | 435 |  |  |  |  |
| v/c |  | 0.01 |  | 0.03 |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% queue length |  | 0.05 |  | 0.11 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 8.9 |  | 13.6 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | A |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | -- |  | 13.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | -- | -- |  | B |  |  |  |  |

General Information

| Analyst | $N J F$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | $N S I$ |
| Date Performed | $2 / 22 / 2008$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak |

## Site Information

| Intersection | Rushing Rd. at Drive \#2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Livingston Parish |
| Analysis Year | 2011 No Build |
|  |  |

Project Description
East/West Street: Rushing Road
North/South Street: Drive \#2
Study Period (hrs): 0.25
Intersection Orientation: East-West
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 268 | 8 | 45 | 265 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 291 | 8 | 48 | 288 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | LT |  |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |


| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 4 | 0 | 30 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 4 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | N |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | LT |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |
| $v$ (veh/h) |  | 48 |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |
| C (m) (veh/h) |  | 1274 |  | 684 |  |  |  |  |
| v/c |  | 0.04 |  | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% queue length |  | 0.12 |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 7.9 |  | 10.6 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | A |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | -- |  | 10.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | -- | -- |  | B |  |  |  |  |

General Information

| Analyst | NJF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co | NSI |
| Date Performed | $2 / 22 / 2008$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak |

Site Information

| Intersection | Rushing Rd, at Drive \#2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Livingston Parish |
| Analysis Year | 2011 Buld |
|  |  | Project Description East/West Street: Rushing Road

North/South Street: Drive \#2
Intersection Orientation: East-West
Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 268 | 8 | 45 | 265 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 291 | 8 | 48 | 288 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Two Way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | L | $T$ |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |


| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 4 | 0 | 30 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 4 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | N |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | $L$ |  | $L T R$ |  |  |  |  |
| v (veh/h) |  | 48 |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |
| C (m) (veh/h) |  | 1274 |  | 711 |  |  |  |  |
| V/c |  | 0.04 |  | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |
| $95 \%$ queue length |  | 0.12 |  | 0.16 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 7.9 |  | 10.3 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | A |  | $B$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | -- | 10.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | - | - | B |  |  |  |  |  |

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY

General Information

| Analyst | NJF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | NSI |
| Date Performed | $2 / 22 / 2008$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak |


| Intersection | Rushing Rd. at Drive \#2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Livingston Parish |
| Analysis Year | 2011 No Build |
|  |  |

Project Description
East/West Street: Rushing Road
Intersection Orientation: East-West

Site Information

| $\int$ Intersection |
| :--- |
| Jurisdiction |
| Analysis Year |
| North/South Street: Drive \#2 |
| Study Period (hrs): 0.25 |

North/South Street: Drive \#2
Study Period (hrs): 0.25

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 583 | 25 | 149 | 343 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR | 0 | 633 | 27 | 161 | 372 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | LT |  |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |


| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 28 | 0 | 159 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 30 | 0 | 172 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | N |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | $L T$ |  | $L T R$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~V}(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h})$ |  | 161 |  | 202 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{m})(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h})$ |  | 938 |  | 351 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~V} / \mathrm{c}$ |  | 0.17 |  | 0.58 |  |  |  |  |
| $95 \%$ queue length |  | 0.62 |  | 3.43 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 9.6 |  | 28.3 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | $A$ |  | $D$ |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | -- | 28.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | -- | -- | $D$ |  |  |  |  |  |


| TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  | Site information |  |
| Analyst | INJF | Intersection | Rushing Rd. at Drive \#2 |
| Agency/Co. | NSI | Jurisdiction | Livingston Parish |
| Date Performed | 2/22/2008 | Analysis Year | 2011 Build |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak |  |  |
| Project Description |  |  |  |
| EastlWest Street: Rushing Road |  | North/South Stre |  |
| Intersection Orientation: East-West |  | Study Period (hrs) |  |

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 583 | 25 | 149 | 343 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 633 | 27 | 161 | 372 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Two Way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | L | $T$ |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |


| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 28 | 0 | 159 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 30 | 0 | 172 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | N |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | $L$ |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |
| v (veh/h) |  | 161 |  | 202 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{m})(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h})$ |  | 938 |  | 428 |  |  |  |  |
| v/c |  | 0.17 |  | 0.47 |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% queue length |  | 0.62 |  | 2.47 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 9.6 |  | 20.7 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | A |  | C |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | -- |  | 20.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | -- | -- |  | C |  |  |  |  |

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY
General Information

| Analyst | NJF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | NSI |
| Date Performed | $2 / 22 / 2008$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak |

## Site Information

| \|lntersection |
| :--- |
| Jurisdiction |
| Analysis Year |
|  |
| North/South Street: Drive \#4 |
| Study Period (hrs): 0.25 |

Rushing Rd. at Drive \#4
Livingston Parish
2011 No Build

Project Description

EastWest Street: Rushing Road Intersection Orientation: East-West

North/South Street: Drive \#4
Study Period (hrs): 0.25

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 350 | 3 | 4 | 413 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 380 | 3 | 4 | 448 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | LT |  |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |


| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 5 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | N |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | $L T$ |  | $L T R$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~V}(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h})$ |  | 4 |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{m})($ veh/h) |  | 1187 |  | 576 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~V} / \mathrm{c}$ |  | 0.00 |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| $95 \%$ queue length |  | 0.01 |  | 0.03 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 8.0 |  | 11.3 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | $A$ |  | $B$ |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | - | 11.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | - | - | $B$ |  |  |  |  |  |

TWO-WAY STOP CONTROL SUMMARY

## General Information

Site Information

| Analyst | NJF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | NSI |
| Date Performed | $2 / 22 / 2008$ |
| Analysis Time Period | AM Peak |


| Intersection | Rushing Rd. at Drive W $^{\prime}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Livingston Parish |
| Analysis Year | 2011 Buld |
|  |  |

Project Description

East/West Street: Rushing Road
Intersection Orientation: East-West

North/South Street: Drive \#4
Study Period (hrs): 0.25

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 350 | 3 | 4 | 413 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 380 | 3 | 4 | 448 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Two Way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | L | T |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |


| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 5 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | $N$ |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | $L$ |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |
| v (veh/h) |  | 4 |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{m})($ veh/h) |  | 1187 |  | 622 |  |  |  |  |
| V/c |  | 0.00 |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| $95 \%$ queue length |  | 0.01 |  | 0.03 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 8.0 |  | 10.8 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | $A$ |  | $B$ |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | - | - | 10.8 |  |  |  |  |  |

General Information

| Analyst | NJF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | NSI |
| Date Performed | $2 / 22 / 2008$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak |

## Project Description

East/West Street: Rushing Road
Site Information

| Intersection | Rushing Rd. at Drive \#4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Livingston Parish |
| Analysis Year | 2011 No Build |

North/South Street: Drive \#4
Study Period (hrs): 0.25

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 978 | 9 | 13 | 657 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 1063 | 9 | 14 | 714 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Undivided |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | LT |  |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |


| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 4 | 0 | 23 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 4 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | N |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | LT |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |
| $v$ (veh/h) |  | 14 |  | 28 |  |  |  |  |
| C (m) (veh/h) |  | 658 |  | 208 |  |  |  |  |
| v/c |  | 0.02 |  | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% queue length |  | 0.07 |  | 0.46 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 10.6 |  | 25.0 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | B |  | C |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | -- |  | 25.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | -- | -- |  | C |  |  |  |  |

General Information
Site Information

| Analyst | NJF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co. | NSI |
| Date Performed | $2 / 22 / 2008$ |
| Analysis Time Period | PM Peak |

Rushing Rd. at Drive \#4

| Intersection | Rushing Rd. at D |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Livingston Parish |
| Anicis Year | 2011 Build |

Analysis Year
2011 Build

North/South Street: Drive \#4
Study Period (hrs): 0.25

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Major Street | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) |  | 978 | 9 | 13 | 657 |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 0 | 1063 | 9 | 14 | 714 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- |
| Median Type | Two Way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | TR | L | T |  |
| Upstream Signal |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Minor Street | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| Movement | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 4 | 0 | 23 |  |  |  |
| Peak-Hour Factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly Flow Rate, HFR (veh/h) | 4 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Grade (\%) | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Flared Approach |  | N |  |  | N |  |
| Storage |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| Approach | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Lane Configuration |  | L |  | LTR |  |  |  |  |
| v (veh/h) |  | 14 |  | 28 |  |  |  |  |
| C (m) (veh/h) |  | 658 |  | 262 |  |  |  |  |
| v/c |  | 0.02 |  | 0.11 |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% queue length |  | 0.07 |  | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) |  | 10.6 |  | 20.4 |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  | B |  | C |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | -- | -- |  | 20.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | -- | -- |  | C |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SEP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | P |  | 4 | P |  |  | 4 | \% | \% | \% |  |
| Volume (vph) | 32 | 243 | 23 | 93 | 255 | 66 | 15 | 25 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 40 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 6.0 |  | 4.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 0.97 |  |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.93 |  |
| Fit Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1839 |  | 1770 | 1805 |  |  | 1829 | 1583 | 1770 | 1723 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.55 | 1.00 |  | 0.51 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.88 | 1.00 | 0.73 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1028 | 1839 |  | 942 | 1805 |  |  | 1637 | 1583 | 1358 | 1723 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 35 | 264 | 25 | 101 | 277 | 72 | 16 | 27 | 65 | 54 | 43 | 43 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 31 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 35 | 286 | 0 | 101 | 340 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 11 | 54 | 55 | 0 |


| Turn Type | pm+pt |  | pm+pt |  | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 23.3 | 20.9 | 29.7 | 24.1 |  | 8.3 | 8.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 23.3 | 20.9 | 29.7 | 24.1 |  | 8.3 | 8.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.48 | 0.43 | 0.61 | 0.49 |  | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.13 | 0.13 |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 6.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 527 | 788 | 668 | 891 |  | 278 | 269 | 175 | 222 |
| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.00 | 0.16 | c0.02 | c0.19 |  |  |  |  | 0.03 |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.03 |  | 0.07 |  |  | 0.03 | 0.01 | c0.04 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.07 | 0.36 | 0.15 | 0.38 |  | 0.15 | 0.04 | 0.31 | 0.25 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 6.8 | 9.4 | 4.1 | 7.7 |  | 17.3 | 16.9 | 19.3 | 19.1 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 |  | 0.3 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.6 |
| Delay (s) | 6.9 | 9.7 | 4.2 | 8.0 |  | 17.5 | 17.0 | 20.3 | 19.7 |
| Level of Service | A | A | A | A |  | B | B | C | B |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 9.4 |  | 7.1 |  | 17.2 |  |  | 19.9 |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  | A |  | B |  |  | B |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM Average Control Delay | 10.7 | HCM Level of Service | B |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.34 |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 48.8 | Sum of lost time (s) | 14.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $43.5 \%$ | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SB | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 7 | 曾 |  | 5 | \% |  |  | 4 | fr | \% |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 76 | 592 | 74 | 295 | 322 | 44 | 80 | 133 | 320 | 75 | 123 | 90 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.0 | 6.0 |  | 4.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.94 |  |
| Fil Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1832 |  | 1770 | 1829 |  |  | 1828 | 1583 | 1770 | 1745 |  |
| Fll Permitted | 0.53 | 1.00 |  | 0.12 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.65 | 1.00 | 0.42 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 983 | 1832 |  | 229 | 1829 |  |  | 1216 | 1583 | 774 | 1745 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 83 | 643 | 80 | 321 | 350 | 48 | 87 | 145 | 348 | 82 | 134 | 98 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 261 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 83 | 720 | 0 | 321 | 394 | 0 | 0 | 232 | 87 | 82 | 212 | 0 |


| Turn Type | pm+pt |  | pm+pt |  | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 | - 1 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  | 8 | 4 |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 53.6 | 50.6 | 72.1 | 65.1 |  | 27.2 | 27.2 | 25.2 | 25.2 |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 53.6 | 50.6 | 72.1 | 65.1 |  | 27.2 | 27.2 | 25.2 | 25.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.49 | 0.46 | 0.66 | 0.60 |  | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.23 |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.0 | 6.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 504 | 848 | 398 | 1089 |  | 303 | 394 | 178 | 402 |
| v/s Ratio Prot | 0.00 | c0.39 | c0.13 | 0.22 |  |  |  |  | 0.12 |
| v/s Ratio Perm | 0.08 |  | 0.40 |  |  | c0.19 | 0.05 | 0.11 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.16 | 0.85 | 0.81 | 0.36 |  | 0.77 | 0.22 | 0.46 | 0.53 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 14.9 | 26.0 | 25.1 | 11.4 |  | 38.1 | 32.6 | 36.2 | 36.8 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 0.2 | 7.9 | 11.3 | 0.2 |  | 11.0 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 1.3 |
| Delay (s) | 15.0 | 33.9 | 36.4 | 11.6 |  | 49.1 | 32.9 | 38.1 | 38.1 |
| Level of Service | B | C | D | B |  | D | C | D | D |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 32.0 |  | 22.7 |  | 39.4 |  |  | 38.1 |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  | C |  | D |  |  | D |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM Average Control Delay | 31.8 | HCM Level of Service | C |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.82 |  | 14.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 109.3 | Sum of lost time (s) | F |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $92.1 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |



## Attachment: E

MOBILE 6.2 Input \& Output Files
MO

* MOBILE6. 2 (31-0ct-2002)
* Input file: M6INPUT. IN (file 1, run 1)
M603 Comment
User has disabled the calculation of REFUELING emissions
* Reading Registration Distributions from the following external
* data file: LA_REGD.D
* Reading I/M program description records from the following external
* data file: BTR_IM.D
* Average speed 2.5 mph
* \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \#
*[02 0001] 14
* File 1, Run 1, Scenario 2.
* \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# M615 Comment:

User supplied VMT mix.

* Reading Hourly Roadway VMT distribution from the following external
* data file: V000102F.DEF

Reading User Supplied ROADWAY VMT Factors

* Reading Hourly VMT distribution from the following external
data file: V000102H.DEF
* Reading Hourly, Roadway, and Speed VMT dist. from the following external
data file: V000102S.DEF
M 48 Warning:
there are no sales for vehicle class HDGV8b

* \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \#
*[03 0001] 616
* File 1, Run 1, Scenario 3.
* \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \# M615 Comment:

User supplied VMT mix.

* Reading Hourly Roadway VMT distribution from the following external
* data file: V000103F.DEF

Reading User Supplied ROADWAY VMT Factors

* Reading Hourly VMT distribution from the following external
* data file: V000103H.DEF
* Reading Hourly, Roadway, and Speed VMT dist. from the following external
* data file: V000103S.DEF

M 48 Warning:
vvfsd


