

ARIZONA TEXAS NEW MEXICO OKLAHOMA

October 25, 2022

Mr. Christopher Wanamaker County Engineer Pinal County Department of Public Works 85 N. Florence St. Florence, AZ 85132

Re: Fossil Springs Drive/Sleepy Hollow Trail Connection Access Study

Dear Mr. Wanamaker:

You recently retained Lee Engineering to evaluate a street connection between Sleepy Hollow Trail and Fossil Springs Drive in the Gold Canyon area of Pinal County. It is understood that this connection, known as Peralta Canyon Way, is supported by some nearby residents and opposed by other residents. The purpose of this report is to present the results of Lee Engineering's study to recommend how this connection should be used and whether changes to traffic control devices or traffic calming features should be considered in the vicinity.

Executive Summary

This study has drawn the following conclusions and recommendations about Peralta Canyon Way:

- As of April-May 2022, the Peralta Canyon connection carries an average of about 450 vehicles per day on weekdays. This level of traffic is considered low for a local street. If seasonal trends on U.S. 60 apply to the neighborhood, then this volume is expected to be about 4 percent higher than the annual average.
- Volume on the connection is forecast to increase to about 800 vehicles per day on full build-out of Peralta Canyon, based on lot-by-lot construction status observed in June 2022. This level of traffic is considered average for a local street.
- The safety performance of the Sleepy Hollow Trail corridor was excellent for the 5-year period between 2016 and 2020, the most recent period for which crash data is available. Only two crashes occurred along the corridor, both single-vehicle run-off road crashes not likely to be correctible by engineering measures. It is possible that crashes will increase as traffic volume increases.
- A traffic signal is not warranted at the intersection of Sleepy Hollow Trail and Kings Ranch Road, and a signal is not expected to be warranted at full build-out of Peralta Canyon.
- The traffic volume on Sleepy Hollow Trail exceeds Maricopa County's planning-level guidelines for an urban local street and exceeds the thresholds for installing city-funded traffic calming devices in Mesa, Tempe, and Scottsdale. This condition was true even without the traffic added from Peralta Canyon.
- Peralta Canyon Way should remain open to traffic, and additional access points be considered for the Peralta Canyon development.
- While the connection provides mobility for active travelers such as pedestrians and bicyclists, no dedicated accommodations for pedestrians or bicyclists are required due to the low-speed local nature of Peralta Canyon Way and low to moderate traffic levels expected on the connector. Pinal County may wish to consider sidewalks on one or both sides of Peralta Canyon Way if pedestrian traffic becomes frequent.

- Pinal County should work with local residents to determine if traffic calming on Sleepy Hollow Trail is desirable, and if so, identify an appropriate traffic calming treatment and a funding source.
- One or more speed humps or speed cushions on the Peralta Canyon connection are unlikely to appreciably affect traffic volume and the already-low traffic speeds, but such devices may be considered upon request to improve community livability.

Existing Conditions

Gold Canyon is a rapidly developing area served by U.S. Route 60 southeast of Apache Junction, Arizona. Because it is unincorporated, the public streets are maintained by Pinal County.

This study was precipitated by the development of Peralta Canyon, a large residential subdivision that is currently partially developed. Peralta Canyon has its primary access to U.S. 60 via Peralta Road, but it was also designed with a secondary access via Sleepy Hollow Trail and Kings Ranch Road to U.S. 60.

The study area, including these access points, is depicted in Figure 1.¹

Sleepy Hollow Trail is a local street that traverses a largely east-west alignment in the study area. The street serves some front-facing homes, particularly in its eastern segment, directly north of Peralta Canyon. The street is about 1.6 miles long between its western terminus at Kings Ranch Road and its eastern terminus at Lazy Lane. Its cross-section varies slightly along this length, but its pavement width is typically approximately 40 feet. On-street parking is permitted along both sides of the street. It is unmarked and posted with a 25-mph speed limit. A sidewalk is present on the south side of Sleepy Hollow Trail for about 850 feet, a small fraction of its total length, near its western terminus. The remainder of the street has no sidewalks on either north or south sides; pedestrians are permitted to walk on the pavement. Sleepy Hollow Trail is stop-controlled at Kings Ranch Road, but no other STOP or YIELD signs are present for traffic along the street. No traffic calming devices are present, although the street does have some horizontal and vertical curvature that helps control speeds, particularly in its western segment.

Sleepy Hollow Trail is classified as a local street, according to the Pinal County Functionally Classified Roads map dated February 22, 2011. However, it has several characteristics commonly associated with collector streets. Notably, its 40-foot width is wider than typical local streets in the neighborhood, and its 1.6-mile uninterrupted length is considerably longer than nearby local streets. Some surrounding developments were constructed with lots back-facing or side-facing onto Sleepy Hollow Trail, a common collector-street treatment, but other lots face the street. Aside from the connection to Peralta Canyon, Sleepy Hollow Trail serves a clear collector-street function delivering traffic from the surrounding neighborhood to and from Kings Ranch Road.

¹ Aerial photos in this document were sourced from Google Earth images dated April 2020.





Sleepy Hollow Trail was constructed at least 30 years ago. In an aerial photograph dated May 1992, it appears paved for its entire 1.6-mile length, although homes in the surrounding neighborhood are sparse. In a photo dated December 2003, it appears to be fully developed with a complement of homes similar to today's development density.

Pinal County staff provided two Traffic Impact Studies for the Peralta Canyon development: a preliminary study dated November 2007 and an approved final study dated March 2016.² Development work on the site was not visible in an aerial photo dated February 2017. Some grading work in the southern part of the community was evident in an aerial photo dated January 2018, although at that time no streets were paved, and residential construction had not begun on any lots. Construction was well underway by April 2020, when about ¼ of the development's homes appear to be complete and occupied, and grading had begun on all lots.

Lee Engineering visited the site on June 7, 2022, to document the status of construction. The review found all the development's streets paved and about 70 percent of lots occupied. (Further detail on occupied lots is presented later in this report.)

The northernmost east-west street in the Peralta Canyon development is Fossil Springs Drive. It runs approximately parallel to and about 500 feet south of Sleepy Hollow Trail, although at about 0.8 miles long it is only half the length of Sleepy Hollow Trail.

² Peralta Canyon's approved traffic study indicates that it consists of 761 single-family residential lots. Lee Engineering's review of site plans confirmed only 750 lots.

On June 7, 2022, the connection between Fossil Springs Drive and Sleepy Hollow Trail, Peralta Canyon Way, was observed to be open to traffic. It is understood from Pinal County staff that the connection has been open to traffic since at least April 29, 2022, when traffic data was collected along Sleepy Hollow Trail. The connection is about 500 feet long. About midway along its length was a series of gates that could be used to close access; it is understood that the gates had been open since at least April 29. The street was posted with EMERGENCY EXIT ONLY regulatory signs in a format that appears to mimic a DO NOT ENTER sign, as shown at right. These signs were posted on both left and right sides of the roadway facing both northbound and southbound traffic entering the connection.³



Kings Ranch Road is classified as a major collector and carries one lane in each direction separated by a twoway left-turn lane in the vicinity of Sleepy Hollow Trail. About ½ mile separates Sleepy Hollow Trail from U.S. Route 60 when measured along Kings Ranch Road, which is on a tangent alignment for this distance. Kings Ranch Road is posted with a 35-mph speed limit.

Peralta Road is classified as a minor collector, but in the vicinity of Peralta Canyon, it carries two lanes in each direction separated by two-way or one-way left-turn lanes. The four-lane section continues southwest to the U.S. 60 intersection, although in this segment the street is divided by a vegetated median. Peralta Road is about 1 mile in length between U.S. 60 and the first access point to Peralta Canyon, Emma Parkway. Peralta Road is posted 35 mph. In this segment the street has features in common with an arterial, including the four-lane divided cross-section, the lack of stop-controlled or traffic-signal controlled intersections, and dedicated left-turn lanes at intersecting streets and driveways.

Data Collection on the Sleepy Hollow Connection

Pinal County collected traffic data on Sleepy Hollow Trail on two occasions in spring 2022: once in April and May and a second time in June.

April - May 2022

The first set of counts was conducted between Friday, April 29, and Friday, May 6, 2022, and included traffic volume and speed data collected at the following two locations:

- Just east of the connection to Peralta Canyon (1500 feet west of Lazy Lane). Traffic using the Peralta Canyon connection is highly unlikely to have been included in this traffic count, because virtually all traffic using the connection has a preferred route to or from the west on Sleepy Hollow Trail.
- Just west of the connection to Peralta Canyon (east of Breathless Avenue). Traffic using the connection is likely to have been captured by this traffic count.

Both of these counts captured traffic local to the Sleepy Hollow Trail corridor as well. It is reasonable to estimate the traffic volume on the Peralta Canyon connection as the difference in the volume between these two count sites. The difference is likely to be a slight overestimate of the volume using the connection, because it also reflects homes situated along Sleepy Hollow Trail between the two count sites. Table 1 presents a summary of the traffic volume collected at these two sites, along with the difference between the two sites that is a proxy for volume using the connection.

³ As of August 18, 2022, it is understood that the gates and EMERGENCY EXIT ONLY signs are no longer present.

The April-May 2022 data collection documented that on an average weekday, about 450 vehicles used the connection each day, slightly more of these southbound than northbound. Volume using the connection was somewhat higher in the afternoon peak hour than in the morning, with the average volume peaking at 40 vehicles per hour, split evenly by direction.

		West of the Connection		East of the	Connection	Difference (approximate Connection volume)		
		Eastbound	Westbound	Eastbound	Westbound	Eastbound	Westbound	
	Saturday	302	341	81	57	221	284	
Daily	Sunday	222	292	60	39	162	253	
	Average Weekday	284	283	68	54	216	229	
Average weekday peak hour	Morning (10–11 am)	23	21	6	6	17	15	
	Afternoon (4–5 pm)	27	23	7	3	20	20	

 Table 1: Summary of Traffic Volume on Sleepy Hollow Trail, April 29 – May 6, 2022

The April-May data collection also captured speeds of traffic at both sites. A summary of speed data at each site is presented in Table 2.

Table 2:	Average	Traffic S	peed or	n Sleepy	Hollow	Trail, A	April 29 –	May 6	, 2022
									,

	West of the Connection	East of the Connection
Saturday	27 mph	26 mph
Sunday	24 mph	26 mph
Average weekday	27 mph	26 mph

Average speeds east of the connection (without the influence of connection traffic) averaged a consistent 26 mph, only slightly above the 25-mph speed limit. West of the connection, average speeds were higher, by 1 mph, on Saturday and weekdays.

June 2022

Pinal County also collected traffic data directly on Peralta Canyon Way from Tuesday, June 21, to Tuesday, June 28, 2022. This volume is similar to the "Difference" column in Table 1, although traffic volume in late June tends to be lower than in April and May throughout the street network, which could account for the

lower volume during this data collection period. Table 3 summarizes this traffic volume data. (While speeds were also collected as part of this data collection effort, the short length of the connection means that speed data collected there are not representative of drivers' typical desired speeds. At this site, speeds averaged 24 mph.)

		Southbound	Northbound
	Saturday	141	105
Daily	Sunday	109	45
Duny	Average Weekday	170	131
Average weekday	Morning (10–11 am)	10	12
peak hour	Afternoon (4–5 pm)	9	9

Table 3: Summary of Traffic Volume on Peralta Canyon Way, June 21 – June 28, 2022

The June count showed that an average of 301 vehicles per weekday used Peralta Canyon Way.

Seasonal Variation

Traffic volume varies by time of year. In the Phoenix area, traffic often drops during the summer months, reflecting factors such as the closure of schools, vacations to cooler climates, and the absence of winter visitors. The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) maintains a network of permanent count stations on the state highway system that constantly collects and reports traffic data; one benefit of this network is the ability to quantify seasonal traffic variations.

The nearest ADOT permanent count station to the study area is on U.S. 60 just east of Superstition Mountain Drive, about 3 miles northeast of the Peralta Road intersection. According to data from this station in 2021, the most recent year available, average traffic volume during the entire year on mid-week days (Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays) averaged about 33,200 vehicles per day on U.S. 60. However, during the highest-volume month of the year (March), traffic volume on the same days averaged 39,200 vehicles per day, about 18 percent above the annual average. During the lowest-volume month (August), traffic averaged 26,200 vehicles per day, about 21 percent below the annual average.

The amount of seasonal traffic variation on U.S. 60 may or may not be representative of conditions within Peralta Canyon and the local streets in the study area, because the conditions that cause seasonal variation change considerably by land use and location. However, if the U.S. 60 conditions also apply to the study area, then counts conducted in April and May are likely to be about 4 percent higher than the annual average, and counts conducted in June are likely to be about 15 percent lower than the annual average.

The two Pinal County counts conducted during these months on Peralta Canyon Way showed that the traffic volume in June was about 32 percent lower than in April-May. Some of this reduction is likely because the April-May count is a known overestimate of the volume on Peralta Canyon Way, but it is expected that the greater reason for the discrepancy is related to the time of year when data collection occurred.

If the U.S. 60 seasonal trends are applicable to the study area, then the annual average volume on the connection is expected to be about 4 percent below counts collected in April-May, or about 430 vehicles per weekday. The volume during the highest-volume time of year (March) is expected to be about 18 percent greater than the annual average, or about 500 vehicles per day.

Data Collection on Kings Ranch Road at Sleepy Hollow Trail

In support of this study, Lee Engineering engaged a subcontractor to collect traffic turning-movement count data at the intersection of Sleepy Hollow Trail and Kings Ranch Road for a 24-hour period on Thursday, June 16, 2022. Traffic passing through this intersection and turning to or from Sleepy Hollow Trail is likely to include both traffic from the Sleepy Hollow Trail corridor and traffic using the connection to Peralta Canyon. A summary of the traffic data at this intersection is presented in Table 4.

		Eastbound	Westbound
Daily		898	941
Average weekdav	Morning (10–11 am)	57	73
peak hour	Afternoon (4–5 pm)	79	64

Table 4: Summary of Traffic Volume on Sleepy Hollow Trail East of Kings Ranch Road, June 16, 2022

The June 16 count showed 1,839 vehicles per day using Sleepy Hollow Trail, considerably higher than the other counts. However, this count includes all vehicles using Sleepy Hollow Trail to access the large neighborhood north of Sleepy Hollow Trail; most of those vehicles were not counted at the other data collection sites.

Assuming that 300 to 450 vehicles per day use Peralta Canyon Way per Pinal County's counts, then it is likely that the Kings Ranch Road count includes about 1,400 to 1,500 vehicles per day on Sleepy Hollow Trail that does not use Peralta Canyon Way. In round numbers, this suggests that about 20 percent of traffic on Sleepy Hollow Trail at the Kings Ranch Road intersection uses Peralta Canyon Way and about 80 percent does not.

Crash History

Lee Engineering reviewed the collision history at Kings Ranch Road and Sleepy Hollow Trail using crash data from ADOT. The review encompassed the most recent 5-year period for which complete crash data is available (2016 through 2020). Crashes were included in the evaluation if they occurred within 150 feet of the center of the intersection, a distance typically sufficient to capture intersection-related crashes that occurred on an approach. A summary of crash history is provided in Table 5. The intersection experienced a perfect safety record, with no reported crashes in the 5-year study period.

Year	Total Crashes
2016	0
2017	0
2018	0
2019	0
2020	0

Table 5: Total Crashes by Year at Kings Ranch Road and Sleepy Hollow Trail

For the same 5-year analysis period, crashes were also investigated along the entire 1.6-mile length of Sleepy Hollow Trail. This review identified two crashes:

- On March 16, 2018, at 1:48 a.m., about 300 feet west of the intersection of Sleepy Hollow Trail and Breathless Avenue, an eastbound vehicle driven by a 20-year-old male ran off the road and collided with a fixed object. The responding officer estimated the driver's speed as 35 mph and indicated that he was distracted by his 17-year-old female passenger. No injuries were reported.
- On June 20, 2019, at 5:08 a.m., an eastbound vehicle driven by a 53-year-old male ran off the road to the right and struck a fixed object near the intersection of Sleepy Hollow Trail and Breathless Avenue. The driver was carrying no passengers and was not injured. The responding officer cited the driver for a speed too fast for conditions.

In both of these crashes, no roadway elements appear to have contributed, because Sleepy Hollow Trail near the Breathless Avenue intersection is straight and flat with no vertical or horizontal curvature.

Based on reported crashes between 2016 and 2020, the safety performance of Sleepy Hollow Trail is excellent. Certainly, it is possible that safety performance may have changed, and may continue to change, since the opening of the Peralta Canyon connection, but the effects of the connection are too recent to be reflected in ADOT tabular crash data.

Future Volume Forecast

Peralta Canyon is only partially developed, and upon full build-out, if the connection to Sleepy Hollow Trail remains open, traffic volume is expected to be higher than in mid-2022 due to the influence of homes yet to be occupied. In this section of the report, the traffic volume expected to use the connection at full build-out of Peralta Canyon is forecast.

The Peralta Canyon connection supports the following primary categories of trips:

- 1. Trips with origins or destinations along the Sleepy Hollow Trail corridor that use the Peralta Canyon connection to or from points south. For example, this could include trips that originate along Sleepy Hollow Trail with a destination in Florence.
- 2. Trips with origins or destinations in Peralta Canyon that use the connection to or from points north or east. For instance, this could include trips that originate along Fossil Springs Drive with a destination in Mesa.
- 3. Trips with origins or destinations outside Peralta Canyon or the Sleepy Hollow Trail corridor. For instance, this could include trips with origins in the Peralta Trails community (south of Peralta Canyon) with destinations elsewhere in Gold Canyon.

The number of trips in Category 3 is expected to be very small. For example, trips from Peralta Trails to U.S. 60 are unquestionably shorter using Peralta Road than using the Peralta Canyon connection, which limits the attractiveness of the connection for these trips. Category 3 also includes trips with an origin or destination at Peralta Regional Park. Park trips are certainly much smaller in magnitude than trips to and from U.S. 60. For the purposes of the future volume forecast, trips in Category 3 are not quantified. However, to the extent that these trips are already using the connection and were captured in data collection in spring 2022, then the methodology discussed below considers these trips to continue to use the connection in the future.

It is expected that Category 2 comprises the majority of trips on the connection, but the exact split among categories is not known. However, trips in Category 1 are not expected to significantly change from levels collected in spring 2022, because no new trip origins (residences) are expected to be developed in the neighborhood along or north of the Sleepy Hollow Trail corridor. As such, no forecast increase is calculated for Category 1. As a conservative assumption, the forecast increase Category 2 (discussed below) assumes that all existing trips on the connection are from within Category 2.

On June 7, 2022, Lee Engineering visited Peralta Canyon and assessed the number of parcels that were occupied at that time. Simplistically, if 70 percent of the parcels were occupied, it might be expected that the traffic volume on the connection might increase to reflect the additional 30 percent of parcels.

However, drivers in some parts of Peralta Canyon are more likely to use the connection than drivers in other parts, based on the proximity of individual parcels to the potential routes in and out of the development. This tendency was evaluated by dividing Peralta Canyon into 14 zones, as shown in Figure 2. Zones were established to group parcels that have similar access to the street network, and as a result, similar likelihood of using the Peralta Canyon connection.

Most long-distance trips generated by this part of Gold Canyon are likely to be routed to and from the west on U.S. 60, towards Apache Junction, Mesa, and the Phoenix area. The following two travel routes were evaluated to and from each zone:

- A route that uses Fossil Springs Drive, the connection to Sleepy Hollow Trail, Kings Ranch Road, and U.S. 60. This route is known as the "north route."
- A route that uses Emma Parkway or Peralta Heights Road (whichever is faster), Peralta Road, and U.S. 60. This route is known as the "south route."

For each zone, both the north route and south route were established with the same origin and destination points. The travel time along each route was estimated, using the following assumptions:

- Vehicles travel at the speed limit along all roadway segments.
- Vehicles experience delay at intersections because of the need to slow to turn, to stop and yield to cross traffic, or to comply with a traffic signal. Delay (or "impedance") values were selected to best represent actual average travel conditions, with the understanding that conditions often change by time of day and day of week and even from trip to trip. Impedance values range from 5 seconds per vehicle for right-turn movements at local-street intersections to 60 seconds per vehicle for protected-only left-turn movements from U.S. 60 to both Kings Ranch and Peralta Roads.





Using a GIS model, the two routes' travel times were compared for each zone. Trips to and from zones for which one route is significantly faster are much more likely to use the faster route. Trips to and from zones for which the routes have approximately equal travel time are likely to be split more equally among the two routes. In particular, when the difference in travel time between routes is 90 seconds or more, 95 percent of trips are assumed to use the faster route. When the difference in travel times is less than 10 seconds, trips are assumed to be split equally between the routes. This methodology acknowledges that not all trips use the faster route, for a variety of reasons, including differences in origin and destination and personal preference. Using this methodology, a percentage of each zone's trips using the north and south routes was forecast.

Furthermore, using field observations from June 7, 2022, the percentage of occupied parcels in each zone was determined. Peralta Canyon has generally developed from south to north; Figure 3 illustrates the percentage of occupied parcels in each zone.



Figure 3: Peralta Canyon Zones by Percent Occupancy (Based on June 7, 2022 Observations)

Zones in the south, typically with high percentages of occupied parcels, are more likely to use the south route. Zones in the north, with lower percentages of occupied parcels, are more likely to use the north route.

Table 6 shows the development status of each of the 14 zones, the number of occupied and unoccupied parcels, and the percentage of occupied parcels.

Zone	Nu	Percent		
Number	Total	Occupied	Vacant	Occupied
1	42	41	1	98
2	42	40	2	95
3	54	53	1	98
4	20	20	0	100
5	62	61	1	98
6	29	29	0	100
7	83	81	2	98
8	37	0	37	0
9	136	52	84	38
10	49	13	36	27
11	13	7	6	54
12	156	109	47	70
13	12	4	8	33
14	15	15	0	100
TOTAL	750	525	225	70

Table 6: Peralta Canyon Occupancy Status by Zone (as of June 7, 2022)

As a whole, Table 6 illustrates that 70 percent of parcels in Peralta Canyon are occupied, but the occupancy varies considerably by zone.

Table 7 shows the following:

- For each zone, the estimated travel time to and from the intersection of U.S. 60 and Kings Ranch Road, which is the first intersection common to both north and south routes.
- The estimated percentage of trips to and from each zone that would use the north route, which includes the Peralta Canyon connection. (The remainder of trips would use Peralta Road.)
- The estimated equivalent number of occupied parcels in each zone that would use the north route and the Peralta Canyon connection. This value was computed by multiplying the estimated percentage of trips that would use the connection by the number of occupied households in each zone.

	Ľ	Departing	Peralta Can	yon	Returning to Peralta Canyon			
Zone	Travel time (min.)		Percent	Equiv. Parcels	Trave (m	l time in.)	Percent	Equiv.
Number	Via S. Route	Via N. Route	Using N. Route	Using N. Route	Via S. Route	Via N. Route	Using N. Route	Using N. Route
1	4.7	6.4	5	2	6.6	8.0	15	6
2	4.0	7.4	5	2	5.7	9.0	5	2
3	4.3	7.4	5	3	6.0	8.9	5	3
4	4.5	6.7	5	1	6.3	8.3	5	1
5	4.8	8.0	5	3	6.4	9.2	5	3
6	5.9	8.2	5	1	7.6	9.5	5	1
7	6.1	7.8	5	4	7.8	9.1	15	12
8	5.0	6.9	5	0	6.7	8.3	5	0
9	5.2	6.6	15	8	6.9	8.0	15	8
10	6.2	6.3	50	7	7.9	7.7	60	8
11	6.1	5.8	60	4	7.9	7.2	75	5
12	5.7	7.0	15	16	7.3	8.5	15	16
13	5.5	5.8	40	2	7.2	7.3	50	2
14	5.4	7.8	5	1	7.1	9.2	5	1
	TOTAL			53		TOTAL		

Table 7: Peralta Canyon Connection Use by Occupied Households

Several conclusions can be drawn from Table 7. In existing conditions, with the development about 70 percent occupied, the GIS model predicts that trips from the equivalent of about 53 households would use the Peralta Canyon connection for trips leaving the development, and the trips from the equivalent of about 68 households would use the connection approaching the development. Zone 12 contributes the most trips to the connection in both directions—trips from the equivalent of 16 households in both directions. (Zone 12 is also the largest of the 14 zones measured by number of parcels.) Zones 10 and 11 are expected to contribute the highest percentage of their trips to the north route, varying between 50 and 75 percent.

The *Trip Generation* Manual estimates the number of trips generated by residential households as 9.43 trips per household per day.⁴ If the occupied homes in Peralta Canyon generate trips at this rate, then the connection would be expected to carry about 500 trips per day in the outbound (northbound) direction and about 645 trips per day in the inbound (southbound) direction. In fact, the connection carries a total of about 445 vehicles per weekday, about 39 percent of the *Trip Generation* estimate. It is possible that the demographics of Peralta Canyon involve fewer trips than the published rates. It is also possible that fewer

⁴ *Trip Generation*, 11th edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, September 2021, Land Use Code 210, Vol. 3, p. 219.

residents are choosing to use the north route than indicated by the GIS model. It is also possible that the EMERGENCY EXIT ONLY signs and gates discouraged some drivers from using the connection.

It is notable that Table 7 predicts about 28 percent more trips using the connection in the southbound direction than northbound. This difference is due to changes in the trip duration for inbound and outbound trips on the north and south routes. Specifically, inbound trips using the south route often require more left-turn movements than the north route, which adds to the appeal of the north route. Actual trips using the connection are also biased in favor of southbound trips. Weekday trips in the April-May count showed about 6 percent more southbound trips than northbound. The similarity of the magnitude of the southbound bias suggests that the GIS model is accurately representing local trip patterns.

Table 8 forecasts the equivalent number of parcels expected to use the Peralta Canyon connection to and from each zone at full-build out of the community.

	Departing Pe	ralta Canyon	Returning to Peralta Canyon		
Zone Number	Percent Using N. Route	Equiv. Parcels Using N. Route	Percent Using N. Route	Equiv. Parcels Using N. Route	
1	5	2	15	6	
2	5	2	5	2	
3	5	3	5	3	
4	5	1	5	1	
5	5	3	5	3	
6	5	1	5	1	
7	5	4	15	12	
8	5	2	5	2	
9	15	20	15	20	
10	50	25	60	29	
11	60	8	75	10	
12	15	23	15	23	
13	40	5	50	6	
14	5	1	5	1	
	TOTAL	100	TOTAL	121	

Table 8: Peralta Canyon Connection Use by Total Households at Build-Out

Table 8 indicates that the number of equivalent households using the Peralta Canyon connection is expected to increase from 53 to 100 in the inbound direction, an increase of 87 percent. In the outbound direction, the number of equivalent households using the Peralta Canyon connection is expected to increase from 68 to 121, an increase of 76 precent. When considering both directions, the number of equivalent households using the connection is expected to increase at full build-out by about 81 percent over April-May 2022 levels.

Consequently, the traffic volume on the connection is expected to increase by the same 81 percent, since all the community's households are assumed to generate trips at the same rate.

While the community was approximately 70 percent occupied in June 2022, most of the occupied parcels were in the southern part of the development, where the south route tends to be faster. Consequently, the traffic volume on the connection is only about 55 percent of its full build-out level, considerably less than the 70 percent occupancy rate.

The forecast 81 percent increase in traffic volume was applied to the volume on the connection collected by Pinal County in April and May 2022 and shown earlier in Table 1. As discussed earlier, April-May volumes are expected to be about 4 percent above the annual average if seasonal trends on U.S. 60 apply to the study area. The average weekday volume on the connection during the April-May count was 445 vehicles per day; it is estimated that this volume would increase to about 806 vehicles per day upon Peralta Canyon's full build-out. This same percentage increase was applied to the hourly volume collected in April-May to forecast the hourly volume using the connection at full build-out. These volumes are shown in Table 9.

Hour Start	Existing 2-way hourly volume (April-May 2022)	Forecast build-out 2-way hourly volume	Forecast increase in 2-way hourly volume at build-out
6:00 a.m.	19	34	15
7:00 a.m.	30	55	25
8:00 a.m.	38	69	31
9:00 a.m.	35	63	28
10:00 a.m.	32	58	26
11:00 a.m.	30	54	24
12:00 noon	25	46	20
1:00 p.m.	31	56	25
2:00 p.m.	36	65	29
3:00 p.m.	31	57	25
4:00 p.m.	40	72	32
5:00 p.m.	33	60	27
6:00 p.m.	21	37	17
7:00 p.m.	15	27	12
8:00 p.m.	9	16	7
9:00 p.m.	8	14	6

Table 9: April-May 2022 and Build-Out Forecast Hourly Volume Using the Sleepy Hollow Connection

The future volume forecast considers typical conditions. When special events impact traffic on U.S. 60, it is possible that traffic volume using the connection would differ from the forecast above. For instance, the Arizona Renaissance Festival, which is typically held in Gold Canyon on weekends between February and early April, can significantly impact traffic conditions on U.S. 60. The increase in U.S. 60 travel time caused by festival attendees is likely to shift some trips from the south route to the north route, increasing the volume on the connection. However, the Renaissance Festival impacts relatively few trips on an annual basis, since it is open for about 20 days per year and affects traffic for only a few hours on each day it is open. Traffic volume on the connection is also likely to vary due to other planned special events, construction, and incidents that affect either the north or south routes.

It is not expected that delays on U.S. 60 due to special events would be so severe as to cause a route along U.S. 60 to be slower than a route through Gold Canyon neighborhoods and the Peralta Canyon connection. The number of turns, additional trip length, and slow neighborhood speeds on the north route contribute to its longer trip lengths for through traffic.

Kings Ranch Road and Sleepy Hollow Trail Traffic Signal Warrant Evaluation – Current Conditions

The intersection of Kings Ranch Road and Sleepy Hollow Trail was evaluated to determine if a traffic signal would be appropriate, both under existing conditions and under conditions when Peralta Canyon is fully developed, assuming the connection remains open. This section addresses existing conditions, and a subsequent section addresses potential future conditions.

Traffic signals can be helpful under certain, but not all, traffic conditions. The *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD) contains nine traffic signal warrants outlining specific criteria that may make a traffic signal justifiable at an intersection.⁵ A signal should only be installed if one or more MUTCD warrants are met. However, satisfaction of a warrant does not require the installation of a signal.

Signal warrants are "standard" provisions in the MUTCD, indicating that agencies are obligated to comply with them.

The three volume-related signal warrants were evaluated, and the remainder of this section outlines the results of this evaluation.

⁵ MUTCD, 2009 Edition, Chapter 4C.



Warrant 1: Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume

The eight-hour vehicular volume warrant has two parts: Condition A, applicable where a signal may be needed due to a high volume of intersecting traffic, and Condition B, where traffic is so heavy on the major street that minor street traffic suffers excessive delay or conflict. If the amount of traffic at an intersection exceeds the thresholds in Table 10 for 8 hours on a typical day, the intersection meets Warrant 1.

Table 10: MUTCD Table 4C-1. Warrant 1, Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume Threshold Values

Number of lanes for moving traffic on each approach		Vehicles per hour on major street (total of both approaches)				Vehicles per hour on higher-volume minor-street approach (one direction only)			
Major Street	Minor Street	100% ^a	80% ^b	70% ℃	56% ^d	100% ^a	80% ^b	70% ^c	56% ^d
1	1	500	400	350	280	150	120	105	84
2 or more	1	600	480	420	336	150	120	105	84
2 or more	2 or more	600	480	420	336	200	160	140	112
1	2 or more	500	400	350	280	200	160	140	112

Condition A-Minimum Vehicular Volume

Condition	B —	Interruption	of	Continuous	Traffic
oonanion		menupuon	0	Continuous	manne

				-					
Number of lar traffic on ea	nes for moving ch approach	Vehicle (tot	s per hou al of both	ir on majo approach	r street les)	Vehicle minor-stre	es per hour et approac	on higher-v h (one dire	volume ction only)
Major Street	Minor Street	100%ª	80% ^b	70% °	56% ^d	100% ^a	80% ^b	70% ^c	56% ^d
1	1	750	600	525	420	75	60	53	42
2 or more	1	900	720	630	504	75	60	53	42
2 or more	2 or more	900 720 630 504 100		80	70	56			
1	2 or more	750	600	525	420	100	80	70	56

^a Basic minimum hourly volume

^b Used for combination of Conditions A and B after adequate trial of other remedial measures

^c May be used when the major-street speed exceeds 40 mph or in an isolated community with a population of less than 10.000

^d May be used for combination of Conditions A and B after adequate trial of other remedial measures when the

major-street speed exceeds 40 mph or in an isolated community with a population of less than 10,000

For the purposes of this analysis, Kings Ranch Road is considered the "major street" and Sleepy Hollow Trail is considered the "minor street." All four approaches to the intersection have one lane in each direction, so the first row in the MUTCD tables are relevant.

The MUTCD permits the volume-based Warrants to be evaluated at 70 percent of their normal thresholds on streets where the major-street speed exceeds 40 mph or in isolated communities with a population of less than 10,000. While Gold Canyon is on the fringe of the Phoenix metropolitan area, its population estimate in the year 2020 was nearly 12,000,⁶ too high to justify using the 70-percent columns. As such, the 100% columns were used. The relevant threshold values for Warrant 1 are 500 vehicles per hour on the major street and 150 vehicles per hour on the minor street approach for Condition A, and 750 vph/75 vph for Condition B.

⁶ World Population Review, <u>https://worldpopulationreview.com/us-cities/gold-canyon-az-population</u>.

The highest-volume hours of the day are presented in Table 11, which shows the results of the evaluation of Warrant 1. In this table, Kings Ranch Road is designated "eastbound" and "westbound."

			Approac	h volume	s			Sign	al Warrai	ıt 1 evalu:	ation	
Start					D 4		(Condition A	ł	(Condition I	3
time	NB	SB	EB	WB	Both	Minor	Threshol	ld values	Demite	Thresho	d values	Demite
					major		Major	Minor	Results	Major	Minor	Results
5:00 AM	42	-	46	63	109	42	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
6:00 AM	51	-	90	103	193	51	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
7:00 AM	74	-	132	145	277	74	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
8:00 AM	78	-	153	173	326	78	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
9:00 AM	73	2	185	161	346	73	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
10:00 AM	73	2	212	174	386	73	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
11:00 AM	71	-	204	169	373	71	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
12:00 PM	<mark>6</mark> 9	-	226	168	394	69	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
1:00 PM	57	1	204	156	360	57	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
2:00 PM	52	-	248	178	426	52	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
3:00 PM	64	1	250	152	402	64	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
4:00 PM	64	1	266	148	414	64	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
5:00 PM	40	2	260	126	386	40	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
6:00 PM	35	-	171	80	251	35	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
7:00 PM	21	-	140	6 4	204	21	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
8:00 PM	12	-	114	43	157	12	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
							Hours met 0 H				ours met 0	

Table 11: Results of Signal Warrant 1 Evaluation, Existing Conditions

The observed traffic volume at the intersection is too low to satisfy the MUTCD thresholds for any hours of the day in either Condition A or Condition B, let alone the eight required hours. Both the major and minor streets fall below the MUTCD thresholds. As such, Warrant 1 is not met.

Warrant 2: Four-Hour Vehicular Volume

The four-hour warrant is intended for application at intersections where traffic during any four hours of the day reaches a level that indicates that a signal would be beneficial. Warrant 2 is met when the plotted points representing the traffic volumes during any four hours of the day lie above the relevant curve in Figure 4. In this case, the relevant curve is the lowest curve, reflecting one lane on the major street and one lane on the minor street.



Figure 4: MUTCD Figure 4C-1. Warrant 2, Four-Hour Vehicular Volume, Existing Conditions

Figure 4 also displays the plotted points of the highest-volume hours of the day. As can be seen from the figure, none of the plotted points fall above the relevant curve. Warrant 2 is not met.

Warrant 3: Peak-Hour Vehicular Volume

The peak-hour warrant is intended for use at intersections where traffic volume is high enough that a traffic signal would be beneficial for a single high-volume hour of a typical day. If the plotted point representing the highest-volume hour falls above the appropriate curve in Figure 5, a signal is warranted.

According to the MUTCD, the peak-hour warrant is only permitted to be applied in "unusual cases," such as factories or office complexes that discharge a large number of vehicles during a very short time. It is unlikely that the subject intersection could be considered an "unusual case," but the results of Warrant 3 are presented for informational purposes.

The results of Warrant 3 are presented in Figure 5, again including the highest-volume hours of the day. The results show that no plotted points lie above the relevant curve, so Warrant 3 is not met.



Figure 5: MUTCD Figure 4C-3. Warrant 3, Peak-Hour Vehicular Volume, Existing Conditions

approach with two or more lanes and 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Signal Warrant Summary

None of the three volume-based warrants are met. A review of the other six traffic MUTCD signal warrants indicates that these are unlikely to be met or are not applicable. As a result, the subject intersection does not warrant traffic signal control under current conditions.

Kings Ranch Road and Sleepy Hollow Trail Traffic Signal Warrant Evaluation – Build-Out Conditions

The signal warrant evaluation was repeated to consider conditions likely to exist at the intersection of Kings Ranch Road and Sleepy Hollow Trail if the Peralta Canyon connection remains open at the development's full build-out. Table 9 shows the increase in the number of vehicles expected to use the connection from April-

May 2022 conditions to full build-out conditions. This increase in hourly volume was added to the June 2022 data collected at Kings Ranch Road and Sleepy Hollow Trail to determine if build-out conditions are likely to warrant a traffic signal at this intersection. Half of the increase was assumed to involve outbound trips; the Sleepy Hollow Trail approach was increased by this amount. The other half of the increase was assumed to involve inbound trips; the Kings Ranch Road eastbound approach was increased by this amount.

Table 12 shows the results of Signal Warrant 1 using the increased traffic volumes. This table indicates that even with the increase in traffic volume, the intersection would not meet the warranting criteria for any hours of the day in either Condition A or B.

			Approac	h volume	s		Signal Warrant 1 evalu				luation	
Start					D 4		(Condition A	ł	(Condition E	3
time	NB	SB	EB	WB	Both	Minor	Thresho	ld values	Demite	Thresho	d values	Denute
					major		Major	Minor	Results	Major	Minor	Results
5:00 AM	50	-	54	63	117	50	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
6:00 AM	63	-	102	103	205	63	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
7:00 AM	90	-	148	145	293	90	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
8:00 AM	92	-	167	173	340	92	2 500 150 not me		not met	750	75	not met
9:00 AM	86 2 198 1 1 85 2 224 1				359	86	5 500 150		not met	750	75	not met
10:00 AM	85 2 224 17				398	85	5 500 150		not met	750	75	not met
11:00 AM	81	-	214	169	383	81	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
12:00 PM	81	-	238	168	406	81	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
1:00 PM	72	1	219	156	375	72	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
2:00 PM	65	-	261	178	439	65	500 150		not met	750	75	not met
3:00 PM	80	1	266	152	418	80	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
4:00 PM	77	1	279	148	427	77	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
5:00 PM	48	2	268	126	394	48	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
6:00 PM	41	-	177	80	257	41	500	150	not met	750	75	not met
7:00 PM	M 25 - 144 64 208						500	150	not met	750	75	not met
8:00 PM	15	-	117	43	160	15	15 500 150 not m			750	not met	
							Hours met 0 Hours met			0		

Table 12: Results of Signal Warrant 1 Evaluation, Build-Out Conditions

Figure 6 shows the modified results of Warrant 2, and Figure 7 shows the modified results of Warrant 3. In both cases, the plotted points representing the increased traffic volumes remain well below the relevant curves, indicating that neither of these warrants are expected to be met at full build-out.



Figure 6: MUTCD Figure 4C-1. Warrant 2, Four-Hour Vehicular Volume, Build-Out Conditions



Figure 7: MUTCD Figure 4C-3. Warrant 3, Peak-Hour Vehicular Volume, Build-Out Conditions

*Note: 150 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

The increase in traffic volume on Sleepy Hollow Trail due to additional traffic expected to use the Peralta Canyon connection is not expected to cause a traffic signal to be warranted at Kings Ranch Road and Sleepy Hollow Trail. While traffic volumes will be higher at build-out of Peralta Canyon, the numbers continue to fall far short of meeting any signal warrant.

Discussion

The traffic volume on Sleepy Hollow Trail varies considerably along its 1.6-mile length. The June 2022 count showed that just east of Kings Ranch Road, the street carries about 1,840 vehicles per weekday, of which, as discussed earlier, 300 to 450 trips likely also use the Peralta Canyon connection. East of Breathless Avenue, Sleepy Hollow Trail carries about 650 vehicles per day, about 1/3 the volume at Kings Ranch Road. Further east, east of the Peralta Canyon connection, the volume drops to only about 140 vehicles per day, less than 10 percent of the volume at Kings Ranch Road.

Clearly, the amount of traffic experienced by any resident on Sleepy Hollow Trail depends on the exact location of that resident's home. Homes in the west, nearest Kings Ranch Road, experience higher volumes; Peralta Canyon traffic using the connection adds a relatively small percentage to the total. Homes further east experience lower traffic, but volumes there increase by a higher percentage when Peralta Canyon traffic is considered.

Nevertheless, Sleepy Hollow Trail west of the Peralta Canyon connection carries in the range of 650 to 1,850 vehicles per day, a volume range that might be expected to increase to 1,000 to 2,200 vehicles per day at full build-out of Peralta Canyon. Without the connection, it is expected that the volume on Sleepy Hollow Trail would range from 200 to 1,400 vehicles per day.

It is not known whether Pinal County has guidelines on the desirable number of vehicles on streets of various classifications. However, Maricopa County does have such guidelines, as shown in Table 13.⁷ While Maricopa County is more populous than Pinal County, the roadway network maintained by Maricopa County is outside of cities and towns, which includes a wide array of conditions. Maricopa County's guidelines suggest that local streets in urban areas can support a planning-level traffic volume of 900 vehicles per day. Minor collectors are intended to support traffic volumes up to 9,200 vehicles per day in urban areas. The City of Phoenix has similar guidelines, noting that traffic volume on low-density residential local streets should not exceed 1,000 vehicles per day, and volume on collector streets should not exceed 8,000 vehicles per day.⁸

Maricopa County's planning-level traffic volumes are intended to apply to new streets constructed according to the county's requirements. In Maricopa County, local streets are intended to serve traffic movements "over relatively short distances."⁹ While no specific maximum length is provided, to allow flexibility for unusual circumstances, it is clear that a street with the length and characteristics of Sleepy Hollow Trail in the context of a similar street network would not be classified as a local street if it were constructed today in a new development in Maricopa County. Rather, it would be classified as a minor collector.

Other agencies do provide a maximum uninterrupted length for local streets. The City of Phoenix notes that local streets provide "for short-distance (less than ½ mile) traffic movement."¹⁰ Most trips on Sleepy Hollow Trail use the street for a distance longer than ½ mile.

Furthermore, planning-level traffic volumes such as those shown in Table 13 are not intended to reflect the *capacity* of a street—the maximum number of vehicles it can accommodate. Rather, they are intended to reflect a *desirable* amount of traffic for streets with typical configurations. On typical local streets, the desirable amount traffic is often constrained by conditions at intersections. For instance, if a local street is

⁷ Maricopa County Department of Transportation, *Roadway Design Manual*, Updated August 2021, p. 2-3. <u>https://www.maricopa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/51399/Roadway-Design-Manual-2021?bidId=</u>.

⁸ City of Phoenix Street Planning and Design Guidelines, December 1, 2009, Sec. 7.1.3, p. 7-3.

⁹ Maricopa County Department of Transportation, *Roadway Design Manual*, Updated August 2021, p. 2-5.

¹⁰ City of Phoenix Street Planning and Design Guidelines, December 1, 2009, Sec. 2.1.5, p. 2-3.

stop-controlled where it intersects an arterial, traffic on the local street may experience considerable delay before finding a gap to turn onto the arterial. The desirable number of vehicles on a local street is often limited by the ability of traffic to enter and exit the local street at intersections. This condition applies only minimally to Sleepy Hollow Trail because it has no stop- or signal-controlled intersections other than its western terminus at Kings Ranch Road. At the Kings Ranch Road intersection, gaps are plentiful, as discussed earlier, and traffic can easily turn onto and off of Sleepy Hollow Trail such that a traffic signal is not warranted or expected to be warranted even with the addition of Peralta Canyon traffic at full build-out of the development.

Clearly, Sleepy Hollow Trail has many characteristics common to collector streets, and its volume is among them. Its peak volume of 1,400 vehicles per day, without Peralta Canyon traffic, already exceeds Maricopa County's local-street guidelines. However, if Sleepy Hollow Trail were classified as a minor collector, its volume would be well below Maricopa County's planning level of 9,200 vehicles per day, even with Peralta Canyon traffic added.

	Rural Roadway P	lanning Level	Traffic	
ROAD	NO. OF THRU	MEDIAN	MAXIMUM	PEAK HOUR
CLASSIFICATION	LANES	TYPE	ADT	/ ADT % (K)
	4	Divided	36,900	
Parkway	6	Divided	55,500	10
-	8	Divided	N/A	
	2	Undivided	10,600	
Principal Arterial	2	Divided	11,200	10
	4	Divided	22,900	10
	6	Divided	34,700	
	2	Undivided	9,500	
Minor Arterial	2	Divided	10,100	10
	4	Divided	20,700	1
Maion Callester	2	Undivided	5,600	10
Major Collector	2	Divided	5,900	10
Minor Collector	2	Undivided	5,000	12
Local	2	Undivided	700	15
Local	-	Charriada	100	10
Loour	Urban Roadway I	Planning Leve	el Traffic	10
ROAD	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU	Planning Leve MEDIAN	el Traffic MAXIMUM	PEAK HOUR
ROAD CLASSIFICATION	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE	I Traffic MAXIMUM ADT	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K)
ROAD CLASSIFICATION	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES 4	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE Divided	I Traffic MAXIMUM ADT 50,800	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K)
ROAD CLASSIFICATION Parkway	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES 4 6	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE Divided Divided	MAXIMUM ADT 50,800 76,400	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K) 8
ROAD CLASSIFICATION Parkway	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES 4 6 8	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE Divided Divided Divided	Abs MAXIMUM ADT 50,800 76,400 101,800	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K) 8
ROAD CLASSIFICATION Parkway	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES 4 6 8 2	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE Divided Divided Divided Undivided	Abs MAXIMUM ADT 50,800 76,400 101,800 15,000	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K) 8
ROAD CLASSIFICATION Parkway	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES 4 6 8 2 2 2	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE Divided Divided Divided Undivided Divided	Traffic MAXIMUM ADT 50,800 76,400 101,800 15,000 15,900	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K) 8
ROAD CLASSIFICATION Parkway Principal Arterial	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES 4 6 8 2 2 2 4	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided	Traffic MAXIMUM ADT 50,800 76,400 101,800 15,000 15,900 34,100	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K) 8
ROAD CLASSIFICATION Parkway Principal Arterial	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES 4 6 8 2 2 2 4 6	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided	100 Interfic MAXIMUM ADT 50,800 76,400 101,800 15,000 15,900 34,100 51,500	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K) 8 8
ROAD CLASSIFICATION Parkway Principal Arterial	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES 4 6 8 2 2 2 4 6 2 2 4 6 2	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Undivided	100 Interfic MAXIMUM ADT 50,800 76,400 101,800 15,000 15,900 34,100 51,500 12,800	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K) 8 8
ROAD CLASSIFICATION Parkway Principal Arterial Minor Arterial	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES 4 6 8 2 2 2 4 6 6 2 2 2 2	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided	100 Itraffic MAXIMUM ADT 50,800 76,400 101,800 15,000 15,900 34,100 51,500 12,800 13,600	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K) 8 8 8 8
ROAD CLASSIFICATION Parkway Principal Arterial Minor Arterial	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES 4 6 8 2 2 2 4 6 6 2 2 2 4 4	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided	100 Interfic MAXIMUM ADT 50,800 76,400 101,800 15,900 34,100 51,500 12,800 13,600 29,000	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K) 8 8 8 8
ROAD CLASSIFICATION Parkway Principal Arterial Minor Arterial	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES 4 6 8 2 2 2 4 6 2 2 4 6 2 2 4 4 2 2	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided	100 Interfic MAXIMUM ADT 50,800 76,400 101,800 15,900 34,100 51,500 12,800 13,600 29,000 10,200	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K) 8 8 8
ROAD CLASSIFICATION Parkway Principal Arterial Minor Arterial Major Collector	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES 4 6 8 2 2 2 4 6 2 2 4 6 2 2 4 4 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided	1000 Interfic MAXIMUM ADT 50,800 76,400 101,800 15,900 34,100 51,500 12,800 13,600 29,000 10,200 10,800	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K) 8 8 8 10
ROAD CLASSIFICATION Parkway Principal Arterial Minor Arterial Major Collector Minor Collector	Urban Roadway I NO. OF THRU LANES 4 6 8 2 2 4 6 2 2 4 6 2 2 4 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Planning Leve MEDIAN TYPE Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Divided Undivided	100 Irraffic MAXIMUM ADT 50,800 76,400 101,800 15,900 34,100 51,500 12,800 13,600 29,000 10,200 10,800 9,200	PEAK HOUR / ADT % (K) 8 8 8 10 12

Table 13:	Maricopa	County	Planning-Level	Traffic Volume
-----------	----------	--------	----------------	-----------------------

ADT - Average Daily Traffic (24 Hour weekday two way volume.)

Some agencies in the Phoenix metropolitan area have guidelines that indicate the number of vehicles per day on a local street that make it eligible for traffic calming treatments. While traffic calming is not the main purpose of this document, the threshold values are notable because they provide a measure of the number of vehicles that might degrade a street's livability to an undesirable point, in the views of at least some residents. Livability is subjective, however, and some residents may be satisfied with traffic volume lower or higher than others. With that said, for example, Tempe permits traffic calming on local streets when traffic volume exceeds 400 vehicles per day.¹¹ Mesa pays the full cost of speed humps on local streets when traffic volume exceeds 500 vehicles per day.¹² Scottsdale permits traffic calming devices, such as speed humps, to be used on local streets that have at least 500 vehicles per day.¹³

These three east-valley cities have collectively determined that volumes of more than 400 to 500 vehicles per day on a local street may be enough to degrade livability in the judgment of at least some residents. Much of Sleepy Hollow Trail already exceeds these thresholds, without the addition of Peralta Canyon traffic.

Considering that Sleepy Hollow Trail is 1.6 miles long with no controlled intersections along its length, the observed average speeds in the range of 26 to 27 mph are reasonable. Speeding traffic is generally undesirable by nearby residents, and the speed results indicate that the fastest 15 percent of traffic often exceeds 34 or 35 mph, much faster than desirable. However, the speeds on Sleepy Hollow Trail are not higher than expected for its characteristics.

Pedestrians and Bicyclists

Peralta Canyon Way provides connectivity not only for motor vehicles, but also for modes such as pedestrians and bicyclists, collectively known as "active transportation" modes. The connection serves both recreational and utilitarian active trips.

Active travelers could be accommodated on a public street, but they could also be accommodated on a shared-use path, which would prohibit motor vehicles. Both options would provide identical circulation and mobility for active travelers. Some pedestrians and bicyclists prefer using a facility that is closed to motor vehicles because of a perception of increased comfort. However, virtually all local streets are safely, comfortably, and efficiently shared by both motorists and active travelers. It is not reasonable or expected to prohibit motor vehicle traffic on a local street solely to increase comfort for active travelers.

As currently constructed, sidewalks are not present on Peralta Canyon Way. Many local streets, including Sleepy Hollow Trail, do not have sidewalks. On these streets, Arizona law permits pedestrians to walk along the roadway and requires them to use the left side of the street, facing approaching traffic, "when practicable."¹⁴

As discussed earlier, the traffic volume on the connection is expected to reach a high of 72 vehicles per hour during the highest-volume hour of the day at build-out of the Peralta Canyon development. This volume translates to an average rate of one vehicle every 50 seconds. Pedestrians walking the full length of Peralta Canyon Way, about 480 feet, would require about 2 minutes to traverse the entire segment at a typical

¹¹ *Tempe Neighborhood Traffic Calming Guide,* June 2022, p. 4. https://www.tempe.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/96926/637920115255770000.

¹² City of Mesa Speed Hump Policy, Jan. 11, 2018, p. 1.

https://www.mesaaz.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/8152/636518825023600000. ¹³ Neighborhood Traffic Management Policy, City of Scottsdale, April 2021, p. 6. https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/ScottsdaleAZ/Transportation/Engineering/NTMP+policy.pdf

¹⁴ Arizona Revised Statues §28-796 (B).

walking pace of 4 feet per second (2.4 mph). As such, pedestrians are likely to see, on average, only one or two vehicles while walking the full length of Peralta Canyon Way during the highest volume hour. The width of Peralta Canyon Way is sufficient for the low volume of motor vehicles and pedestrians to share side-by-side, particularly considering the expected very low frequency of on-street parking.

Most local streets also accommodate bicyclists without any dedicated infrastructure, such as bicycle lanes. Bike lanes are seldom used on local streets, for several reasons:

- Striping bike lanes requires that on-street parking be prohibited or separate space be provided outside the bike lane, because under Arizona law it is illegal to park in a bike lane.¹⁵ Providing dedicated space for bicycle lanes, parking, and vehicle lanes would make local streets much wider than they are usually designed, and the excess width tends to encourage higher speeds, which increases crash risk for active travelers.
- Longitudinal pavement markings (such as bike lane lines) sometimes communicate to motorists that a street is of a higher functional classification than a local street, and they may encourage speeds higher than desirable.
- Bicycle lanes provide the most value on higher-speed streets, because they offer dedicated space for cyclists to travel outside the motor vehicle traffic flow. On local streets posted at 25 mph, bicyclists and motor vehicles travel at much closer speeds and can safely share the available pavement.

Traffic Calming on Sleepy Hollow Trail

Sleepy Hollow Trail, as a local street, carries more traffic than many residents may find desirable, particularly at its western end. It appears that Sleepy Hollow Trail is already eligible for Pinal County's Speed Hump Program.¹⁶

However, the addition of Peralta Canyon connection traffic onto Sleepy Hollow Trail does not mandate the installation of speed humps. Some residents may support speed humps; others may not. The additional traffic may influence some residents' views on whether speed humps are appropriate, but Pinal County should not install speed humps in the absence of resident support.

Rather, residents and the county should collectively consider whether traffic calming on Sleepy Hollow Trail is desired. While speed humps are a common traffic calming treatment, other traffic calming treatments may also be considered. Speed humps are considered "vertical-deflection" devices, because they slow traffic by causing vehicles to travel up and over the device. "Horizontal-deflection" devices, by contrast, slow traffic by causing vehicles to traverse laterally around a device. They are sometimes preferred over vertical-deflection devices because they offer aesthetic advantages such as the ability to incorporate landscaping or public art. Horizontal-deflection devices can be grouped into two categories:

- Intersection devices are designed for use only at intersections. Traffic circles, shown conceptually in
- Figure **8**, are common intersection calming devices, but other devices include bulb-outs, as shown in Figure 9.¹⁷ A variety of traffic diverters are also among intersection devices in the traffic calming

https://www.pinalcountyaz.gov/publicworks/trafficengineering/documents/speedhumps.pdf 17



¹⁵ Arizona Revised Statues §28-815 (D).

¹⁶ Pinal County Department of Public Works, Speed Hump Program,

toolbox. Diverters aim to improve livability by reducing traffic volume rather than speed. Diverters are not considered appropriate on Sleepy Hollow Trail because Sleepy Hollow Trail is the preferred uninterrupted street that serves the adjacent communities.

• **Segment devices** are designed for use between intersections. Segment devices include chicanes, as shown in Figure 10, and chokers, as shown in Figure 11, among other devices.



Figure 8: Conceptual Traffic Circle (Intersection Device)

Figure **8** through Figure 12 were adapted from the City of Tempe <u>Neighborhood Traffic Calming Guide</u>, prepared by Lee Engineering in 2022.





Figure 9: Conceptual Bulb-Out (Intersection Device)

Figure 10: Conceptual Chicane (Segment Device)





Figure 11: Conceptual Choker (Segment Device)

One potential concern is that Sleepy Hollow Trail does not have vertical curbs, which help prevent motorists from driving off the pavement to avoid traffic calming devices. It may be possible to identify acceptable locations for traffic calming devices to minimize this concern, particularly considering the length of the street and the presence of trees and other objects on the roadside. If traffic calming devices are determined to be desirable, it may also be desirable to consider short segments of vertical curb near traffic calming devices to discourage motorists from driving off the pavement to circumvent them. Vertical curbs are highly beneficial for both vertical- and horizontal-deflection devices.

Another potential concern is the lack of streetlighting along Sleepy Hollow Trail. The lack of lighting may influence the types of traffic calming devices suggested or permitted by the county.

The county's normal speed hump process requires residents to circulate petitions and achieve 70 percent support from the affected area and 100 percent support from residents within 50 feet of each proposed device. This resident-driven process is part of a traffic calming partnership between residents and the county that keeps the county in a neutral position, respecting both residents who support the devices and those who do not.

Because the Peralta Canyon connection has changed, and will continue to change, the traffic volume on Sleepy Hollow Trail, it is recommended that Pinal County provide greater traffic calming assistance than its policy suggests, if the neighborhood so requests. For example, the county might publicize and hold a meeting to discuss the potential for traffic calming or communicate with Sleepy Hollow Trail corridor residents by mail, requesting their opinion on whether traffic calming devices should be installed. The county might take on the task of contacting Sleepy Hollow Trail corridor residents to solicit their signatures on a traffic calming petition, perhaps to supplement resident-circulated petitions.

However, the county should not install traffic calming devices unless sufficient support for the devices is documented, either by a petition or other similar method.

If sufficient neighborhood consensus is documented, residents of the Sleepy Hollow Trail corridor should not be expected to fund the entire cost of traffic calming due to the change in traffic conditions caused by the Peralta Canyon development. The county may wish to coordinate with Peralta Canyon to determine if the developer would be willing to participate in funding for traffic calming, or the county may wish to consider other funding sources.

Traffic Calming on Peralta Canyon Way

Lee Engineering understands that a suggestion has been made to install one or more speed humps on Peralta Canyon Way as an alternative to traffic calming on Sleepy Hollow Trail. The intent of this suggestion is to discourage traffic from using the Peralta Canyon connection yet avoid the disadvantages of traffic calming on Sleepy Hollow Trail.

Existing travel speeds on the connection are already quite low, averaging 24 mph, due to its short (less than 500-foot) length between Fossil Springs Drive and Sleepy Hollow Trail. Most drivers traverse speed humps at 15 to 20 mph, then tend to speed up slightly between the devices. Because of the existing low speeds, it is not expected that one or more speed humps on the Peralta Canyon connection would provide much speed-reduction benefit. Speed humps are more often used on streets with higher baseline speeds to obtain the greatest level of speed reduction.

A very small percentage of motorists strongly prefer not to drive over speed humps, and if one or more speed humps were installed on Peralta Canyon Way, these motorists may choose to avoid the route. However, the vast majority of motorists are willing to traverse speed humps, and considering the potential travel time savings that the Peralta Canyon connection offers, speed humps are unlikely to deter these motorists from using the connection. Thus, it is expected that speed humps would not have an appreciable impact on the traffic volume using Peralta Canyon Way.

However, if one or more speed humps is viewed as a compromise solution, then the devices could certainly be considered on Peralta Canyon Way. Pinal County's speed hump program typically requires speed humps to be located at least 200 feet from a STOP sign, which suggests that one speed hump, positioned midway along the street, would fit. It may also be possible to consider positioning speed humps slightly closer to the STOP signs than this 200-foot threshold, perhaps about 150 feet, to provide sufficient space for two such devices at reasonable spacing.

The county may also prefer to consider speed cushions, an example of which is shown in Figure 12, rather than speed humps. Speed cushions have gaps between the raised elements to minimize their impact on emergency response vehicles and travel times.



Figure 12: Example Speed Cushion (Segment Device)

Gates

Gates are sometimes used in neighborhoods with private streets where the community intends to permit only residents and other authorized vehicles to use the private street network. Outside of private-street communities, very few gates are known to exist in the Phoenix metropolitan area. The few gates that do exist can be categorized into two functions:

- Allowing access only by emergency vehicles
- Allowing access by emergency vehicles and some other traffic

Costs to construct, operate, and maintain gates vary by location. However, gate operators should budget for the following costs:

- Initial construction, including (for electrically operated gates) provision of a power supply, electric meter, and ancillary equipment.
- Routine maintenance of the gate, including its operating mechanism and elements such as associated traffic signs.
- Power consumption (and communications, if so equipped).
- Repairs to gate components that have outlasted their service life.
- Repairs due to vandalism. Many gates are known to experience high rates of vandalism. One tactic sometimes used by vandals is to lock the gate in its closed position, which could be a severe life-safety issue if it prevents access by emergency responders. As such, vandalism repairs often need to be scheduled with high priority.
- Gate replacement at the end of its life cycle.

In general, costs are higher for electrically operated gates that use a keypad for access compared to gates that are manually opened and closed with a standard lock.

Following are a few examples of known uses of gates outside of private-street communities.

Hearn Road east of 71st Street

Hearn Road was once a continuous public street between 71st Street and Scottsdale Road, but when new development was proposed along Scottsdale Road, residents were concerned about the prospect of increased traffic on Hearn Road. The City of Phoenix agreed to abandon Hearn Road between 71st Street and Scottsdale Road as a public street and allow installation of a gate east of 71st Street for resident access, as shown in Figure 13. A keypad allows residents to enter a code to obtain access. The gate is believed to be maintained by the commercial property owner along Scottsdale Road, so it does not require public funds for maintenance or eventual replacement.



Figure 13: Gate on Hearn Road east of 71st Street

Virginia Avenue and Edgemont Avenue west of 1st Avenue

Gates were installed across public local streets, including Virginia Avenue (Figure 14) and Edgemont Avenue, immediately west of 1st Avenue, along the Phoenix Central Corridor. The gates are intended to shield the adjacent neighborhood from traffic generated by high-rise office development along Central Avenue. These gates permit only emergency access and cannot be opened by residents. They require no power and experience low operating cost because of their rare use and pedestrian accessibility.



Figure 14: Gate on Virginia Avenue west of 1st Avenue

Catalina Drive west of 7th Street

A gate was installed on Catalina Drive, a public local street, about 160 feet west of 7th Street to shield the neighborhood from so-called "cut-through" traffic, as shown in Figure 15. East of 7th Street, the Catalina Drive alignment serves as a main access point to the Phoenix Country Club; the gate prevents through traffic to and from the country club from using Catalina Drive to access Central Avenue. The gate also shields single-family residential parcels from apartment and business traffic along 7th Street. This gate is also for emergency use access only and cannot be opened by residents.



Figure 15: Gate on Catalina Drive west of 7th Street

Gate Summary

The known uses of gates outside private-street communities, such as the examples above, fall into two categories:

- Gates on public streets for use by emergency vehicles only
- Gates on private streets (abandoned public streets) for which broader access is permitted

No gates are known to exist on public streets, maintained by a public agency, that allow only a subset of the public to have access, for instance, using a code entered into a keypad. The only known gates to offer this functionality are on private streets, with the gates operated and maintained by a private entity. While this report focuses on traffic engineering concepts, it does not appear that an access-controlled public gate would be legal. Such a configuration would rely on taxpayer dollars to maintain the street and gate but exclude a portion of the taxpaying public from their use. County staff may wish to solicit legal advice to confirm the lawfulness of this arrangement. Among other challenges, it is expected that if Pinal County operated the gate, county staff would be required to divulge the gate code to anyone who requested it under a Freedom of Information Act request.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered for the county's consideration:

- 1. It is recommended that the connection between Sleepy Hollow Trail and Fossil Springs Drive be permanently opened to traffic. The connection's main disadvantage is that it increases the amount of traffic on Sleepy Hollow Trail, but it has many advantages that outweigh this disadvantage:
 - It promotes connectivity in Gold Canyon, allowing residents multiple paths to reach their ultimate destinations. Connectivity helps to reduce travel times and vehicle emissions, and it helps balance traffic congestion across the street network, rather than concentrating traffic impacts at fewer points.
 - It provides unfettered access in the event of an incident. While even a gated connection can provide access through the gate for emergency vehicles, a gated connection does not allow access for non-emergency vehicles during an incident elsewhere. For instance, if an incident such as a crash, fire, major utility repair, or road construction closes or restricts Peralta Road, the connection can provide a valuable alternative access. Without the Peralta Canyon connection, access to and from the Peralta Canyon development is limited to exclusively Peralta Road. This single point of access is highly undesirable for a development of the size of Peralta Canyon in addition to other developments (existing and future) along Peralta Road.
 - The connection provides similar value to residents of the Sleepy Hollow Trail corridor during incidents. If Sleepy Hollow Trail or Kings Ranch Road are temporarily impassable, the connection can help maintain mobility for that community.
 - The amount of Peralta Canyon traffic estimated to use the connection is expected to increase from about 450 vehicles per weekday (as of April-May 2022) to about 800 vehicles per day at full build-out. This amount of traffic, when added to existing traffic volumes, is within the capacity of Sleepy Hollow Trail without unduly impacting its safety or traffic operational performance.
- 2. It is recommended that Pinal County continue its considerations of other potential access points to and from Peralta Canyon and/or Peralta Trails. Additional access points, such as an extension of Chevelon Trail to the west, would help reduce the amount of traffic using any one access point and help maintain more consistent traffic volumes throughout the neighborhood, rather than concentrating it heavily at only a few access points. Additional access points would also improve the mobility of Gold Canyon during incidents that affect one access point. Access alternatives were evaluated in a 2019 study¹⁸ that recommended a follow-up study in five years, following full buildout of Peralta Canyon.
- 3. Lee Engineering understands that the gates and EMERGENCY EXIT ONLY signs that were observed in the field on June 7 have been removed. Lee Engineering supports this removal. This action properly communicates to roadway users that it the connection is permanently open. The gates and signs may have mistakenly communicated that the roadway was not intended for general traffic, and they

¹⁸ Peralta Trails Access Study, Prepared for Pinal County, Arizona, by Y2K Engineering, LLC, August 2019.

may have made travelers wonder whether the gates would be closed during their next visit. Unfettered access is important to maintain the full value of the connection.

(Furthermore, the EMERGENCY EXIT ONLY signs did not comply with the MUTCD because they show the symbol of a DO NOT ENTER sign but use different text.)

- 4. No dedicated accommodations for pedestrians or bicyclists are needed on Peralta Canyon Way, typical of local streets north of the connection. If pedestrians use the street frequently, sidewalks could be considered on one or both sides of Peralta Canyon Way.
- 5. Residents along and near Sleepy Hollow Trail and Pinal County staff should collectively consider whether traffic calming on Sleepy Hollow Trail is desired. If so, Pinal County should provide greater traffic calming assistance to this community than its policy suggests, if the neighborhood so requests, because of the traffic impact of Peralta Canyon Way. However, the county should not install traffic calming devices unless sufficient support for the devices is documented, either by a petition or other similar method, and funding is available. Residents of the Sleepy Hollow Trail corridor should not be expected to fund the entire cost of traffic calming.
- 6. Speed humps would not be expected to have an appreciable impact on the amount of traffic using Peralta Canyon Way. However, if one or more speed humps is viewed as a compromise solution, then one or two speed humps or speed cushions could be considered on Peralta Canyon Way.

Closure

In summary, this report has documented the following conclusions and recommendations:

- As of April-May 2022, the Peralta Canyon connection carries an average of about 450 vehicles per day on weekdays. If seasonal trends on U.S. 60 apply to the neighborhood, then this volume is expected to be about 4 percent higher than the annual average.
- Volume on the connection is forecast to increase to about 800 vehicles per day on full build-out of Peralta Canyon.
- The safety performance of the Sleepy Hollow Trail corridor was excellent for the 5-year period between 2016 and 2020, the most recent period for which crash data is available. Only two crashes occurred along the corridor, both single-vehicle run-off road crashes not likely to be correctible by engineering measures. It is possible that crashes will increase as traffic volume increases.
- A traffic signal is not warranted at the intersection of Sleepy Hollow Trail and Kings Ranch Road, and a signal is not expected to be warranted at full build-out of Peralta Canyon.
- The traffic volume on Sleepy Hollow Trail exceeds Maricopa County's planning-level guidelines for an urban local street and exceeds the thresholds for installing city-funded traffic calming devices in Mesa, Tempe, and Scottsdale. This condition was true even without the traffic added from Peralta Canyon.
- Gates on public streets are extremely rare. Where used, public-street gates permit access only by emergency vehicles. Gates that allow broader access are on private streets and are privately operated and maintained.
- Lee Engineering recommends that the Peralta Canyon connection remain open to traffic and that additional access points be considered for Peralta Canyon.

- While the connection provides mobility for active travelers such as pedestrians and bicyclists, no dedicated accommodations for pedestrians or bicyclists are required due to the low-speed local nature of Peralta Canyon Way and low to moderate traffic levels expected on the connector. Pinal County may wish to consider sidewalks on one or both sides of Peralta Canyon Way if pedestrian traffic becomes frequent.
- Lee Engineering recommends that the county work with local residents to determine if traffic calming on Sleepy Hollow Trail is desirable, and if so, identify an appropriate traffic calming treatment and a funding source.
- One or more speed humps or speed cushions on the Peralta Canyon connection are unlikely to appreciably affect traffic volume and already-low traffic speeds, but such devices may be considered upon request to improve community livability.

If you have any questions regarding this study, feel free to contact me at 602-443-8479 or by email at rdittberner@lee-eng.com.

Respectfully Submitted,

Randy Dittberner, P.E., PTOE Lee Engineering, LLC

Attachments



ATTACHMENTS

Pinal County Traffic Section Class,Speed,Totals

CustomList-249 -- English (ENU)

<u>Datasets:</u>	
Site:	[Sleepy Hallow Trail] On Sleepy Hallow Trail 1500 Ft. West of Lazy Ln.
Attribute:	Pinal County
Direction:	6 - West bound A>B, East bound B>A. Lane: 0
Survey Duration:	14:26 Wednesday, April 27, 2022 => 14:51 Thursday, May 12, 2022,
Zone:	
File:	Sleepy Hallow Trail 0 2022-05-12 1451.EC0 (Plus)
Identifier:	RP35DZJV MC5900-X13 (c)MetroCount 09Nov16
Algorithm:	Factory default axle (v5.07)
Data type:	Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)
<u>Profile:</u>	
Filter time:	15:00 Friday, April 29, 2022 => 15:00 Friday, May 6, 2022 (7)
Included classes:	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
Speed range:	6 - 99 mph.
Direction:	North, East, South, West (bound), P = <u>East,</u> Lane = 0-16
Separation:	Headway > 0 sec, Span 0 - 328.084 ft
Name:	Default Profile
Scheme:	Vehicle classification (Scheme F3)
Units:	Non metric (ft, mi, ft/s, mph, lb, ton)
Column Logond:	
0 [Timo]	24 hour time (0000 - 2350)
1 [Total]	24-nour lime (0000 - 2009) Number in time step
	Class totals
	Vidas iulidis
ວ [10[ໆ]	Number in time step (Primary)

4 [TotS] Number in time step (Secondary)

* Friday	, April 29	, 2022														
Time	Total	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	TotP	TotS
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Е	W
1500	15	1	8	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6
1600	13	2	6	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4
1700	13	1	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6
1800	11	1	5	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4
1900	8	1	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5
2000	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
2100	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
2200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2300	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
07-19	52	5	26	17	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	20
06-22	67	6	35	19	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	28
06-00	68	6	35	20	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	28
00-00	68	6	35	20	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	28

Peak step 15:00 (15) PM Peak step 15:00 (15)

Vehicles = 68

Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 44 (64.71%), Mean Exceeding = 30.75 mph
Maximum = 41.3 mph, Minimum = 9.3 mph, Mean = 26.5 mph
85% Speed = 34.86 mph, 95% Speed = 37.89 mph, Median = 26.73 mph
12 mph Pace = 23 - 35, Number in Pace = 42 (61.76%)
Variance = 54.68, Standard Deviation = 7.39 mph

* Saturday.	April 30), 2022
-------------	----------	---------

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0500	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0600	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
0700	5	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1
0800	10	1	4	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4
0900	7	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
1000	10	0	4	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6
1100	15	0	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6
1200	14	2	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6
1300	16	0	9	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7
1400	11	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3
1500	6	0	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1
1600	12	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5
1700	8	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3
1800	6	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1
1900	5	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
2000	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2100	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2200	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
2300	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
07-19	120	9	71	31	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	47
06-22	130	12	75	34	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	53
06-00	136	12	81	34	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	56
00-00	138	12	83	34	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	57

Peak step 13:00 (16) AM Peak step 11:00 (15) PM Peak step 13:00 (16)

Vehicles = 138
Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 84 (60.87%), Mean Exceeding = 30.54 mph
Maximum = 48.2 mph, Minimum = 6.7 mph, Mean = 26.2 mph
85% Speed = 32.02 mph, 95% Speed = 36.13 mph, Median = 27.01 mph
12 mph Pace = 20 - 32, Number in Pace = 97 (70.29%)
Variance = 47.69, Standard Deviation = 6.91 mph

* Sunday, May 1, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Е	W
0000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0500	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0700	5	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
0800	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
0900	11	0	5	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
1000	7	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1
1100	11	0	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4
1200	18	0	15	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10
1300	4	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
1400	10	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	2
1500	5	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
1600	4	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
1700	7	0	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3
1800	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
1900	5	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
2000	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1
2100	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
07-19	86	0	58	22	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	34
06-22	97	0	67	24	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	39
06-00	97	0	67	24	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	39
00-00	99	0	69	24	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	39

Peak step 12:00 (18) AM Peak step 9:00 (11) PM Peak step 12:00 (18)

Vehicles = 99

Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 57 (57.58%), Mean Exceeding = 30.04 mph
Maximum = 43.6 mph, Minimum = 9.5 mph, Mean = 25.6 mph
85% Speed = 32.21 mph, 95% Speed = 35.46 mph, Median = 26.28 mph
12 mph Pace = 21 - 33, Number in Pace = 70 (70.71%)
Variance = 43.78, Standard Deviation = 6.62 mph

* Monday, May 2, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0500	4	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
0600	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0700	9	1	5	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4
0800	3	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
0900	10	0	5	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6
1000	14	0	7	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5
1100	11	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7
1200	5	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
1300	8	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
1400	11	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4
1500	8	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3
1600	9	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2
1700	12	0	5	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
1800	5	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
1900	7	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
2000	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2200	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
07-19	105	5	55	31	0	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	45
06-22	115	7	58	35	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	51
06-00	116	7	59	35	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	51
00-00	121	7	61	38	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	54

Peak step 10:00 (14) AM Peak step 10:00 (14) PM Peak step 17:00 (12)

Vehicles = 121

Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 77 (63.64%), Mean Exceeding = 31.70 mph
Maximum = 46.0 mph, Minimum = 8.5 mph, Mean = 27.4 mph
85% Speed = 34.80 mph, 95% Speed = 40.42 mph, Median = 27.51 mph
12 mph Pace = 22 - 34, Number in Pace = 77 (63.64%)
Variance = 53.85, Standard Deviation = 7.34 mph

* Tuesday, May 3, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0100	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0500	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
0600	4	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
0700	6	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2
0800	7	0	4	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
0900	9	1	3	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	4
1000	9	1	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7
1100	8	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3
1200	6	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4
1300	9	0	5	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4
1400	9	0	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3
1500	3	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
1600	10	2	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3
1700	8	2	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5
1800	9	1	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3
1900	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
2000	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
2100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
07-19	93	8	48	22	0	13	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	51	42
06-22	106	10	55	26	0	13	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	59	47
06-00	106	10	55	26	0	13	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	59	47
00-00	112	10	57	30	0	13	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	61	51

Peak step 16:00 (10) **AM Peak step** 9:00 (9) **PM Peak step** 16:00 (10)

Vehicles = 112

Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 57 (50.89%), Mean Exceeding = 29.66 mph
Maximum = 44.8 mph, Minimum = 10.1 mph, Mean = 25.2 mph
85% Speed = 31.03 mph, 95% Speed = 35.46 mph, Median = 25.05 mph
12 mph Pace = 21 - 33, Number in Pace = 82 (73.21%)
Variance = 35.05, Standard Deviation = 5.92 mph

* Wednesday, May 4, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Е	W
0000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0500	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0600	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
0700	7	1	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
0800	5	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
0900	6	0	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2
1000	6	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
1100	8	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
1200	10	1	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3
1300	13	1	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6
1400	6	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
1500	11	0	7	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4
1600	8	2	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3
1700	11	0	6	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1
1800	6	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
1900	11	1	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4
2000	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
2100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
07-19	97	5	52	30	1	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	38
06-22	114	7	62	30	1	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	46
06-00	114	7	62	30	1	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	46
00-00	115	7	62	31	1	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	47

Peak step 13:00 (13) AM Peak step 11:00 (8) PM Peak step 13:00 (13)

Vehicles = 115

Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 67 (58.26%), Mean Exceeding = 30.01 mph
Maximum = 40.3 mph, Minimum = 9.9 mph, Mean = 26.2 mph
85% Speed = 31.70 mph, 95% Speed = 35.97 mph, Median = 26.06 mph
12 mph Pace = 19 - 31, Number in Pace = 87 (75.65%)
Variance = 33.81, Standard Deviation = 5.81 mph

* Thursday, May 5, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0500	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
0600	6	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2
0700	8	0	3	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3
0800	6	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2
0900	4	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
1000	17	1	7	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	10
1100	8	0	2	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2
1200	13	1	1	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
1300	12	0	10	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5
1400	13	0	8	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7
1500	14	0	5	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8
1600	11	0	5	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4
1700	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
1800	9	0	0	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4
1900	4	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
2000	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
2100	5	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
2200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
07-19	118	2	49	42	0	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	54
06-22	136	2	62	47	0	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	61
06-00	136	2	62	47	0	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	61
00-00	139	2	65	47	0	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	63

Peak step 10:00 (17) AM Peak step 10:00 (17) PM Peak step 15:00 (14)

Vehicles = 139
Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 81 (58.27%), Mean Exceeding = 30.83 mph
Maximum = 47.5 mph, Minimum = 11.1 mph, Mean = 26.6 mph
85% Speed = 33.44 mph, 95% Speed = 36.69 mph, Median = 26.40 mph
12 mph Pace = 21 - 33, Number in Pace = 93 (66.91%)
Variance = 40.29, Standard Deviation = 6.35 mph

* Friday, May 6, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0500	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0600	4	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
0700	13	0	4	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5
0800	5	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
0900	15	0	2	10	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	6
1000	15	0	6	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5
1100	15	0	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6
1200	10	0	3	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6
1300	4	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
1400	7	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
07-19	84	0	31	38	0	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	46	38
06-22	88	0	33	40	0	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	48	40
06-00	88	0	33	40	0	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	48	40
00-00	90	0	34	41	0	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	49	41

Peak step 9:00 (15) **AM Peak step** 9:00 (15) **PM Peak step** 12:00 (10)

Vehicles = 90

Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 53 (58.89%), Mean Exceeding = 30.09 mph
Maximum = 42.9 mph, Minimum = 6.7 mph, Mean = 26.0 mph
85% Speed = 31.54 mph, 95% Speed = 36.16 mph, Median = 25.78 mph
12 mph Pace = 20 - 32, Number in Pace = 64 (71.11%)
Variance = 39.79, Standard Deviation = 6.31 mph

* Grand	d Total															
Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
	882	44	466	265	1	99	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	502	380

Vehicles = 882

Venicies = 882
Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 520 (58.96%), Mean Exceeding = 30.51 mph
Maximum = 48.2 mph, Minimum = 6.7 mph, Mean = 26.2 mph
85% Speed = 32.77 mph, 95% Speed = 36.46 mph, Median = 26.40 mph
12 mph Pace = 21 - 33, Number in Pace = 594 (67.35%)
Variance = 43.31, Standard Deviation = 6.58 mph

In profile: Vehicles = 882 / 1596 (55.26%)

Pinal County Traffic Section Class,Speed,Totals

CustomList-247 -- English (ENU)

<u>Datasets:</u>	
Site:	[Sleep Hallow Trail] On Sleepy Hallow Trail between Breathless Ave and Fossil Spring Dr.
Attribute:	Pinal County
Direction:	6 - West bound A>B, East bound B>A. Lane: 0
Survey Duration:	14:29 Wednesday, April 27, 2022 => 14:18 Thursday, May 12, 2022,
Zone:	
File:	Sleep Hallow Trail 0 2022-05-12 1419.EC0 (Plus)
Identifier:	TY92J9A3 MC5900-X13 (c)MetroCount 09Nov16
Algorithm:	Factory default axle (v5.07)
Data type:	Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)
Profile:	
Filter time:	12:00 Friday, April 29, 2022 => 12:00 Friday, May 6, 2022 (7)
Included classes:	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
Speed range:	6 - 99 mph.
Direction:	North, East, South, West (bound), P = <u>East</u> , Lane = 0-16
Separation:	Headway > 0 sec, Span 0 - 328.084 ft
Name:	Default Profile
Scheme:	Vehicle classification (Scheme F3)
Units:	Non metric (ft, mi, ft/s, mph, lb, ton)
Column Logond:	
0 [Timo]	24 hour time (0000 - 2350)
	24-IIOUI (IIIIe (0000 - 2559)
	Class totals
	Vidoo IUldio Number in time stan (Duimenu)
	Number in time step (Primary)
4 [10tS]	Number in time step (Secondary)

* Friday	, April 29	, 2022														
Time	Total	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	TotP	TotS
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
1200	44	1	23	16	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	26
1300	57	0	32	18	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	28
1400	39	1	21	12	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	21
1500	57	4	22	21	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	26
1600	55	3	31	17	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	18
1700	48	0	24	18	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	21
1800	39	1	21	12	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	20
1900	27	1	13	10	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	15
2000	27	0	13	11	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	13
2100	9	0	2	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3
2200	17	0	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	6
2300	4	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
07-19	339	10	174	114	10	29	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	160
06-22	402	11	202	139	11	35	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	211	191
06-00	423	11	216	146	11	35	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	225	198
00-00	423	11	216	146	11	35	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	225	198

Peak step 13:00 (57) PM Peak step 13:00 (57)

Vehicles = 423

Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 314 (74.23%), Mean Exceeding = 31.36 mph Maximum = 60.5 mph, Minimum = 9.3 mph, Mean = 28.7 mph 85% Speed = 34.61 mph, 95% Speed = 37.89 mph, Median = 29.08 mph 12 mph Pace = 23 - 35, Number in Pace = 295 (69.74%)

Variance = 37.98, Standard Deviation = 6.16 mph

Jaiun	uay, April Total	Clc		C1 c	Cla	C1 c	Cla	Cla	Cla	Cla	Cla	Cla	C1 c	C1 c	TotD	Tote
<	IULAI	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	IOUS W
0000	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0100	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0200	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
0300	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
0400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0500	12	0	8	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
0600	15	6	5	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6
0700	25	5	10	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11
0800	35	6	12	10	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	16
0900	45	6	18	15	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	20
1000	48	5	24	11	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	29
1100	44	3	30	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	24
1200	49	3	38	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	29
1300	66	1	60	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	34
1400	55	2	43	7	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	29
1500	37	2	26	5	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	18
1600	45	1	39	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	26
1700	29	0	26	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	19
1800	32	0	27	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
1900	37	2	28	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	22
2000	24	0	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13
2100	19	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	11
2200	8	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
2300	12	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5
07-19	510	34	353	86	3	28	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	239	271
06-22	605	42	427	95	3	31	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	282	323
06-00	625	42	446	96	3	31	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	293	332
00-00	643	42	457	101	3	32	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	302	341

Peak step 13:00 (66) AM Peak step 10:00 (48) PM Peak step 13:00 (66)

Vehicles = 643 Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 410 (63.76%), Mean Exceeding = 31.09 mph Maximum = 53.1 mph, Minimum = 8.7 mph, Mean = 27.3 mph 85% Speed = 34.56 mph, 95% Speed = 38.12 mph, Median = 26.96 mph 12 mph Pace = 20 - 32, Number in Pace = 420 (65.32%) Variance = 43.91, Standard Deviation = 6.63 mph

* Sunday, May 1, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0500	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0600	14	5	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
0700	28	9	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
0800	20	0	16	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14
0900	39	2	30	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	22
1000	42	2	35	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23
1100	52	8	40	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	32
1200	61	3	54	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	36
1300	41	0	35	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	22
1400	35	0	32	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	19
1500	46	0	40	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	26
1600	25	1	20	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14
1700	37	0	30	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	21
1800	10	1	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
1900	32	0	28	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	21
2000	12	0	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5
2100	11	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
2200	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
07-19	436	26	356	41	2	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	188	248
06-22	505	31	411	48	2	7	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	218	287
06-00	506	31	411	48	2	8	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	218	288
00-00	514	31	419	48	2	8	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	292

Peak step 12:00 (61) AM Peak step 11:00 (52) PM Peak step 12:00 (61)

Vehicles = 514

Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 233 (45.33%), Mean Exceeding = 30.01 mph
Maximum = 49.1 mph, Minimum = 7.7 mph, Mean = 24.3 mph
85% Speed = 30.65 mph, 95% Speed = 35.93 mph, Median = 24.49 mph
12 mph Pace = 18 - 30, Number in Pace = 335 (65.18%)
Variance = 46.84, Standard Deviation = 6.84 mph

* Monday, May 2, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0300	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0400	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0500	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
0600	21	4	13	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	14
0700	52	7	29	10	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	35
0800	53	2	42	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	32
0900	56	4	42	5	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	35
1000	64	2	54	3	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	32
1100	50	3	35	9	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	33
1200	45	1	42	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	26
1300	40	0	30	7	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
1400	50	5	36	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	25
1500	50	0	36	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	27
1600	63	3	50	7	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	31
1700	62	1	47	11	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	36
1800	35	1	26	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	17
1900	21	3	13	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	11
2000	8	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
2100	14	0	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8
2200	8	0	5	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
2300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
07-19	620	29	469	88	0	23	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	271	349
06-22	684	37	513	98	0	24	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	298	386
06-00	692	37	518	99	0	25	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	302	390
00-00	704	37	530	99	0	25	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	305	399

Peak step 10:00 (64) AM Peak step 10:00 (64) PM Peak step 16:00 (63)

Vehicles = 704

Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 456 (64.77%), Mean Exceeding = 30.69 mph
Maximum = 55.1 mph, Minimum = 9.5 mph, Mean = 27.2 mph
85% Speed = 33.44 mph, 95% Speed = 38.81 mph, Median = 26.96 mph
12 mph Pace = 21 - 33, Number in Pace = 501 (71.16%)
Variance = 44.57, Standard Deviation = 6.68 mph

* Tuesday, May 3, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0100	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0200	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0300	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0400	4	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
0500	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
0600	21	3	9	4	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12
0700	40	4	22	9	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	25
0800	42	1	28	4	0	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	26
0900	38	3	27	5	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	18
1000	47	4	33	5	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	24
1100	44	3	27	9	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	26
1200	27	2	18	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	17
1300	48	3	22	19	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	20
1400	43	1	20	14	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	21
1500	33	1	16	10	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	15
1600	48	0	24	16	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	22
1700	36	5	13	12	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	11
1800	28	0	17	6	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	8
1900	21	0	9	8	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12
2000	10	2	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4
2100	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
2200	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
2300	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
07-19	474	27	267	113	4	44	5	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	241	233
06-22	528	32	291	127	4	50	6	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	266	262
06-00	530	32	293	127	4	50	6	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	268	262
00-00	549	32	309	130	4	50	6	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	273	276

Peak step 13:00 (48) AM Peak step 10:00 (47) PM Peak step 13:00 (48)

Vehicles = 549

Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 333 (60.66%), Mean Exceeding = 30.34 mph
Maximum = 45.4 mph, Minimum = 8.5 mph, Mean = 26.4 mph
85% Speed = 32.66 mph, 95% Speed = 36.46 mph, Median = 26.51 mph
12 mph Pace = 21 - 33, Number in Pace = 385 (70.13%)
Variance = 39.15, Standard Deviation = 6.26 mph

* Wednesday, May 4, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
0500	5	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
0600	22	4	14	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	14
0700	27	5	11	7	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	16
0800	40	4	17	16	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	15
0900	33	3	18	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	19
1000	16	1	5	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	4
1100	5	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1
1200	22	2	9	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	9
1300	36	1	16	15	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
1400	41	2	19	12	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	16
1500	34	0	17	13	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	11
1600	44	0	20	18	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	18
1700	42	2	17	14	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	20
1800	23	0	9	8	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	11
1900	22	1	13	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	9
2000	12	1	7	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5
2100	9	0	6	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2
2200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2300	5	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
07-19	363	22	160	131	13	34	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	205	158
06-22	428	28	200	142	15	40	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	240	188
06-00	433	28	202	143	16	41	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	243	190
00-00	442	29	207	145	16	42	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	246	196

Peak step 16:00 (44) AM Peak step 8:00 (40) PM Peak step 16:00 (44)

Vehicles = 442

Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 295 (66.74%), Mean Exceeding = 31.91 mph
Maximum = 58.8 mph, Minimum = 8.0 mph, Mean = 28.0 mph
85% Speed = 35.63 mph, 95% Speed = 43.01 mph, Median = 27.51 mph
12 mph Pace = 20 - 32, Number in Pace = 297 (67.19%)
Variance = 62.41, Standard Deviation = 7.90 mph

* Thursday, May 5, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0500	8	0	1	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
0600	25	6	5	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	14
0700	32	2	9	12	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
0800	39	1	14	11	3	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	17
0900	42	1	14	14	2	4	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	23	19
1000	48	3	15	20	1	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	24
1100	55	3	22	19	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	26
1200	41	0	13	17	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	21
1300	41	1	19	13	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	17
1400	49	2	22	16	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	23
1500	44	2	19	14	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	22
1600	41	0	17	19	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	15
1700	27	0	12	11	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	12
1800	25	1	11	9	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	12
1900	23	0	12	7	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	8
2000	17	3	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	3
2100	11	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3
2200	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
2300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
07-19	484	16	187	175	23	72	5	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	260	224
06-22	560	25	223	201	23	75	7	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	308	252
06-00	562	25	225	201	23	75	7	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	310	252
00-00	571	25	226	208	23	76	7	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	311	260

Peak step 11:00 (55) AM Peak step 11:00 (55) PM Peak step 14:00 (49)

Vehicles = 571

Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 363 (63.57%), Mean Exceeding = 32.28 mph
Maximum = 61.8 mph, Minimum = 6.4 mph, Mean = 28.1 mph
85% Speed = 35.25 mph, 95% Speed = 43.93 mph, Median = 26.84 mph
12 mph Pace = 21 - 33, Number in Pace = 382 (66.90%)
Variance = 65.55, Standard Deviation = 8.10 mph

*	Friday,	May	6,	2022
---	---------	-----	----	------

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
0500	5	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
0600	14	3	0	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9
0700	35	2	10	15	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	20
0800	34	3	9	17	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	15
0900	49	3	17	16	1	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	21
1000	51	2	13	24	4	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	29
1100	43	2	14	17	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	22
07-19	212	12	63	89	10	35	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	105	107
06-22	226	15	63	98	11	36	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	110	116
06-00	226	15	63	98	11	36	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	110	116
00-00	234	15	66	103	11	36	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	113	121

Peak step 10:00 (51) **AM Peak step** 10:00 (51)

Vehicles = 234
Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 143 (61.11%), Mean Exceeding = 31.89 mph
Maximum = 52.5 mph, Minimum = 7.2 mph, Mean = 27.3 mph
85% Speed = 35.09 mph, 95% Speed = 42.47 mph, Median = 26.51 mph
12 mph Pace = 20 - 32, Number in Pace = 159 (67.95%)
Variance = 65.87, Standard Deviation = 8.12 mph

otal															
otal	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	TotP	TotS
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
1080	222	2430	980	70	304	25	45	2	2	0	0	0	0	1997	2083
	tal tal	tal Dtal Cls 1 080 222	tal otal Cls Cls <u>1 2</u> 080 222 2430	tal Dtal Cls Cls Cls <u>1 2 3</u> 1080 222 2430 980	tal Dtal Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls 1 2 3 4 1080 222 2430 980 70	tal Dtal Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls 1 2 3 4 5 080 222 2430 980 70 304	tal Dtal Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls 1 2 3 4 5 6 080 222 2430 980 70 304 25	tal Dtal Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1080 222 2430 980 70 304 25 45	tal Dtal Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1080 222 2430 980 70 304 25 45 2	tal Dtal Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cl	tal Dtal Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cl	tal Dtal Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cl	tal Dtal Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cl	tal Dtal Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cl	tal Dtal Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cls Cl

Vehicles = 4080

Posted speed limit = 25 mph, Exceeding = 2547 (62.43%), Mean Exceeding = 31.16 mph
Maximum = 61.8 mph, Minimum = 6.4 mph, Mean = 27.1 mph
85% Speed = 33.89 mph, 95% Speed = 39.26 mph, Median = 26.84 mph
12 mph Pace = 20 - 32, Number in Pace = 2722 (66.72%)
Variance = 50.94, Standard Deviation = 7.14 mph

In profile: Vehicles = 4080 / 6081 (67.09%)

Pinal County TrafficSection Class,Speed,Totals

CustomList-272 -- English (ENU)

<u>Datasets:</u>	
Site:	[Peralta Canyon Way] On Peralta Canyon Way. between Sleepy Hallow and Fossil Springs
Attribute:	Pinal County
Direction:	6 - West bound A>B, East bound B>A. Lane: 0
Survey Duration:	16:20 Thursday, June 16, 2022 => 15:03 Tuesday, June 28, 2022,
Zone:	
File:	Peralta Canyon Way 0 2022-06-28 1503.EC0 (Plus)
Identifier:	RP06JSM3 MC5900-X13 (c)MetroCount 09Nov16
Algorithm:	Factory default axle (v5.07)
Data type:	Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)
Drofile	
<u>Profile:</u>	15:00 Turanday, June 24, 2022 -> 15:00 Turanday, June 20, 2022 (7)
Fliter time:	15:00 Tuesday, June 21, 2022 => $15:00$ Tuesday, June 28, 2022 (7)
Included classes:	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
Speed range:	6 - 99 mpn.
Direction:	North, East, South, West (bound), $P = \underline{East}$, Lane = 0-16
Separation:	Headway > 0 sec, Span 0 - 328.084 ft
Name:	Default Profile
Scheme:	Vehicle classification (Scheme F3)
Units:	Non metric (ft, mi, ft/s, mph, lb, ton)
Column Legend:	
0 [Time]	24-hour time (0000 - 2359)
1 [Total]	Number in time step
2 [Cls]	Class totals
3 [TotP]	Number in time step (Primary)
4 [TotS]	Number in time step (Secondary)
	· ····································

* Tuesc	lay, June	21, 202	22													
Time	Total	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	Cls	TotP	TotS
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Е	W
1500	20	0	8	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11
1600	15	0	5	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6
1700	16	1	7	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9
1800	23	4	8	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	14
1900	8	0	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6
2000	4	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
2100	6	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
2200	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
2300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
07-19	74	5	28	33	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	40
06-22	92	5	34	44	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	52
06-00	94	5	35	45	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	53
00-00	94	5	35	45	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	53

Peak step 18:00 (23) PM Peak step 18:00 (23)

Vehicles = 94

Posted speed limit = 35 mph, Exceeding = 1 (1.064%), Mean Exceeding = 36.77 mph Maximum = 36.8 mph, Minimum = 6.7 mph, Mean = 22.3 mph 85% Speed = 28.69 mph, 95% Speed = 32.80 mph, Median = 21.64 mph **12 mph Pace** = 18 - 30, Number in Pace = 69 (73.40%) Variance = 35.82, Standard Deviation = 5.99 mph

* Wednesday,	June 22,	2022
--------------	----------	------

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0100	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1
0500	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
0600	12	5	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3
0700	13	1	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7
0800	16	2	4	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8
0900	15	1	4	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7
1000	17	0	6	7	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8
1100	18	0	6	8	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10
1200	21	0	7	11	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10
1300	18	1	7	6	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10
1400	14	0	5	6	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	8
1500	19	1	8	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	16
1600	16	0	6	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7
1700	17	0	8	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	10
1800	18	0	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11
1900	16	1	7	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8
2000	10	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8
2100	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
2200	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
2300	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
07-19	202	6	74	89	4	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	90	112
06-22	242	12	88	106	4	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	109	133
06-00	247	12	90	109	4	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	109	138
00-00	255	12	91	114	4	32	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	114	141

Peak step 12:00 (21) AM Peak step 11:00 (18) PM Peak step 12:00 (21)

Vehicles = 255 Posted speed limit = 35 mph, Exceeding = 12 (4.706%), Mean Exceeding = 36.90 mph Maximum = 40.4 mph, Minimum = 11.0 mph, Mean = 24.1 mph 85% Speed = 30.04 mph, 95% Speed = 34.81 mph, Median = 23.94 mph **12 mph Pace** = 17 - 29, **Number in Pace** = 183 (71.76%) **Variance** = 31.74, **Standard Deviation** = 5.63 mph

* Thursday, June 23, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Е	W
0000	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
0500	10	0	2	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
0600	8	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1
0700	13	2	2	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5
0800	19	0	6	10	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	9
0900	14	0	9	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
1000	22	1	4	14	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	8
1100	28	0	15	9	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	20
1200	17	1	9	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8
1300	17	1	6	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8
1400	12	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8
1500	24	0	10	11	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13
1600	21	0	9	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12
1700	17	0	8	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9
1800	14	0	8	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10
1900	21	0	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	15
2000	41	0	25	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	35
2100	44	0	22	19	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	32
2200	45	1	27	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	34
2300	8	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5
07-19	218	7	92	95	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	117
06-22	332	10	151	142	2	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	200
06-00	385	11	181	163	2	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	239
00-00	399	11	184	172	2	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153	246

Peak step 22:00 (45) AM Peak step 11:00 (28) PM Peak step 22:00 (45)

Vehicles = 399

Posted speed limit = 35 mph, Exceeding = 12 (3.008%), Mean Exceeding = 39.58 mph
Maximum = 46.7 mph, Minimum = 8.8 mph, Mean = 23.7 mph
85% Speed = 28.86 mph, 95% Speed = 32.32 mph, Median = 23.60 mph
12 mph Pace = 18 - 30, Number in Pace = 313 (78.45%)
Variance = 29.14, Standard Deviation = 5.40 mph

* Friday, June 24, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
0100	4	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
0200	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
0500	7	4	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1
0600	13	2	2	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6
0700	23	3	4	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	9
0800	24	0	6	13	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	14
0900	28	2	13	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	11
1000	32	2	9	13	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18
1100	32	1	11	17	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	17
1200	30	0	14	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	18
1300	25	0	7	15	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13
1400	18	0	3	10	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	16	2
1500	11	0	3	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4
1600	8	0	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0
1700	10	0	1	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	1
1800	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
1900	5	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
2000	11	0	2	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5
2100	5	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
2200	5	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
2300	3	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
07-19	244	8	71	130	9	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	137	107
06-22	278	10	77	150	10	29	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	158	120
06-00	286	10	80	152	12	30	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	162	124
00-00	302	15	81	157	14	33	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	175	127

Peak step 10:00 (32) AM Peak step 10:00 (32) PM Peak step 12:00 (30)

Vehicles = 302

Posted speed limit = 35 mph, Exceeding = 12 (3.974%), Mean Exceeding = 36.93 mph
Maximum = 39.7 mph, Minimum = 6.9 mph, Mean = 24.1 mph
85% Speed = 30.50 mph, 95% Speed = 34.53 mph, Median = 24.05 mph
12 mph Pace = 18 - 30, Number in Pace = 210 (69.54%)
Variance = 35.81, Standard Deviation = 5.98 mph

* Saturday, June 25, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0100	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0200	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0500	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1
0600	4	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
0700	15	4	5	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	2
0800	18	2	9	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	4
0900	9	0	1	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0
1000	29	1	9	12	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	12
1100	22	1	4	10	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	6
1200	24	1	5	14	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13
1300	16	0	6	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8
1400	15	0	6	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8
1500	10	0	4	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
1600	16	1	8	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10
1700	15	0	5	8	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5
1800	10	0	4	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4
1900	12	0	6	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9
2000	7	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
2100	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
2200	4	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
2300	5	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
07-19	199	10	66	82	12	26	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	122	77
06-22	228	14	82	86	13	30	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	132	96
06-00	237	16	84	90	13	31	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	136	101
00-00	246	16	91	91	13	32	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	141	105

Peak step 10:00 (29) AM Peak step 10:00 (29) PM Peak step 12:00 (24)

Vehicles = 246

Posted speed limit = 35 mph, Exceeding = 11 (4.472%), Mean Exceeding = 38.14 mph
Maximum = 44.8 mph, Minimum = 6.3 mph, Mean = 22.6 mph
85% Speed = 29.85 mph, 95% Speed = 33.91 mph, Median = 22.48 mph
12 mph Pace = 15 - 27, Number in Pace = 157 (63.82%)
Variance = 45.86, Standard Deviation = 6.77 mph

* Sunday, June 26, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0100	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0400	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0500	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
0600	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
0700	12	4	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3
0800	16	0	8	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7
0900	8	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3
1000	9	2	0	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0
1100	15	2	3	4	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	2
1200	11	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3
1300	7	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2
1400	12	0	6	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5
1500	13	1	3	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	3
1600	5	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
1700	9	0	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3
1800	8	1	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1
1900	7	0	4	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3
2000	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1
2100	7	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3
2200	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
2300	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
07-19	125	14	36	57	7	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	90	35
06-22	145	15	44	65	8	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	103	42
06-00	149	15	47	66	8	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	104	45
00-00	154	17	47	68	8	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	109	45

Peak step 8:00 (16) AM Peak step 8:00 (16) PM Peak step 15:00 (13)

Vehicles = 154

Posted speed limit = 35 mph, Exceeding = 8 (5.195%), Mean Exceeding = 37.64 mph
Maximum = 42.3 mph, Minimum = 8.4 mph, Mean = 23.6 mph
85% Speed = 32.04 mph, 95% Speed = 35.87 mph, Median = 23.15 mph
12 mph Pace = 17 - 29, Number in Pace = 85 (55.19%)
Variance = 53.98, Standard Deviation = 7.35 mph

* Monday, June 27, 2022

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0500	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
0600	5	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
0700	14	2	2	5	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	4
0800	15	0	0	7	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	1
0900	12	1	4	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4
1000	21	3	6	6	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12
1100	20	2	2	12	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11
1200	18	0	3	13	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
1300	13	0	3	6	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7
1400	24	0	1	18	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	14
1500	18	0	4	12	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13
1600	17	0	6	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9
1700	18	1	2	13	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13
1800	19	2	4	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12
1900	9	0	2	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7
2000	7	0	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5
2100	9	0	0	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7
2200	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
2300	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
07-19	209	11	37	117	5	32	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	109
06-22	239	14	40	134	5	39	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	128
06-00	243	14	42	135	5	40	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	131
00-00	246	14	44	135	6	40	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	131

Peak step 14:00 (24) AM Peak step 10:00 (21) PM Peak step 14:00 (24)

Vehicles = 246
Posted speed limit = 35 mph, Exceeding = 10 (4.065%), Mean Exceeding = 37.67 mph
Maximum = 47.5 mph, Minimum = 8.4 mph, Mean = 24.1 mph
85% Speed = 30.09 mph, 95% Speed = 34.45 mph, Median = 24.27 mph
12 mph Pace = 19 - 31, Number in Pace = 171 (69.51%)
Variance = 38.11, Standard Deviation = 6.17 mph

	*	Tuesday,	June 28	, 2022
--	---	----------	---------	--------

Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	E	W
0000	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0200	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0400	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0500	5	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
0600	9	3	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3
0700	14	3	2	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6
0800	19	0	4	12	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	9
0900	21	2	2	10	0	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	10
1000	26	1	2	16	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	10
1100	33	0	7	19	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	17
1200	35	0	6	24	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21
1300	42	0	7	30	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	29
1400	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
07-19	191	6	30	120	2	28	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	89	102
06-22	200	9	31	123	2	30	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	95	105
06-00	200	9	31	123	2	30	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	95	105
00-00	208	9	35	126	2	31	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	101	107

Peak step 13:00 (42) AM Peak step 11:00 (33) PM Peak step 13:00 (42)

Vehicles = 208

Posted speed limit = 35 mph, Exceeding = 7 (3.365%), Mean Exceeding = 36.65 mph
Maximum = 38.1 mph, Minimum = 11.8 mph, Mean = 24.9 mph
85% Speed = 31.05 mph, 95% Speed = 33.17 mph, Median = 25.28 mph
12 mph Pace = 20 - 32, Number in Pace = 149 (71.63%)
Variance = 30.26, Standard Deviation = 5.50 mph

* Granc	l Total															
Time	Total	Cls	TotP	TotS												
<		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Е	W
	1904	99	608	908	51	218	11	1	3	3	1	0	0	1	949	955

Vehicles = 1904

Posted speed limit = 35 mph, Exceeding = 73 (3.834%), Mean Exceeding = 37.69 mph
Maximum = 47.5 mph, Minimum = 6.3 mph, Mean = 23.8 mph
85% Speed = 29.97 mph, 95% Speed = 33.89 mph, Median = 23.82 mph
12 mph Pace = 18 - 30, Number in Pace = 1311 (68.86%)
Variance = 36.66, Standard Deviation = 6.05 mph

In profile: Vehicles = 1904 / 1990 (95.68%)

Intersection Turning Movement Prepared by:





N-S STREET: Sleepy Hollow Trail E-W STREET: Kings Ranch Rd

DATE: 06/16/22 DAY: THURSDAY

LOCATION: Gold Canyon PROJECT# 22-1362-001

	NC	RTHBO	UND	SC	UTHBO	UND	E	ASTBOU	IND	W	WESTBOUND		
LANES:	NL 0	NT 1	NR 0	SL 0	ST 1	SR 0	EL 0	ET 1	ER 0	WL 1	WT 1	WR 0	TOTAL
12:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4
12:15 AM	0	Õ	õ	Õ	Õ	Õ	0	5	1	Õ	3	Õ	9
12:30 AM	0	Õ	0	0	Õ	Õ	0	2	2	Õ	5	0	9
12:45 AM	0	Õ	0	0	Õ	Õ	0	2	0	Õ	1	0	3
1:00 AM	2	Õ	0	0	Õ	Õ	0	1	Õ	1	0	0	4
1:15 AM	1	Õ	0	0	Õ	Õ	0	2	1	0	0	0	4
1:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	4
1:45 AM	Ō	Ō	1	0	0	Ō	Ō	0	0	Ō	3	Ō	4
2:00 AM	Ō	0	Ō	0	0	Ō	Ō	4	0	0	0	Ō	4
2:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3
2:30 AM	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	5
2:45 AM	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	7
3:00 AM	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	6
3:15 AM	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	8
3:30 AM	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	5
3:45 AM	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	5	0	14
4:00 AM	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	0	17
4:15 AM	6	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	10	0	26
4:30 AM	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	1	12	0	32
4:45 AM	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	1	13	0	37
5:00 AM	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	1	18	0	37
5:15 AM	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	0	17	0	48
5:30 AM	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	10	0	28
5:45 AM	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	3	1	15	1	38
6:00 AM	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	1	0	22	0	48
6:15 AM	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	2	1	25	0	63
6:30 AM	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	4	0	27	0	71
6:45 AM	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	3	0	28	0	62
7:00 AM	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	22	5	1	42	0	88
7:15 AM	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	21	4	0	29	0	77
7:30 AM	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	30	2	0	40	0	89
7:45 AM	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	35	13	2	31	0	9/
8:00 AM	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	20	11	0	45	0	91
8:15 AM	26	0	1	0	0	0	3	2/	6	0	40	0	103
8:30 AM	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	34	12	2	38	0	10/
8:45 AM	10	0	1	0	0	0	2	25	11	2	46	0	103
	1/	U	0	0	U	U ₁	<u>ک</u>	33 22	/	2	30	U	90
9:15 AM	21	U	2	0	U	1 L	1 L	32 27	び 1つ	1 C	38	U ₁	99 110
9:30 AM	ъ С	U	<u>ک</u>	0	U	U	U	3/	12	U ₁	50	1	121
9:45 AM	17	U ₁	1	1	U	U	U	48 20	10	1	38	U	121
	16	1	U 1	0	0	U	U	29 25	17	2	30 57	U	95 121
10:15 AM	10 21	0	1	1	0	0	2	55 ∕7	10	3 1	כ /כ רכ	0	131
	21 16	0	1	1	0	U 1	U	4/ 40	10	1 L	3/ 20	0	11ð 117
10:45 AM	10	U	U	U	U	T	U	48	14	U	38	U	11/

Intersection Turning Movement Prepared by:

11:00 AM 11:15 AM 11:30 AM 11:45 AM	24 11 19 11	0 0 0	3 0 2 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	32 34 40 42	14 12 16 14	3 1 0 0	48 45 35 37	0 0 0 0	124 103 112 105
12:00 PM	25	0	2	0	0	0	2	30	16	1	43	0	119
12:15 PM	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	38	28	0	32	0	110
12:30 PM	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	42	13	1	33	1	108
12:45 PM	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	26	0	5/	0	126
	13	0	2	0	0	0	1	28	15	0	49	0	106
1:15 PM	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	29 45	10	0	30	0	9I 100
	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	45 47	10	2	38	0	112
1:45 PM	10	0	2	0	1	0	1	47	10 21	1	30 ⊿2	0	113
2.00 PM	0	0	۲ ۲	0	0	0	1	79 27	21 10	1	42	0	129
2.15 PM	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	20	10	2	20	0	112
2.30 PM	9 15	0	1 2	0	0	0	0	<u> </u>	22 18	2	29 20	0	130
2.43 PM	14	0	2 1	0	0	0	0	47	21	2	36	0	122
3.15 PM	19	0	3	0	1	0	0	35	17	1	30 45	0	122
3.30 PM	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	15	0	33	0 0	100
3:45 PM	14	0	2	0	Ő	0	0	42	32	0	34	0	124
4:00 PM	18	Õ	0	Õ	Õ	Ő	1	54	16	1	32	0	122
4:15 PM	14	Õ	2	Õ	Õ	Õ	Ō	51	21	Ō	34	0	122
4:30 PM	19	0	3	0	0	0	0	44	17	1	42	Ō	126
4:45 PM	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	40	22	1	37	0	109
5:00 PM	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	41	21	2	29	0	102
5:15 PM	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	52	23	2	33	0	117
5:30 PM	12	0	2	0	0	1	0	54	10	1	31	0	111
5:45 PM	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	45	14	1	27	0	98
6:00 PM	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	17	2	18	0	81
6:15 PM	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	18	1	23	0	79
6:30 PM	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	11	1	18	0	59
6:45 PM	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	32	10	0	17	0	67
7:00 PM	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	30	14	0	22	0	69
7:15 PM	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	12	0	16	0	63
7:30 PM	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	12	3	14	0	61
7:45 PM	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	0	9	0	32
8:00 PM	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	10	1	11	0	45
8:15 PM	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	14	0	5	0	53
8:30 PM	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	0	10	0	29
8:45 PM	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	4	0	16	0	42
9:00 PM	I E	0	1	0	0	0	0	12	2	1	4	0	19
9.15 PM	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	2	1	7 Q	0	29
9.30 PM	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	1	0	0	0	29
10.00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	2	0	8
10.00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	0	2	0	18
10:10 PM	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	0	0	0 0	10
10:35 PM	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	Ő	6
11:00 PM	0	Õ	Õ	Õ	Õ	Õ	Õ	2	3	Õ	1	0	6
11:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	7
11:30 PM	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	5	Ō	10
11:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	2	0	7
TOTAL	NL	NT	NR	SL	ST	SR	EL	ET	ER	WL	WT	WR	TOTAL
Volumes	880	1	60	2	2	5	19	2233	833	63	2167	3	6268
Approach %	93.52	0.11	6.38	22.22	22.22	55.56	0.62	72.38	27.00	2.82	97.04	0.13	
App/Depart	941	/	23	9	/	898	3085	/	2295	2233	/	3052	