## Appendix "A"

## Purpose and Need Statement

# Concept Development Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange Improvements Purpose and Need Statement 

## INTRODUCTION

The project is located in the area between the Route 24 EB ramp to Columbia Turnpike and the signalized intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue in Morris and Hanover Townships, Morris County. Based on the Smart Solution Study, the intersection is currently near capacity with several movements failing and the signal is over capacity during the AM peak hours.

The Route 24 EB ramp merges with Columbia Turnpike approximately 650 feet east of the signalized intersection and there is a heavy movement from this ramp to the double left-turn lane at the intersection; however queuing in the left-turn lane prevents motorists from this ramp from entering the lane, and they then impede the movement of through traffic. The westbound Columbia Turnpike approach to Park Avenue is currently striped as two through lanes, two left lanes and one right lane. This intersection is currently near capacity with several movements failing and over capacity during the AM peak hours.

A Project Location Map and NJDOT Straight Line Diagrams for NJ Route 24, Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue are attached.

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this project is to develop recommendations that would improve the traffic flow between the ramp and the intersection and reduce crashes, along with providing improvements to the operation of the intersection that could be investigated further. The Route 24 EB ramp merges with Columbia Turnpike WB approximately 650 feet east of the signalized intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue. At this intersection there is a heavy AM left turn movement on the Columbia Turnpike WB approach that currently utilizes a double left-turn lane.

## NEED

Operational Deficiency: The Route 24 EB ramp merges with Columbia Turnpike approximately 650 feet east of the signalized intersection at Park Avenue. There is a heavy movement from this ramp to the double left-turn lane at the intersection. Columbia Turnpike is currently striped as two through lanes, two left lanes and one right lane.

The ramp movement from EB Route 24 to WB Columbia Turnpike is impacted by the weaving movement from this turn to left turns from Columbia Turnpike WB to Park Avenue SB. There is inadequate transition room for this movement to operate smoothly, and left-turn queuing often leaves this traffic waiting to enter the left-turn lane thus impeding the flow of through traffic. This creates congestion that backs up onto the Route 24 mainline, especially during the weekday morning peak period.

The intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue operates at or close to capacity during both peak hours. During the morning peak hours, the WB left and SB through movements
operate at unacceptable levels of service. During the evening peak hour, the NB approach operates at marginal levels of service.

## GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

It is the intent of this project to fulfill the purpose and address the needs while minimizing environmental, quality of life, access, right of way and utility impacts. Any proposed improvements will consider improvements to pedestrian accommodations and circulation, as well as impacts to emergency services and road user costs.

## EXISTING DEFICIENCIES

Information gathered from available record plans and reports, combined data observation during field visits, was used to identify areas that were noted to be deficient according to current design criteria. Section II summarizes the project's purpose and need as well as goals and objectives based on these deficiencies.

The focus of the project is the traffic flow between the ramp and the intersection along with providing improvements to the operation of the intersection. There are no bridge replacement issues, flooding issues or other significant maintenance issues related to the structure. However, upon evaluation the following deficiencies exist:

- Right turn from EB Route 24 to WB Columbia Turnpike are impacted by the weaving movement from this turn to left turns from Columbia Turnpike WB to Park Avenue SB. There is inadequate transition room for this movement to operate smoothly and left-turn queuing contributes to ramp traffic blocking westbound through travel lanes. This creates congestion that backs up onto the Route 24 mainline during the morning peak.
- The intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue operates at or close to capacity during both peak hours. During the morning peak hours, the WB left and SB through movements operate at unacceptable levels of service. During the evening peak hour, the NB approach operates at marginal levels of service.


## Appendix "B"

## Bridge Re-evaluation Survey Report (latest cycle) <br> (Not Applicable)

## Appendix "C"

# Bridge Scour Evaluation Report (latest cycle) <br> (Not Applicable) 

## Appendix "D"

## As-Built Plans and Jurisdiction Maps























# Appendix "E" 

## Tax Maps

KEMMAP
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## Appendix "F"

## Crash Data

## Crash Data

2016-2018

#  

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
P.O. Box 600

Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0600

PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor
SHEILA Y. OLIVER
Lt. Governor

DIANE GUTIERREZ-SCACCETTI
Commissioner

October 30, 2019
John Korunow, Civil Design Services Manager
IH Engineers, PC
103 College Road East, $1^{\text {st }}$ floor
Princeton, NJ 08540
RE: Crash Analysis
CR 510 MP 14.13 to 14.60 and at 14.23
Various Municipalities, Morris County
This is in reference to your request dated October 2, 2019, requesting this office to furnish the crash data for the above referenced location for the years 2016 through 2018.

## CRASH DATA RELATIVE TO OVERREPRESENTATIONS:

The crash summaries relative to overrepresentations for the following sections of CR 510, for the period January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2018 are herewith attached. The percentages on the summary are 2018 statewide average values corresponding to overrepresented crash categories.

Also, enclosed are the Details of Motor Vehicle Accidents for the years 2016 through 2018. The Details will show the frequency and severity at various locations (at/between intersection) along this portion of this roadway segment. This information may help your office in any engineering decision that might be made to improve or upgrade this intersection.

The following is the safety score:

## Evaluation \#2 Safety Score

| Route | Mile Post | At Intersection | Safety Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CR 510 | 4.23 | CR 510/CR 623 | 10 |

If there are any further questions, please contact Yosy Cosme of this office at (609)-963-1873.

Very truly yours,
Narhaba Onum
Marhaba Omer, Principal Engineer
Bureau of Transportation Data and Safety
MO: YC
BSP Log \#112-19
Cc: Eduard D'Arcy, Division of Program Management
CRASH SUMMARY
Route CR 510 MP 14.23
Various communities, Morris County
$01 / 01 / 2016$ THRU 12/31/2018

| INTERSECTION | COUNT | \% OF TOTAL | 2018 Average | ${ }^{* *}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| At Signalized Intersection | 19 | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
| At Unsignalized Intersection | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Between Intersections | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Railroad Crossing | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Total | 19 |  |  |  |


TOTAL CRASHES: 19

COL


[^0]CRASH SUMMARY
Route CR 510 MP 14.13 to 14.60
Various communities, Morris County

${ }_{* *}$ These columns indicate the number of fatal crashes in each accident category. Length of Segment

AADT
Crash Rate/MVM
TOTAL CRASHES: 61



Length of Segment Number of Years
-




| ROAD SYS <br> DLN / Ramp | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COLLISION } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | VEHICLE 1 DIR TRAV VEH TYPE, VEH ACTN | VEHICLE 2 DIR TRAV VEH TYPE, VEH ACTN | WEA SUR | LITE | DATE | DOW | TIME | VEH 1 CONTRIB CIRCUMSTANCES | VEH 2 CONTRIB CIRCUMSTANCES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. } \\ & \text { KIL } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INJ } \\ & \text { MOD } \end{aligned}$ | URED MIN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. } \\ & \text { ACC } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.41 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK |  |  |  | HAN | VER T |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 00 | 1 |
| 16102538 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-SLOW-STOP | W- PASS-SLOW-STOP | CL/DR | DARK | 01/06/16 |  | 17:17 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLLOW TO CLOSE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.42 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK |  |  |  | HAN | VER T |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 17117745 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- SUV-STOP-TRAF | W- SUV-SLOW-STOP | RN/WT | DARK | 01/03/17 | TUE | 17:25 | FOLLOW TO CLOSE | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | - CR 510 | MP 014.48 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK |  |  |  | HAN | VER T |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 |
| 16149582 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | CL/DR | DAY | 03/24/16 | THR | 17:19 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 16200999 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-START TRAF | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | CL/DR | DAY | 06/17/16 | FRI | 17:17 | DRI INATTENTION | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 16210848 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-GOING STRT | W- SUV-MERGING | CL/DR | DAY | 06/30/16 | THR | 17:31 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLLOW TO CLOSE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.55 | NEAR NJ 24 |  |  |  | HAN | VEER T |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |
| 18295103 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- PASS-SLOW-STOP | RN/WT | DARK | 12/20/18 |  | 17:21 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLLOW TO CLOSE | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.58 | NEAR NJ 24 |  |  |  | HAN | OVER T |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 18270408 | SAME DIR-SIDE | E- PASS-CHNG LANES | E- PASS-GOING STRT | RN/WT | DAY | 11/05/18 | MON | $13: 24$ | IMP LANE CHANGE | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.59 | NEAR AIRPORT RD |  |  |  | HAN | VER T |  | MORRIS | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 18295107 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-GOING STRT | W- PASS-SLOW-STOP | OC/WT | DAY | 12/21/18 | FRI | 15:35 | FOLLOW TO CLOSE | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.60 | AT NJ 24 |  |  |  | HAN | VER T |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 16190031 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-SLOW-STOP | W- PASS-GOING STRT | CL/DR | DAY | 06/01/16 | WED | 17:19 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLLOW TO CLOSE | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |

## Crash Data

2011-2013
01/01/2011 TO 12/31/2013

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROAD SYS } \\ & \text { D L N } \end{aligned}$ | T®®EISION | VEHICLE 1 DIR TRAV VEH TYPE, VEH ACTN | VEHICLE 2 DIR TRAV VEH TYPE, VEH ACTN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEA } \\ & \text { SUR } \end{aligned}$ | LITE | DATE | DOW | TIME | VEH 1 CONTRIB CIRCUMSTANCES | VEH 2 CONTRIB CIRCUMSTANCES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. } \\ & \text { KIL } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. } \\ & \text { MAJ } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IURED } \\ & \text { MIN } \end{aligned}$ | NO . <br> ACC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.23 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK AV |  |  |  | HAN | OVER TW |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 00 | ) 4 |
| 12018529 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- PASS-START TRAF | CL/DR | DUSK | 01/24/12 | TUE | 15:50 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | DRI INATTENTION | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12026503 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- SUV-START TRAF | CL/DR | DAY | 02/13/12 | MON | 09:39 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | DISOBEYED TCD | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 12037848 | SAME DIR-SIDE | W- SUV-STOP-TRAF | W-OTHPV-CHNG LANES | CL/DR | DUSK | 02/27/12 | MON | 17:18 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | IMP LANE CHANGE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12259579 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-SLOW-STOP | W- SUV-SLOW-STOP | RN/WT | DAY | 12/17/12 | MON | 09:04 | DISOBEYED TCD | FOLLOW TO CLOSE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.23 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK AV |  |  |  | MOR | RIS TWP |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 00 | 03 |
| 12196119 | SAME DIR-REAR | E- SUV-SLOW-STOP | E- SUV-START TRAF | CL/DR | DAY | 09/14/12 | FRI | 09:15 | DRI INATTENTION | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 13032001 | SAME DIR-REAR | E- PASS-START TRAF | E- PASS-STOP-TRAF | CL/DR | DAY | 04/23/13 | TUE | 11:55 | DRI INATTENTION | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 13240139 | SAME DIR-SIDE | E- PASS-CHNG LANES | E- PASS-NEG CURVE | CL/DR | DAY | 09/28/13 | SAT | 17:13 | IMP LANE CHANGE | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.23 | AT CR 623 / PARK AVE |  |  |  | HAN | OVER TV |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 15 |
| 11036857 | LEFT/U TURN | W- PASS-GOING STRT | E- PASS-LEFT TURN | CL/DR | DAY | 03/04/11 | FRI | 08:36 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FAIL TO YLD ROW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12017283 | RIGHT ANGLE | W- PKUP-GOING STRT | N- PASS-LEFT TURN | RN/WT | DAY | 01/23/12 | MON | 15:22 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | DRI INATTENTION | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12018540 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- SUV-START TRAF | OC/WT | DAY | 01/26/12 | THR | 07:37 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLLOW TO CLOSE | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12217656 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W-S2AXL-STOP-TRAF | RN/WT | DAY | 10/19/12 | FRI | 11:58 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | DRI INATTENTION | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 13010377 | RIGHT ANGLE | N- PASS-LEFT TURN | W- PASS-GOING STRT | CL/DR | DARK | 02/07/13 | THR | 21:03 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | DISOBEYED TCD | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | C CR 510 | MP 014.23 | AT CR 623 / PARK AVE |  |  |  | MOR | RIS TWP |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 02 | 24 |
| 11014612 | SAME DIR-REAR | E- PASS-RT TRN-NRD | E- SUV-RT TRN-NRD | CL/DR | DAY | 01/24/11 | MON | 09:44 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLLOW TO CLOSE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12028533 | SAME DIR-REAR | E-STRWT-RT TRN-NRD | E- PASS-RT TRN-NRD | CL/DR | DAY | 01/31/12 | TUE | 09:45 | DRI INATTENTION | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 12202774 | FIXED OBJECT | E- PASS-GOING STRT | - - | FG/WT | DARK | 10/08/12 | MON | 01:20 | DRI INATTENTION |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 13156461 | RIGHT ANGLE | S- SUV-GOING STRT | W- SUV-LEFT TURN | CL/DR | DARK | 04/27/13 | SAT | 20:34 | UNKNOWN | UNKNOWN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| － | － | r | ＊ | m | $\checkmark$ | ＊ | $\stackrel{\square}{\sim}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| － | $\bigcirc \bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc 0$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | HOOOHO | vo | 00000000 |
| $\bigcirc 0$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc 0$ | 00000 | $\bigcirc \bigcirc$ | 000000 | 00000 | H |
| $\bigcirc 0$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc 0$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 000000 | 00000 | 00000000 |
| $\bigcirc 0$ | $\bigcirc 0$ | $\bigcirc 0$ | 00000 | 0000 | 000000 | 0000 | $\bigcirc$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ M \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \text { H } \\ & \text { H } \\ & \text { 思 } \\ & \text { 苔 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 云 | 品 | 剧 | 810 | 品品罟 |  | 云吽吕号 |  |
| 发运 | 岩 | 号 | $\underset{\sim}{c} \circ$ | 鲁 윽 응 |  | 客 군ํㅇN 이 |  |
| ¢ | ¢ $\ddot{\infty}$ | 勺 $\ddot{\square}$ | 相 $\ddot{\sim}$ | 勺呺 | 品 $\ddot{\infty}$ 动 $\ddot{\sim}$ |  | 品 $\ddot{\sim}$ |
| － | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | 告 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 告范 } \\ & \text { 品 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROAD SYS } \\ & \text { D L N } \end{aligned}$ | TGEEISION | VEHICLE 1 DIR TRAV VEH TYPE, VEH ACTN | VEHICLE 2 DIR TRAV VEH TYPE, VEH ACTN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEA } \\ & \text { SUR } \end{aligned}$ | LITE | DATE | DOW | TIME | VEH 1 CONTRIB CIRCUMSTANCES | VEH 2 CONTRIB CIRCUMSTANCES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. } \\ & \text { KIL } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JURED } \\ & \text { D MIN } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. } \\ & \text { ACC } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.24 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK AVE |  |  |  | HANOVER TWP |  |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 10 |
| 13004976 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- SUV-StART TRAF | CL/DR | DAY | 01/18/13 | FRI | 09:36 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLlow to Close | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 13026066 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- SUV-GOING STRT | RN/WT | DAY | 03/25/13 | MON | 17:14 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLlow to Close | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 13201912 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- SUV-STOP-TRAF | W- SUV-Chng Lanes | CL/DR | DAY | 06/28/13 | FRI | 07:11 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | IMP LANE CHANGE | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.25 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK AVE |  |  |  | HANOVER TWP |  |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 00 | 3 |
| 12001351 | SAME DIR-SIDE | W- PASS-GOING STRT | W- PASS-Chng lanes | CL/DR | DUSK | 01/07/12 | SAT | 16:46 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | IMP LANE ChAnge | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 13004988 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- PASS-CHNG LANES | SN/SN | DARK | 01/25/13 | FRI | 18:23 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | DRI INATTENTION | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 13216470 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- PASS-START TRAF | CL/DR | DAY | 07/29/13 | MON | 09:28 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLlow to Close | 0 | 0 |  | 00 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.26 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK AVE |  |  |  | HANOVER TWP |  |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 01 | 2 |
| 11014425 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- PASS-StART TRAF | CL/DR | DAY | 01/10/11 | MON | 11:31 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | DRI INATTENTION | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 12065216 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- PASS-StART TRAF | CL/DR | DAY | 04/13/12 | FRI | 13:24 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLlow to Close | 0 | 0 |  | 00 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.29 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK AVE |  |  |  | HANOVER TWP |  |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 01 | 5 |
| 11255016 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- PASS-CHNG LANES | CL/DR | DARK | 11/17/11 | THR | 18:54 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | IMP LANE CHANGE | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 12171821 | SAME DIR-SIDE | W- PKUP-GOING STRT | W- PASS-MERGING | CL/DR | DAY | 08/24/12 | FRI | 10:43 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | IMP LANE CHANGE | 0 | 0 |  | 00 |  |
| 12193067 | SAME DIR-SIDE | E- PASS-GOING STRT | E- SUV-Chng Lanes | CL/DR | DAY | 09/12/12 | WED | 08:11 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | IMP LANE CHANGE | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 12208730 | SAME DIR-SIDE | W- PASS-GOING STRT | W-TRPLE-CHNG LANES | OC/DR | DAY | 10/08/12 | MON | 09:31 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FAIL TO YLD ROW | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 13201895 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-GOING STRT | W- SUV-STOP-TRAF | CL/DR | DAY | 06/25/13 | TUE | 07:50 | DRI INATTENTION | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | 0 | 0 |  | 01 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.30 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK AVE |  |  |  | HANOVER TWP |  |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 01 | 1 |
| 13165276 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- SUV-SLOW-STOP | W- PASS-SLOW-STOP | CL/DR | DAY | 05/15/13 |  | 08:55 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLLOW TO CLOSE | 0 | 0 |  | $0 \quad 1$ |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.31 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK AVE |  |  |  | HANOVER TWP |  |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 02 | 1 |
| 12118204 | SAME DIR-REAR | E- PASS-SLOW-STOP | E- PKUP-GOING STRT | CL/DR | DAY | 06/13/12 | WED | 13:25 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | DRI INATTENTION | 0 | 0 |  | 02 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.32 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK AVE |  |  |  | HANOVER TWP |  |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 02 | 3 |
| 12217657 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- SUV-Going Strt | W- SUV-STOP-TRAF | CL/DR | DAY | 10/17/12 | WED | 17:27 | DRI INATtention | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | 0 | 0 |  | 01 |  |
| 12228340 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- SUV-STOP-TRAF | W- PASS-SLOW-STOP | CL/DR | DAY | 10/22/12 | MON | 17:07 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | DRI INATTENTION | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 12271807 | RIGHT ANGLE | W- PASS-GOING STRT | S- UNKN-LEFT TURN | CL/DR | DAY | 12/20/12 | THR | 14:19 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | IMPROPER TURN | 0 | 0 |  | 01 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | D CR 510 | MP 014.33 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK AVE |  |  |  | HANOVER TWP |  |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 00 | 5 |
| 11001495 | SAME DIR-REAR | U- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | CL/DR | DAY | 01/05/11 | WED | 13:41 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLlow to Close | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 11083493 | SAME DIR-SIDE | W- PASS-GOING STRT | W- PASS-Chng Lanes | CL/DR | DAY | 04/26/11 | TUE | 11:35 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | IMP LANE CHANGE | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 11132325 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-MERGING | W- SUV-GOING STRT | OC/DR | DARK | 06/23/11 | THR | 23:05 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | DRI INATTENTION | 0 | 0 |  | 00 |  |
| 11183420 | SAME DIR-REAR | w- PASS-MERGING | W- SUV-GOING STRT | CL/DR | DAY | 08/24/11 | WED | 18:11 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLlow to Close | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 13009506 | SAME DIR-REAR | E- PASS-SLOW-STOP | E- PASS-SLOW-Stop | OC/WT | DAY | 01/30/13 | WED | 16:11 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | 0 | 0 |  | 00 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.42 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK AVE |  |  |  | HANOVER TWP |  |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  | 00 | 2 |
| 12193068 | SAME DIR-REAR | E- PASS-SLOW-STOP | E- PASS-SLOW-STOP | CL/DR | DAY | 09/12/12 | WED | 08:31 | DRI INATTENTION | FOLlow to Close | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |


| ARDLSTRT3 | May 18, | 2016 | NEW JERS B <br> DETAI <br> MILEPO <br> 01 | Y DEPAR REAU OF OF MOT <br> T <br> ON <br> 01/2011 | RTMENT SAFE OR VE ROUTE 14.130 1 TO | OF TRANS TY PROGRA HICLE ACC $\begin{gathered} 510 \\ \text { TO } 14 \\ 12 / 31 / 20 \end{gathered}$ | ORTA S DENTS $600$ $3$ | TION |  |  | Page 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROAD SYS } \\ & \text { D L N } \end{aligned}$ | ©®®EEISION | VEHICLE 1 DIR TRAV VEH TYPE, VEH ACTN | VEHICLE 2 DIR TRAV <br> VEH TYPE, VEH ACTN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEA } \\ & \text { SUR } \end{aligned}$ | LITE | DATE | DOW | TIME | VEH 1 CONTRIB CIRCUMSTANCES | VEH 2 CONTRIB CIRCUMSTANCES | NO. NO. |  | INJURED |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. } \\ & \text { ACC } \end{aligned}$ |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.42 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK |  |  |  | HANO | OVER T |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 13150654 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- PASS-STOP-TRAF | W- PASS-GOING STRT | CL/DR | DAY | 04/26/13 | FRI | 16:57 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLLOW TO CLOSE | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.43 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK |  |  |  | HANO | OVER T |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 12056177 | SAME DIR-REAR | W- SUV-SLOW-STOP | W- PASS-SLOW-STOP | CL/DR | DAY | 03/21/12 | WED | 17:58 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | FOLLOW TO CLOSE | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |
| 13207531 S | SAME DIR-SIDE | W- SUV-GOING STRT | W- PASS-CHNG LANES | CL/DR | DAY | 07/18/13 | THR | 07:22 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | IMP LANE CHANGE | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.48 | NEAR CR 623 / PARK |  |  |  | HANO | OVER T |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 13157937 S | SAME DIR-REAR | W- SUV-SLOW-STOP | W- PASS-CHNG LANES | CL/DR | DAY | 04/30/13 | TUE | 17:26 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | IMP LANE CHANGE | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| COUNTY ROAD | CR 510 | MP 014.60 | AT NJ 24 |  |  |  | HANO | OVER T |  | MORRIS | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 13165268 F | FIXED OBJECT | E- PASS-GOING STRT | E- PASS-GOING STRT | RN/WT | DAY | 05/23/13 | THR | 09:24 | NONE-DRIVER/CYC | UNSAFE SPEED | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |

# Appendix "G" 

## Traffic Counts and Traffic Data

Figure 1- Intersection Turning Movement Traffic Volumes Columbia Turnpike (CR 510) and Park Avenue (CR 623) Morris and Hanover Townships, Morris County, NJ
Counts conducted Thursday, October 17, 2019

|  |  | CR 510 EASTBOUND |  |  |  | CR 510 WESTBOUND |  |  |  | CR 623 NORTHBOUND |  |  |  | CR 623 SOUTHBOUND |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | PEDS | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | PEDS | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | PEDS | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | PEDS |
| 7:00 AM | to 7:15 AM | 0 | 156 | 27 | 0 | 89 | 72 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 27 | 75 | 0 | 39 | 94 | 7 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | to 7:30 AM | 4 | 221 | 61 | 0 | 302 | 99 | 27 | 0 | 12 | 56 | 77 | 0 | 78 | 122 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | to 7:45 AM | 4 | 215 | 66 | 0 | 378 | 128 | 43 | 0 | 30 | 73 | 138 | 0 | 110 | 196 | 12 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | to 8:00 AM | 5 | 228 | 45 | 0 | 429 | 162 | 45 | 0 | 43 | 97 | 136 | 0 | 102 | 176 | 7 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | to 8:15 AM | 5 | 177 | 68 | 0 | 392 | 132 | 24 | 0 | 34 | 79 | 142 | 0 | 66 | 203 | 6 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | to 8:30 AM | 0 | 197 | 102 | 0 | 324 | 136 | 31 | 0 | 12 | 72 | 123 | 0 | 75 | 202 | 6 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | to 8:45 AM | 6 | 174 | 56 | 0 | 300 | 112 | 20 | 0 | 26 | 73 | 128 | 0 | 71 | 179 | 8 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | to 9:00 AM | 3 | 175 | 102 | 0 | 347 | 166 | 28 | 0 | 21 | 92 | 120 | 0 | 47 | 165 | 8 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM |  | 27 | 1543 | 527 | 0 | 2561 | 1008 | 226 | 0 | 189 | 569 | 939 | 0 | 588 | 1337 | 59 | 0 |
|  | to 8:30 AM | 14 | 817 | 281 | 0 | 1523.93 | 559.226 | 142.296 | 0 | 119 | 321 | 539 | 0 | 353 | 777 | 31 | 0 |
|  | PHF | 0.70 | 0.90 | 0.69 |  | 0.89 | 0.86 | 0.80 |  | 0.69 | 0.83 | 0.95 |  | 0.80 | 0.96 | 0.65 |  |
| hV Volume |  | 0 | 13 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 11 | 15 |  | 7 | 19 | 9 |  |
|  | \%HV | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 0.7\% |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  | 0.8\% | 3.4\% | 2.8\% |  | 2.0\% | 2.4\% | 29.0\% |  |
| Peak hour Total |  | 14 | 817 | 281 |  | 1524 | 559 | 142 |  | 119 | 321 | 539 |  | 353 | 777 | 31 |  |
| 4:00 PM | to $4: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ | 5 | 224 | 29 | 0 | 168 | 243 | 78 | 0 | 45 | 249 | 255 | 0 | 83 | 53 | 4 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | to $4: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ | 8 | 291 | 21 | 0 | 147 | 217 | 119 | 0 | 39 | 238 | 312 | 0 | 80 | 71 | 6 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | to $4: 45 \mathrm{PM}$ | 4 | 279 | 18 | 0 | 228 | 279 | 173 | 0 | 55 | 249 | 260 | 0 | 95 | 60 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | to 5:00 PM | 6 | 218 | 18 | 0 | 194 | 284 | 143 | 0 | 15 | 258 | 243 | 0 | 94 | 65 | 7 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | to $5: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ | 6 | 224 | 9 | 0 | 175 | 270 | 145 | 0 | 51 | 214 | 339 | 0 | 106 | 95 | 5 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | to 5:30 PM | 2 | 214 | 30 | 0 | 261 | 391 | 191 | 0 | 50 | 235 | 343 | 0 | 124 | 95 | 7 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | to 5:45 PM | 11 | 258 | 23 | 0 | 207 | 253 | 120 | 0 | 28 | 194 | 276 | 0 | 121 | 112 | 10 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | to 6:00 PM | 16 | 181 | 29 | 0 | 168 | 227 | 102 | 0 | 40 | 249 | 242 | 0 | 74 | 77 | 5 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM |  | 58 | 1889 | 177 | 0 | 1547 | 2164 | 1072 | 0 | 323 | 1886 | 2270 | 0 | 777 | 628 | 51 | 0 |
|  | to 6:00 PM | 35 | 877 | 91 | 0 | 810.586 | 1140.49 | 558.027 | 0 | 169 | 892 | 1200 | 0 | 425 | 379 | 27 |  |
|  | PHF | 0.55 | 0.85 | 0.76 |  | 0.78 | 0.73 | 0.73 |  | 0.83 | 0.90 | 0.87 |  | 0.86 | 0.85 | 0.68 |  |
| HV VOLUME$\% H V$ |  | 1 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 6 | 6 |  | 2 | 3 | 0 |  |
|  |  | 2.9\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  | 0.6\% | 0.7\% | 0.5\% |  | 0.5\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% |  |

Figure 1 - Intersection Turning Movement Traffic Volumes Columbia Turnpike (CR 510) and Park Avenue (CR 623) Morris and Hanover Townships, Morris County, NJ
Counts conducted Wednesday, April 27, 2016

|  | CR 510 EASTBOUND |  |  |  | CR 510 WESTBOUND |  |  |  | CR 623 NORTHBOUND |  |  |  | CR 623 SOUTHBOUND |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | PEDS | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | PEDS | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | PEDS | LEFT | THRU | RIGHT | PEDS |
| 7:00 AM to 7:15 AM | 11 | 130 | 26 | 1 | 94 | 72 | 7 | 0 | 21 | 48 | 71 | 0 | 37 | 147 | 19 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM to 7:30 AM | 8 | 186 | 54 | 0 | 319 | 99 | 19 | 0 | 15 | 47 | 72 | 0 | 93 | 150 | 8 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM to 7:45 AM | 11 | 165 | 58 | 0 | 400 | 129 | 31 | 0 | 14 | 60 | 89 | 0 | 102 | 211 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM to 8:00 AM | 14 | 186 | 94 | 0 | 454 | 163 | 32 | 0 | 16 | 92 | 107 | 0 | 93 | 160 | 8 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM to 8:15 AM | 12 | 184 | 96 | 2 | 415 | 133 | 17 | 0 | 20 | 59 | 81 | 0 | 94 | 194 | 15 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM to 8:30 AM | 6 | 163 | 101 | 0 | 343 | 137 | 22 | 0 | 18 | 91 | 101 | 0 | 72 | 167 | 10 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM to 8:45 AM | 15 | 154 | 116 | 0 | 317 | 113 | 14 | 0 | 31 | 82 | 105 | 0 | 44 | 166 | 2 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM to 9:00 AM | 8 | 124 | 80 | 1 | 367 | 167 | 20 | 0 | 22 | 84 | 103 | 0 | 42 | 205 | 8 | 0 |
|  | 85 | 1292 | 625 | 4 | 2709 | 1013 | 162 | 0 | 157 | 563 | 729 | 0 | 577 | 1400 | 72 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM to 8:30 AM | 43 | 698 | 349 | 2 | 1612 | 562 | 102 | 0 | 68 | 302 | 378 | 0 | 361 | 732 | 35 | 0 |
| PHF | 0.77 | 0.94 | 0.86 |  | 0.89 | 0.86 | 0.80 |  | 0.85 | 0.82 | 0.88 |  | 0.88 | 0.87 | 0.58 |  |
| HV VOLUME | 1 |  | 1 |  | 25 | 20 | 6 |  | 5 |  | 13 |  | 3 | 6 | 5 |  |
| \%HV | 2.3\% | 0.9\% | 0.3\% |  | 1.6\% | 3.6\% | 5.9\% |  | 7.4\% | 2.6\% | 3.4\% |  | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 14.3\% |  | \%HV

HV VOLUME
$\% H V$

| 4:00 PM | to | 4:15 PM | 6 | 141 | 18 | 0 | 95 | 183 | 85 | 0 | 57 | 159 | 241 | 0 | 43 | 44 | 9 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4:15 PM | to | 4:30 PM | 6 | 144 | 21 | 0 | 83 | 163 | 130 | 0 | 46 | 158 | 218 | 0 | 55 | 66 | 15 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | to | 4:45 PM | 6 | 175 | 32 | 0 | 129 | 210 | 189 |  | 38 | 142 | 138 | 0 | 72 | 54 | 8 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | to | 5:00 PM | 16 | 201 | 13 | 0 | 110 | 214 | 156 | 0 | 40 | 148 | 159 | 0 | 74 | 78 | 9 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | to | 5:15 PM | 9 | 222 | 24 | 0 | 99 | 203 | 158 | 0 | 40 | 186 | 173 | 0 | 67 | 65 | 13 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | to | 5:30 PM | 11 | 261 | 15 | 0 | 148 | 294 | 208 | 0 | 28 | 148 | 178 | 0 | 117 | 104 | 20 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | to | 5:45 PM | 9 | 235 | 12 | 0 | 117 | 190 | 131 | 0 | 38 | 179 | 186 | 0 | 80 | 92 | 20 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | to | 6:00 PM | 19 | 246 | 16 | 1 | 95 | 171 | 111 | 0 | 36 | 189 | 177 | 0 | 89 | 95 | 20 | 1 |
|  |  |  | 82 | 1625 | 151 | 1 | 876 | 1628 | 1168 | 0 | 323 | 1309 | 1470 | 0 | 597 | 598 | 114 | 1 |
| 5:00 PM | to | 6:00 PM | 48 | 964 | 67 | 1 | 459 | 858 | 608 | 0 | 142 | 702 | 714 | 0 | 353 | 356 | 73 | 1 |
|  | PHF |  | 0.63 | 0.92 | 0.70 |  | 0.78 | 0.73 | 0.73 |  | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.96 |  | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.91 |  |
|  | VOL | ume | ${ }^{1}$ |  | $1$ |  | 4 | 14 | $8$ |  | $1$ | $1$ | $3$ |  | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |

## ATR count summary
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## ก 

| EASTBOUND TRAFFIC VOLUMES (APPROACHING THE INTERSECTION) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | class | BIKES | $\frac{{ }_{2}^{2}}{\frac{\text { CARS } \alpha}{\text { TRALLERS }}}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ \underline{2 A X I E} \\ \hline \text { LONG } \end{gathered}$ | BUSES | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ \underline{2} \begin{array}{c} \text { AXLE } \end{array} \\ \hline 6 \text { TIRE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} { }^{6} \\ \frac{6 \times X I E}{} \\ \text { SINGIE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ \text { 4AXIE } \\ \hline \text { SNGLIE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ \begin{array}{c} 8 \text { AXLE } \\ \hline \text { DOUBLE } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ \begin{array}{c} 9 \text { AXLE } \\ \text { DOUBLE } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ \frac{6+\text { AXLE }}{\text { DOUBLE }} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ \frac{\sigma \text { AXLE }}{} \\ \hline \text { MULTI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ \frac{6 \text { AXLE }}{} \\ \hline \text { MULTT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ \frac{6+\text { AXLE }}{} \\ \hline \text { MULTI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ \text { UNCLASS- } \\ \hline \text { IFIED } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 / 4 / 2016 \\ & \text { WEDNESDAY } \end{aligned}$ | 12:00 AM | 6 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 29 |
|  | 1:00 AM | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
|  | 2:00 AM | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | 3:00 AM | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
|  | 4:00 AM | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
|  | 5:00 AM | 13 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
|  | 6:00 AM | 30 | 255 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 296 |
|  | 7:00 AM | 54 | 687 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 782 |
|  | 8:00 AM | 58 | 752 | 13 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 978 |
|  | 9:00 AM | 41 | 571 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 670 |
|  | 10:00 AM | 33 | 364 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 414 |
|  | 11:00 AM | 25 | 377 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 417 |
|  | 12:00 PM | 38 | 412 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 473 |
|  | 1:00 PM | 30 | 392 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 440 |
|  | 2:00 PM | 39 | 402 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 460 |
|  | 3:00 PM | 40 | 481 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 546 |
|  | 4:00 PM | 45 | 643 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 727 |
|  | 5:00 PM | 45 | 710 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 827 |
|  | 6:00 PM | 49 | 498 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 563 |
|  | 7:00 PM | 50 | 268 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 323 |
|  | 8:00 PM | 29 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 229 |
|  | 9:00 PM | 27 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 164 |
|  | 10:00 PM | 14 | 63 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 79 |
|  | 11:00 PM | 22 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |
| THU-WED |  | 4505 | 45405 | 505 | ${ }^{43}$ | 213 | 452 | 56 | 20 | 74 | 73 | 3 | 11 | 13 | 127 | 52650 |
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| 68856 | GE¢E | IT | $\varepsilon$ | $\pm$ | 82 | 82 | 908 | $\underline{1}$ | 202 | 200 | 69 | $t / z s$ | 20108 | ors | nH－ | 7tal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| оєโ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | I | 0 | 2 | s | TZI | I | Wd 00：It |  |
| ८દ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | I | 8 | 822 | 0 | Wd 00：0t |  |
| ઘृદ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | โ | 9 | 0 | ¢ | 208 | 0 | Wd 00：6 |  |
| sct | $\llcorner$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | г | r | 02 | ャて | 0 | Wd 00：8 |  |
| sz9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ז | $\dagger$ | 0 | $\varsigma^{\text {¢ }}$ | ¢Ls | โ | Wd 00：L |  |
| $6 \mathrm{6tT}$ | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | г | 0 | ז | $\llcorner$ | $\varepsilon$ | os | 850 | 0 | Wd 00：9 |  |
| ${ }_{689}$ | $60 \tau$ | 0 | 0 | โ | 0 | 0 | $\varepsilon$ | 0 | 9 | 0t | s | ¢8 | 85tt | $\varepsilon \tau$ | Wd 00：s |  |
| 929 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ¢ | ¢ | ז | $9{ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | I | ${ }^{6}$ | OStI | от | Wd 00： |  |
| เยโ̇ | 02 | I | 0 | 0 | I | 0 | โ | 0 | I | 62 | r | 86 | $0<6$ | 8 | Wd 00： |  |
| te6 | ャ2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | r | 0 | $\varepsilon$ | ยโ | $\square$ | $9{ }^{6}$ | ¢ヶ8 | $\llcorner$ | Wd 00：z |  |
| 406 | Iz | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ז | $\dagger$ | 0 | z | て！ | 0 | Ts | 808 | 8 | Wd 00： |  |
| 526 | Iz | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ז | s | 0 | ¢ | て！ | r | 89 | 608 | 9 | Wd 00：ż |  |
| ＜9 | て！ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ¢ | I | 0 | 0 | LI | s | $\varepsilon ¢$ | 189 | โ | Wvooti |  |
| 8 ¢9 | It | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | r | I | ¢ | 8 L | 9 | 09 | 9 ts | $\varepsilon$ | Wv 00：0t |  |
| عLL | 9 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | โ | て | 0 | $\downarrow$ | ז | $\checkmark$ | $6 \varepsilon$ | LLS | 6 | W＊00：6 |  |
| b6L | ¢¢ | 0 | 0 | 0 | I | ¢ | $\varepsilon$ | 0 | It | 0t | r | โ | LLT | $\varepsilon \tau$ | W＊00：8 |  |
| 8tIt | $6 \varepsilon$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | て | 0 | て | ธ | て | ${ }^{\text {o }}$ | 9 | 29 | 8 ¢0¢ | 9 | W＊00：L |  |
| 8 ¢9 | $9{ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ז | I | r | 9 | ธ | $\varepsilon \downarrow$ | $8 L 9$ | 0 | W＊00：9 |  |
| 8 tI | $\varepsilon$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | て | 0 | โ | s | 0 | て | szt | 0 | W＊00：s |  |
| $5 \varepsilon$ | โ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | โ | 0 | 0 | ז | 0 | 9 | 92 | 0 | W＊00：\％ |  |
| st | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ธ | I | 0 | โ | て | 0 | W＊00： |  |
| गT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | r |  | 0 | W＊00：z |  |
| вт | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | r | $9{ }^{\text {9 }}$ | 0 | W＊00：T | Avasunht |
| 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | I | I | r | โ | ${ }^{\text {t }}$ | W＊00：zI | $9702 / 88 / 0$ |
| T101 | व3） | 117กW | แフกW | 117nW | 379nod | 97anod | sanod | \＃jons | TITNIS | 38119 | 573n9 | 9NO7 | รษ37｜ves | इड＞＞19 |  |  |
|  | －55tionn |  | 37XV9 | \＃アV｜ | \＃\＃XV＋9 | 97x＋ 9 | 9TXV ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | जアヤロ | जアヤヲ | 9Tx＋2 |  | जx｜z | ¢54षJ |  |  |  |
|  | ¢ | £โ | zI | It | OT | 6 | 8 | $\llcorner$ | 9 | 9 | $\dagger$ | $\varepsilon$ | て | โ | 5575 |  |
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CR 623 (PARK AVE) NORTHBOUND APPROACHING CR 510 (COLUMBIA TURNPIKE)
AUTOM ATED TRAFFIC RECORDER (ATR) COUNTS PERFORM ED THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2015 THROUGH WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 2015



の䐻家


| DAILY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRI | 45 | 5922 | 493 | 31 | 129 | 18 | 1 | 23 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 102 | 6771 |
| SAT | 6 | 3194 | 283 | 6 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 3568 |
| SUN | 21 | 2503 | 165 | 0 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2730 |
| MON | 63 | 5597 | 468 | 39 | 119 | 13 | 2 | 33 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 6581 |
| TUE | 67 | 7053 | 549 | 23 | 169 | 22 | 3 | 25 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 246 | 8168 |
| WED | 56 | 5744 | 480 | 24 | 121 | 14 | 3 | 28 | 3 |  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 268 | 6747 |
| THU | 52 | 6251 | 493 | 29 | 144 | 11 | 4 | 21 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 7176 |
| TOTALPRJ-THU | 310 | 36264 | 2931 | 152 | 763 | 79 | 14 | 137 | 15 | 15 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1052 | 41741 |
| PCT OF TOTAL | 0.76\% | 89.12\% | 7.20\% | 0.37\% | 1.88\% | 0.19\% | 0.03\% | 0.34\% | 0.04\% | 0.04\% | 0.01\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | --- | 100.00\% |
| REDIST. UNCLASSIFIED | 8 | 938 | 76 | 4 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1052 |
| REMSEDTOTAL | 318 | 37202 | 3007 | 156 | 789 | 81 | 14 | 141 | 15 | 15 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | $4174]$ |
| PCT. PER CLASS | 0.76\% | 89.12\% | 7.20\% | 0.37\% | 1.88\% | 0.19\% | 0.03\% | 0.34\% | 0.04\% | 0.04\% | 0.01\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |  |
| CLASS SUMMARIES |  | 97.1\% |  | 0.37\% | $\stackrel{2.1 \%}{\text { SINGLE UNIT TRUCK }}$ |  |  |  | 0.4\% |  |  | 0\% |  | --- |  |
|  |  | PASS. CARS |  | BUS |  |  |  | DOUBLE TRUCK |  |  | TRIPLE TRUCK |  |  | --- |  |
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average daily traffic volumes

Project Desc.:

| Date: | Ci/22/2016  <br> Time:  <br> Performed by:  <br>  8:00 AM - 9:00 AM |
| :--- | :--- |

## Columbia Turnpike (CR 510) and Park Avenue (CR 623) Morris and Hanover Townships, M orris County, NJ Car License Plates O-D Study

|  |  | 510WB left turn onto Park SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ramp from 24E to 510w | Lane 1 | Lane 2 |


|  |  | 510WB left turn onto Park SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ramp from 24E to $510 w$ | Lane 1 | Lane 2 |


| Ramp from 24E to 510W |  | 510WB left turn onto Park SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lane 1 | Lane 2 |
| NY | 3868 | 24K9 | FPS |
| NJ | BJM | EPK | 51W |
| NY | 833 | ESO | F2S |
| NJ | FZC | BAE | 53X |
| NJ | CKY | Z9N |  |
| NJ | DOZ | 4774 | G8R |
| NY | 6747 | FGV | 4DV |
| NJ | EXB | 3556 | DTD |
| NJ | 76C | GCX | 4556 |
| NY | 9315 | GKW | AHZ |
| NJ | 642 | 51B | $50 Z$ |
| NJ | GCL | EDM | H96 |
| NJ | EWY | FSK | 15F |
| NY | 3124 | Z6K | 67W |
| NY | 6775 | 7423 | 344 |
| NJ | CWS | ENV | EFW |
| NJ | G39 | BMA | FLP |
| NJ | ELK | DMT | ERB |
| PA | 9113 | CM R | 64P |
| NJ | F5Z | HSS | ARV |
| NY | 670M E | 192 | ERC |
| MD | 6376 | OCD | EPZ |
| MD | 244 | DTK | FZF |
| NY | 4806 | 755 | CCP |
| NJ | FRR | ENB | EAG |
| NJ | EWV | FDD | CH4 |
| NJ | V49 | GDZ | GCC |
| NJ | 2039 | BPM | FWA |
| NJ | FYV | FNY | D576 |
| NJ | BAC | FPN | 4260 |
| NJ | 79N | ERF | FBC |
| NY | 4724 | FVN | AHG |
| NJ | FXS | GOM | DMD |
| PA | N40 | EPM | 60 U |
| NJ | DMZ | 39V | EAC |
| VA | 2489 | FGZ | BL5 |
| NJ | GOK | PYX | 87K |
| NJ | 911 | FYE | C6Z |
| NJ | FKB | 1BTT | CDV |
| CT | G24 | GM H | ANT |
| NJ | 902 | GTX | 356A |
| NJ | FGV | GDK | GJ1A |
| NY | 2423 | FZF | CHS |
| NJ | ENV | GCM | 34D |
| NJ | DYZ | AAJ | GAA |
| NJ | E50 | EAK | CRP |
| NJ | GRR | FHR | C4W |


|  |  | 510WB left turn onto Park SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ramp from 24E to 510 F | Lane 1 | Lane 2 |


| Ramp from 24E to 510W |  | 510WB left turn onto Park SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lane 1 | Lane 2 |
| NJ | EWT | DTC | GEU |
| NJ | G1X | DUP | EWS |
| NJ | 49K | M S3 | AYZ |
| NJ | AMP | DTE | FJP |
| NJ | ENY | 16 S | BSP |
| NY | 2873 | FJP | AGX |
| NJ | 38 U | EME | FPS |
| CT | 2424 | FJX | GAX |
| NJ | 85 T | DR4 | EXJ |
| NJ | 915 | DXF | DYX |
| NJ | EST | EUV | DYA |
| NJ | GAL | ALA | DRU |
| NJ | DMC | FDM | 462 |
| NJ | FXE | G2H | PWB |
| NJ | 59P | Z6X | FVJ |
| NJ | GNL | AGO | FBU |
| NJ | DWV | FZL | ZDZ |
| NJ | BPK | EXM | CFX |
| NJ | CHT | CMT | EDU |
| NJ | FJP | EFJ | 782 |
| NJ | BUX | BTO | DWT |
| NJ | GGB | FSC | CDL |
| NJ | FHR | DTT | CDK |
| NJ | BPX | SGM | EDL |
| NJ | FDM | GDX | FVW |
| NY | 9900 | EWL | DLP |
| NJ | AXP | ACR | 1VY |
| MD | 9441 | GAZ | ZOW |
| NJ | FJ7 | CRJ | FGK |
| NJ | CTG | CEC | 95K |
| NJ | DYX | BRX | CJB |
| NJ | 49H | G5M | 9 CH |
| NJ | FYS | CXN | GFD |
| NY | 1144 | B4X | GBW |
| MD | 165 | EFG | G8W |
| NJ | BZV | GAS | FM D |
| NJ | 70] | BZT | DCC |
| MA? | 5274 | AD0 | 49K |
| NJ | 88C | FDC | EMJ |
| NJ | FYE | GHR | GFK |
| NJ | EMC | EJB | DSJ |
| NJ | DDN | 148 | EDV |
| NJ | AAJ | BM N | FCX |
| NJ | 530 | 2JE | 38J |
| NJ | 48 Y | 46 H | E69 |
| NY | 8874 | EJS | G2H |
| NY | 7235 | EWN | FYM |


| Ramp from 24E to 510W |  | 510WB left turn onto Park SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lane 1 | Lane 2 |
| NJ | CMF | DDG | ERP |
| NJ | 366 | FDH | 7BP |
| NJ | GAX | EPP | AMR |
| NJ | AGD | KPZ | EST |
| NJ | 30M | S4V | DBZ |
| CT | VH9 | 36K | FAE |
| NJ | CVB | FYF | 587 S |
| NJ | 52 C | FLP | GFB |
| NJ | DVE | DGC | 45 T |
| NY | 3814 | B2E | DHF |
| NJ | EVW | EGE | 111 |
| NJ | GDZ | FDJ | JDL |
| NJ | CMY | GFX | AHW |
| NJ | BTW | FGK | 11M |
| NJ | EJ3 | ABT | 1519 |
| MD | 3150 | GBK | CHT |
| PA | 4856 | GRP | FVP |
| NJ | DTT | 30M | GT2 |
| NJ | EGE | 9TN | CCX |
| NJ | AVC | GFJ | DRN |
| NY | 8057 | F2Y | ERH |
| NJ | CEC | GSX | DEC |
| NJ | 98Y | FSG | CBN |
| NJ | GEK | DXH | CHR |
| NJ | EZA | DMF | BFBS |
| NJ | FDJ | EPL | CUU |
| NJ | DZX |  | FTV |
| NY | 5588 |  | ERJ |
| PA | 5736 |  | 567C |
| NJ | GBP |  | WBS |
| NJ | GEB |  | BSJ |
| NJ | 30 H |  | 542 |
| NJ | FHX |  | 29D |
| NJ | CAX |  | 53D |
| NJ | ENC |  | FJJ |
| NJ | EWJ |  | DGP |
| NJ | GFJ |  | FZE |
| NJ | FGK |  | EMD |
| NY | 67BR |  | GNH |
| NJ | EUD |  | COS |
| NJ | BAY |  | GBY |
| NJ | 76W |  | BVW |
| NJ | FZY |  | PBU |
| NJ | 11K |  | EYL |
| NJ | BCX |  | FBX |
| NJ | DHG |  | BWU |
| NJ | ECS |  | GAX |


| Ramp from 24E to 510W |  | 510WB left turn onto Park SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lane 1 Lane 2 |
| NJ | 132 | 6EB |
| NJ | EPL | FYE |
| NJ | FPS | ACB |
| NJ | M 53 | FAA |
| NJ | DTE | 37S |
| NJ | GDY | CHX |
| NJ | EWL | 44X |
| NJ | BRM | EJZ |
| NJ | AM G | AVF |
| NJ | DSF | GBE |
| NJ | ACR | DPP |
| NJ | GAZ | 3BJ |
| NY | 8414 | 73W |
| NJ | GRJ | E6X |
| NJ | ENP | CHP |
| NJ | EM D | CAE |
| VA | 1817 | CEF |
| CT | Z7L | 70A |
| NJ | GBA | ELB |
|  |  | 14L |
|  |  | FPG |
|  |  | FJJ |
|  |  | D7F |
|  |  | GNN |
|  |  | UBN |
|  |  | 9GY |
|  |  | 87B |
|  |  | PZX |
|  |  | EMF |
|  |  | GFB |
|  |  | FZL |
|  |  | FHX |
|  |  | GCM |
|  |  | FKT |
|  |  | 967 |
|  |  | AFJ |
|  |  | DHG |
|  |  | GDG |
|  |  | M CP |
|  |  | FPP |
|  |  | 9AJ |
|  |  | ABW |
|  |  | DBM |
|  |  | DBT |
|  |  | FAY |
|  |  | DGM |
|  |  | FDR |


| 510WB left turn onto Park SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane $\mathbf{1}$ | Lane 2 |

Total volume of ramp count: 291 cars
Total matched: 129 cars
Total \%: 44\%
*Based on observation, and difficulty in tracking high-volume two-lane left turn movement, assumed percentage increased to $90 \%$.

IH ENGINEERS, P.C.
www.ihengineers.com

Project Desc.:
Date:
Time:
Performed by:

| $\frac{\text { Columbia Turnpike }}{\text { 6/22/2016 }}$ |
| :--- |
| 5:00 PM - 6:00 PM |
| NL, Imran, Colin |

# Columbia Turnpike (CR 510) and Park Avenue (CR 623) <br> Morris and Hanover Townships, M orris County, NJ <br> Car License Plate O-D Study 

| Ramp from 24E to 510W |  | 510WB left turn onto Park SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lane 1 | Lane 2 |
| MD | 8834 | GF5 | GAE |
| NJ | 97M | END | 1GN |
| NJ | 707 | ZV1 | S8M |
| NJ | 71K | 24D | B1Y |
| NJ | GEK | 392 | $367 Z$ |
| NJ | GLA | GRX | DTZ |
| NJ | 8JM | EVE | ABZ |
| NJ | AEY | ASJ | GTD |
| NJ | $69 Y$ | DMB | EYE |
| NJ | DEN | ASF | BBN |
| PA | 9473 | FFX | 6417 |
| NJ | 973 | BVD | ELN |
| NJ | 94N | DEZ | GY |
| NJ | FLW | SON | BYM |
| NJ | FLS | GNC | 93T |
| NJ | FRH | FVJ | GJU |
| NJ | FWY | EKE | FBJ |
| NJ | FPE | GM F | AZP |
| NJ | FNF | 7D7 | 8514 |
| NJ | DCY | 71F | FZY |
| NJ | KLA | ASF | 35MH |
| NJ | 82N | GLA | V99 |
| NJ | GAD | 255 | A2Y |
| NJ | DFB | BJM | 9AA |
| NJ | GKV | DSM | FMZ |
| NJ | EVP | AEY | 73W |
| NJ | EVN | DEN | GHE |
| PA | 2855 | DER | BTD |
| NJ | BVG | FM D | AUX |
| NJ | BXY | FLS | EVP |
| NJ | FPN | ENV | F7] |
| NJ | ELY | 76K | BVG |
| NJ | 53A | G23G | FPM |
| NJ | DKN | CNT | ELY |
| NJ | CHC | OCY | BLJ |


| Ramp from 24E to 510W |  |  | 510WB left turn onto Park SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Lane 1 | Lane 2 |
| NJ | DTF |  | GA0 | 72B |
| NJ | FPK |  | GXV | CHC |
| NJ | FRJ |  | G39 | DTF |
| NJ | FEP |  | CJN | FPK |
| NJ | ERX |  | BXY | $41 T$ |
| NY | 8549 |  | FPN | ERX |
| NJ | EEH |  | CGZ | CJX |
| NJ | 4380 |  | S3A | EEH |
| NJ | 28N |  | 15C | FSS |
| NJ | F5S |  | CWW | BWU |
| NJ | 23F |  | FRJ | 23F |
| NJ | 88B | $\wedge$ | 91V | EYH |
| NJ | EZV | $\wedge$ | 43BD | $34 Y$ |
| NJ | 48R |  | DTC | DGZ |
| NJ | GRD | $\wedge$ | DEN | GTA |
| NJ | EZY |  | BZE | FMD |
| NY | 1138 |  | 6ZV | FFB |
| NJ | 947 |  | ETT | GFZ |
| NJ | 35 S |  | GPJ | 35 S |
| NJ | EYD |  | 46R | 45 |
| NJ | DYS | $\wedge$ | EZY | ESW |
| NJ | EZK |  | 94S | EYD |
| NJ | DYE |  | CCR | D45 |
| MD | 8293 | $\wedge$ | B4Z | 7086 |
| NJ | ALP |  | 48V | ESN |
| NJ | ESJ |  | EZK | EYW |
| NJ | EYD |  | BJL | FRG |
| MD | 467 | $\wedge$ | FVR | 52P |
| NJ | 997F | $\wedge$ | ES | 39 T |
| NJ | FLS | $\wedge$ | ALP | ARE |
| NJ | G78 |  | DUB | ESM |
| NJ | EZU |  | FCX | 44 |
| NJ | FEX |  | DN5 | ETH |
| NJ | FVV |  | 24F | GKA |
| NY | 6428 |  | ELF | 2607 |
| NJ | 58 F | $\wedge$ | C7B | PUT |
| NJ | C...M | $\wedge$ | G78 | FSE |
| NJ | CXU |  | FJM | CM P |
| NJ | 415 |  | FVK | ESK |
| NJ | 93 |  | JKN | EFJ |
| NJ | ERN | $\wedge$ | DEV | FCP |
| NJ | GCG | $\wedge$ | GBC | EDP |
| NJ | FFR | $\wedge$ | 46M | DZX |
| NJ | FCL | $\wedge$ | 47A | 9C9 |


| Ramp from 24E to 510W |  |  | 510WB left turn onto Park SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Lane 1 | Lane 2 |
| NY | 7262 | $\wedge$ | G2T | CYX |
| NJ | 79 S | $\wedge$ | 879 | DLP |
| NJ | GLN |  | FGG | 57E |
| NJ | 80E |  | OAH | 795 |
| NJ | CJD |  | 34D | GLN |
| NJ | GAU |  | EVN | CJ8 |
| NJ | ELF |  | GGK | 9BJ |
| NJ | CFB |  | GM D | 4JM |
| NJ | C5S |  | 992 | DKS |
| NJ | 41W | $\wedge$ | 2616 | 3410 |
| NJ | 3410 |  | BFW | DEE |
| NJ | FJW |  | ALZ | DM T |
| NJ | 88R |  | 4552 | FYL |
| NJ | 20P |  | GNF | 253 |
| NJ | DEU |  | 99D | 273 |
| NJ | DKR |  | EB6 | CVM |
| NJ | 4GN |  | AES | FLR |
| NJ | . 5 | $\wedge$ | EAF | 7628 |
| NJ | 53P |  | GGF | 580 |
| MD | 14 U |  | CVR | 23L |
| NJ | 58D | $\wedge$ | GJP | 3LY |
| NJ | 11W | $\wedge$ | CCV | 11W |
| NJ | C5Z | $\wedge$ | 59X | $16 Z$ |
| NJ | BYS |  | 83K | GCF |
| MD | 370 |  | 4DS | 564X |
| NJ | DAH |  | DHF | 95C |
| NJ | 81M |  | GLW | 15P |
| NJ | EAF |  | EVL | 80C |
| NJ | DYV |  | FGR | J1C |
| NJ | 489 |  | FWD | GMJ |
| NJ | GMO | $\wedge$ | BBJ | 5251 |
| NJ | CHD |  | CCS | GGW |
| NJ | GXL | $\wedge$ | FVA | CWM |
| NJ | 997 |  | BHK | GAZ |
| MD | 1470 |  | FKK | DDY |
| NJ | 20 V |  | BXN | VRP |
| NJ | EHM | ^ | BTJ | GHC |
| NJ | E74 |  | DYL | EM 1 |
| NJ | BHW | $\wedge$ | 57N | CEP |
| NJ | ALZ |  | FPM | GEP |
| NJ | 4552 | $\wedge$ | FLD | CCR |
| NJ | GNF | $\wedge$ | DGF | BYV |
| NJ | EBB |  | GAV | DMJ |
| NJ | 99P |  | ELV | 462 |


| Ramp from 24E to 510W |  |  | 510WB left turn onto Park SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Lane 1 | Lane 2 |
| IN |  | $\wedge$ | EBH | FRP |
| NJ | YRP | $\wedge$ | DVG | DNJ |
| NJ | GGF | $\wedge$ | EUA | FYT |
| NJ | 47V | $\wedge$ | 36R | 591K |
| NJ | AES | $\wedge$ | EZF | ETZ |
| NJ | GEF | $\wedge$ | AFG | EEA |
| NY | 395C | $\wedge$ | ENJ | FBM |
| NJ | CVR | $\wedge$ | FBH | GGF |
| NJ | GJR | $\wedge$ | BLC | ERG |
| NJ | 59X |  | FAC | BM X |
| NJ | ETB |  | DLH | BLN |
| NJ | EWS |  | FSC | EPO |
| NJ | CJD | $\wedge$ | SSA | GR9 |
| NJ | ERG |  | 54J | GGL |
| NJ | FYT |  | ESK | GMZ |
| NJ | FMF | $\wedge$ | GTE | 754 |
| NJ | GAF | $\wedge$ | CYC | CCH |
| NJ | GLW | $\wedge$ | 7936 | EWD |
| NJ | EFM | $\wedge$ | FWY | EGP |
| NJ | FWD | $\wedge$ | CLF | EWR |
| NJ | BBJ |  | GJR | EFS |
| NJ | EEA |  | DLS | GEJ |
| NJ | FVA |  | 16R | EWP |
| NJ | GOK |  | F3V | 92 T |
| NJ | GGF |  | 761 | 125 |
| NJ | BHK |  | CED | FXP |
| NJ | BXN |  | J14 | ZBC |
| NJ | AZV |  | 36 V | 335 |
| NJ | FFU |  | 49E | DFA |
| NJ | EPD | $\wedge$ | FBB | 11X |
| NJ | BT] | $\wedge$ | CPY | 17E |
| NJ | DYL |  | DZX | ARJ |
| NJ | 57W | $\wedge$ | CKX | ESR |
| NJ | GHZ | ^ | CYL | 91K |
| NJ | 21 L |  | EWR | DAH |
| NJ | ECD |  | FMF | FVR |
| NJ | GAU |  | 76B | 744 |
| NJ | EVR |  | EUVR | EAX |
| NJ | GEL | $\wedge$ | GGW | CVZ |
| NJ | DVG | $\wedge$ | GRT | 857H |
| MD | 51.. | $\wedge$ |  | CSC |
| NJ | 9SR | ^ |  | DVX |
| NJ | ..7S | $\wedge$ |  | G0B |
| NJ | 7WC | $\wedge$ |  | 69 ) |


| Ramp from 24E to 510W |  |  | 510WB left turn onto Park SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Lane 1 | Lane 2 |
| NJ | AFG |  |  | AJP |
| NJ | CWJ |  |  | EUP |
| NJ | DFA |  |  | EJG |
| NJ | GFE | $\wedge$ |  | FMJ |
| MD | 623 | ヘ |  | 955 |
| PA | 9258 | $\wedge$ |  | ANT |
| NJ | ERN |  |  | CUS |
| NJ | FAC | $\wedge$ |  | FAV |
| NJ | DLH |  |  | DHT |
| NJ | 786 U | $\wedge$ |  | GCN |
| NJ | 99A | ヘ |  | 590 |
| NJ | 4600 | , |  | 8890 |
| NJ | DAH |  |  | GPJ |
| NJ | ESK |  |  | G2N |
| NJ | 41A |  |  | FVB |
| NJ | EYZ |  |  | DMC |
| NJ | PER |  |  |  |
| NJ | AVE |  |  |  |
| NJ | 74 U |  |  |  |
| NJ | FWY |  |  |  |
| NJ | $52 Z$ |  |  |  |
| NJ | AWL |  |  |  |
| NJ | 06J |  |  |  |
| NJ | EAX |  |  |  |
| NJ | 52] |  |  |  |
| NJ | CLF |  |  |  |
| NJ | CVZ |  |  |  |
| NJ | 857H |  |  |  |
| NJ | DLS |  |  |  |
| NJ | 16R | ^ |  |  |
| NJ | 62H |  |  |  |
| NJ | CSL |  |  |  |
| NJ | 1488 |  |  |  |
| NJ | DVX |  |  |  |
| NJ | CED |  |  |  |
| NJ | 31A |  |  |  |
| NJ | 60B |  |  |  |
| NY | 2416 | $\wedge$ |  |  |
| NJ | 47L |  |  |  |
| NJ | FJG | $\wedge$ |  |  |
| NJ | CYL |  |  |  |
| NJ | FWR |  |  |  |
| NJ | ERD | $\wedge$ |  |  |
| NJ | FJB |  |  |  |


|  |  | 510WB left turn onto Park SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ramp from 24E to 510W |  |  |
| Lane 1 |  |  |


| Ramp from 24E to 510W |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| NJ | 41N |
| NJ | 73U |
| NJ | CZY |
| NJ | FEW |
| NJ | DLR |
| NJ | DTN |
| NJ | DZP |
| NJ | DHP |
| NJ | 129B |
| NJ | DTM |
| NJ | 1296 |
| NJ | BJC |
| NJ | 62 U |
| NJ | EEE |
| NJ | 71 C |
| NJ | CLE |
| NJ | DDF |
| NJ | FXR |
| NJ | DM F |
| NJ | 79G |
| NJ | DVR |

510WB left turn onto Park SB
Lane 1
Lane 2

Total volume of ramp count: 275 cars
Total matched: 162 cars
Total \%: 59 \%
*Based on observation, and difficulty in tracking high-volume two-lane left turn movement, assumed percentage increased to $75 \%$.

# Excerpt from Langan traffic report for Honeywell site development 
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## EXECUTIVE SUMIMARY

The Rockefeller Group has retained Langan Engineering and Environmental Services to prepare a traffic impact study for the proposed development of 101 Columbia Road (aka Honeywell Campus), Morris Township, Morris County, New Jersey. The Honeywell campus is currently active and is developed with $1,156,182$ sf of office and research / lab space. The development Plan envisions development of the property to provide 715,000 sf of office/ lab space, 235 residential townhomes, and 185,000 sf of existing office/ lab space that will be retained by Honeywell where approximately 105 Honeywell employees will continue to be employed. The campus is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Columbia Turnpike with Park Avenue. Access to the property is currently provided by two signalized driveways on Columbia Road, a controlled access drive along Park Avenue, and a driveway from Kahn Road which connects with Madison Avenue at a signalized intersection.

The existing 147 acre campus is currently zoned OL-40/PUD which allows for the development of office, lab space, and residential homes. The proposed development provides a mix of uses that reduces the overall existing office/lab space to 900,000 sf and provides for a residential development of 235 homes. We estimated the number of trips the proposed redevelopment would generate based on data compiled for Land Use Code 710 (General Office Building), Land Use Code 760 (Research and Development Center), and Land Use Code 230 (Residential Condominium/Townhouse) by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) as contained in the Trip Generation, $9^{\text {th }}$ edition. We estimated that the development will generate approximately 1088 trips ( 883 enter, 205 exit) during the weekday peak morning hour and 1065 trips (237 enter, 828 exit) during the weekday peak evening hour. It is noted that the existing zoning would permit development of the campus with up to $1,420,927$ sf of office/ lab space which would generate significantly more peak hour traffic than the development program as proposed.

The property is also well situated to take advantage of public transit opportunities. Convent Station, located on the NJ Transit Morristown Line, provides train access to NYC and is located within one mile of the campus. Opportunities exist to provide shuttle service to and from the station for residents and employees within the campus. Based upon data published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, this available transit opportunity coupled with the mixed use design could reduce the peak hour traffic generation of the campus from between $5 \%$ to $15 \%$. This potential transit opportunity has not been factored into the analyses as contained herein.

Access to the campus is proposed to be provided via the two existing traffic signalized roadways from Columbia Road, via an access road from Park Avenue, and via the existing access on Kahn Road connecting to Madison Avenue. A new access road is also proposed connecting to Columbia Road providing access to the residential east area in the northeast quadrant of the campus. The proposed access points are expected to operate acceptably during peak traffic hours.

The proposed access, circulation, and pedestrian connections as depicted on Circulation Plan in the General Development Plan submission are logically developed and will provide safe and efficient access and on-site pedestrian and vehicular circulation.

Overall, the proposed development program is estimated to generate similar traffic as compared to the re-occupancy of the current development on the site with approximately 23 less vehicles entering the site, and 19 more exiting trips leaving the site for a net decrease of 4 vehicles during the weekday morning peak hour and approximately 86 additional entering trips and 27 less exiting trips for a net increase of 59 vehicles during the weekday evening peak hour. While several intersections surrounding the project site experience poor levels of service during the peak hours, given the distribution of traffic resulting from the multiple points of access, no intersection will be significantly impacted by the traffic generated during the peak hours as compared to re-occupancy of the existing site to full utilization.

## MORRIS COUNTY IMPROVEMENTS

The County has identified the need for realigning the ramps for NJ Route 24 eastbound to directly intersect Park Avenue at a proposed signalized intersection approximately 650 feet south of Columbia Turnpike. The new ramp connection would intersect Park Avenue opposite an existing Honeywell driveway. The County concept (Concept Plan B-1) includes two exclusive left-turn lanes westbound, two through lanes southbound, and a through and shared through-right turn lane northbound. These improvements will help divert traffic from the intersection of Park Avenue and Columbia Turnpike, and will alleviate the weave condition that exists on Columbia Turnpike westbound between the NJ Route 24 southbound off ramp and the left turn lanes on Columbia Turnpike westbound to Park Avenue Southbound. While these improvements are not currently programmed or funded, the proposed access improvements and campus circulation have been designed to be consistent with this future improvement to the interchange. In addition, since the construction timeline for these improvements is indeterminate, we have prepared the traffic analyses herein both with these improvements and without these improvements. The prosed redevelopment of the campus does not require, or rely on the completion of these regional improvements.

## IMPROVEMENTS IDENTIFIED IN THE FINAL REGIONAL TRAFFIC STUDY (PREPARED BY THE LOUIS BERGER GROUP)

The Louis Berger Group prepared a "Final Regional Traffic Study" for Morris County dated January 2010 that identified short-term and long-term improvements for key intersections as a result of the future redevelopment of the Former Exxon Research Facility Site. The improvements identified in the study have been modeled in the analyses documented herein. The short-term and long-term improvements identified by the report are as follows:

## Madison Avenue \& Old Glen Road/Kahn Road

Short-Term

- Modify signal timing to decrease overall intersection delay.


## Long-Term

- Widen the northbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane.
- Widen and restripe the eastbound and westbound approaches from two lanes to three lanes: provide a shared through/right-turn auxiliary lane. Restripe receiving lanes, followed by a right lane merge.
- Widen receiving lanes to two lanes, followed by a right lane merge.


## Madison Avenue \& Normandy Parkway

Short-Term

- Modify signal timing to decrease overall intersection delay.
- Modify phasing for the EB left turn lane to protected plus permitted.


## Long-Term

- Provide additional through lane in the westbound direction: restripe the westbound right turn only lane to a shared through/right-turn lane.
- Cut back traffic islands.
- Install "Stop" sign on the southbound free right-turn lane.


## IMPROVEMENTS IDENTIFIED AS A RESULT OF HONEYWELL REDEVELOPMENT

Based upon the analyses as documented herein, improvements are proposed to the Honeywell site driveways as a result of the future redevelopment. The improvements identified for the site access roads are as follows:

## Columbia Road \& East Honeywell Access Road

- Re-align the Access Road to align opposite Normandy Heights Road.
- Restripe the westbound approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane.
- Restripe the eastbound approach and provide an exclusive left-turn lane to Normandy Heights Road.
- Install a new traffic signal.


## Columbia Road \& West Honeywell Access Road

- Update the existing traffic signal.


## Columbia Road \& Residential East Access Road

- Construct an access road from Columbia Road opposite Lohman Road
- Widen and Restripe Columbia Road to provide a separate left turn lane into the Residential East Access Road and into Lohman Road.
- Channelize the Residential East Access Road approach to Columbia Road to allow right turn movements only.


## Park Avenue \& Honeywell Access Road/Route 24 EB On/Off Ramps

- Reconstruct the existing access road to provide channelized right-turn in/out movements only.
- Align the roadway to be compatible with the future Route 24 ramp project by Morris County.


## INTRODUCTION

The Rockefeller Group has retained Langan Engineering and Environmental Services to prepare a traffic impact study for the proposed development of 101 Columbia Road (aka Honeywell Campus) located in Morris Township, New Jersey. The campus is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Columbia Turnpike with Park Avenue and is designated as Block 9101, Lot 4, according to township tax maps. The site location is shown in Figure 1.

The campus is currently developed with $1,156,182$ sf of office and research / lab space which is partially occupied and actively utilized by Honeywell as its corporate headquarters. Access to the property is currently provided by two signalized driveways on Columbia Road, a controlled access drive along Park Avenue, and a driveway from Kahn Road which connects with Madison Avenue at a signalized intersection. The existing 147 acre campus is currently zoned OL40/PUD which allows the development of office, lab space, and residential homes.

## Project Description

The Rockefeller Group proposes to develop the 147 acre campus to provide 715,000 sf of new office space, 235 residential townhomes, and the adaptive re-use of 185,000 sf of office/lab space that will be retained by Honeywell and will be occupied by approximately 105 Honeywell employees.

Access to the campus will be provided via the two existing signalized access roads that intersect Columbia Road supplemented by a new access road from Columbia Road proposed to provide access to the northeastern portion of the campus, via the existing Kahn Road Access road connecting out to Madison Avenue, and via an improved existing access road connecting to Park Avenue located opposite the proposed future County By-Pass ramps to and from NJ Route 24 southbound.

## Study Area

The area surrounding the Honeywell Campus is very diverse in terms of land use with a mix of office, residential, institutional, and recreational land uses. The study area is served by an extensive transportation network including NJ Route 24 and I-287 which accommodates the majority of the regional traffic demands. The secondary road system consists of principal arterials such as Park Avenue, Columbia Road, Columbia Turnpike, and Madison Avenue that provide access to the regions land uses. Finally, the area is supported by mass transit including commuter rail with local stations and bus transit.

In preparing this report, we have reviewed and utilized data as documented in prior available studies as referenced below.

1) Morris Country traffic study prepared by The Louis Berger Group, Inc, dated January 2010.
2) 2027 Transportation Needs Assessment Study for Florham Park, prepared by GreenmanPedersen, Inc. dated December 23, 2007.
3) Traffic Impact Study for the Concept Development Plan: The Green at Florham Park prepared by Stantec dated March 2008.
4) Traffic Impact Study, Concept Development Plan, Honeywell, prepared by Langan Engineering and Environmental Services dated September 10, 2010, revised to November 16, 2011.

These various studies have provided analyses of many of the intersections and roadways surrounding the Honeywell campus.

Based upon a review of the existing traffic studies, an evaluation of the roadway network surrounding the campus, and consideration of the existing and proposed access locations to the campus, the following intersections were identified for analysis within this study:

- Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue
- Columbia Road and East Honeywell Access Road/ Normandy Heights Road
- Columbia Road and West Honeywell Access Road
- Columbia Road and Normandy Parkway/ Normandy Heights Road
- Madison Avenue and Normandy Parkway
- Madison Avenue and Kahn Road/Old Glen Road
- Park Avenue and Honeywell Access Road/ County By-Pass Ramps
- Columbia Road and Residential East Access Road/ Lohman Road


## Scope of Study

To assess the traffic impact associated with the proposed redevelopment plan, Langan has undertaken the following steps:

1. Conducted a field examination of the site and surrounding road network to inventory physical and regulatory conditions including the number of lanes, lane assignments, channelization, traffic-control devices, lateral clearances and other factors that limit traffic capacity.
2. Conducted a series of manual turning movement traffic counts at key study intersections. These manual turning movement traffic counts were undertaken on a typical weekday from 6:00 AM to 9:00 AM and from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM. We then identified existing weekday morning and evening peak hour traffic volumes based on the manual traffic count data.
3. Established future "2023 Base" traffic volume by applying a general growth factor of 0.5 percent to the existing traffic volumes based upon the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA) population and employment growth projection for the region.
4. Identified other planned developments and vacancies in the study area and established "2023 No-Build" traffic volumes.
5. Prepared trip generation estimates for the proposed development program based on accepted trip rates developed by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE).
6. Developed a trip distribution based on existing travel patterns and demographic data.
7. Assigned site-generated trips to the site access roads and surrounding road network based on the likely travel routes motorists will use to travel to and from the site.
8. Established future "2023 Build" traffic volumes by adding site-generated trips to the "2023 No-Build" traffic volumes.
9. Performed intersection capacity analyses for the weekday morning and evening peak hours using methodologies as documented in the Highway Capacity Manual.
10. Reviewed the development plan to assess the adequacy of access, on-site circulation and parking.

## DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

## Roads

## Columbia Road (C.R. 510)

Columbia Road (County Route 510, aka Columbia Turnpike east of Park Avenue) is a principal arterial road under the jurisdiction of Morris County. Along the project frontage, Columbia Road provides two travel lanes per direction with an auxiliary lane provided in the eastbound direction along the project frontage for right turns to and from the existing driveways. Columbia Road has a posted speed limit of 40 mph . Within the project area, land uses consist of the subject property and established residential neighborhoods.

## Park Avenue (C.R. 623)

Park Avenue (County Route 623) is a principal arterial road under the jurisdiction of Morris County. Adjacent to the Honeywell Campus, Park Avenue provides two travel lanes per direction, with a turn lane provided at its intersection with Columbia Turnpike. Park Avenue has a posted speed limit of 45 mph . Land uses along Park Avenue within the project area are primarily commercial.

## Normandy Parkway/Normandy Heights Road

Normandy Parkway/ Normandy Heights Road is a local roadway. This roadway provides one travel lane in each direction. This roadway is named Normandy Parkway south of Columbia Road and Normandy Heights Road north of Columbia Road. Normandy Heights Road is a $U$ shaped roadway with both ends of the roadway intersecting with Columbia Road. Normandy Parkway has a posted speed limit of 40 mph . Land use along this road within the project area is primarily residential. The Morris Museum is located along Normandy Heights Road.

## Madison Avenue (NJ Route 124)

Madison Avenue (NJ Route 124) is a principal arterial road under the jurisdiction of the New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT). In the vicinity of the Honeywell Campus, Madison Avenue provides one travel lane per direction with turn lanes provided at intermittent intersections. Madison Avenue has a posted speed limit of 40 mph . Land uses along Madison Avenue within the project area are primarily commercial and institutional.

## Kahn Road/ Old Glen Road

Kahn Road/Old Glen Road is a local roadway. This roadway provides one travel lane in each direction. This roadway is named Kahn Road northeast of the Madison Avenue intersection and

Old Glen Road southwest of the intersection. Land use along Kahn Road is commercial and there is a mix of commercial and residential land uses along Old Glen Road.

## NJ Route 24

NJ Route 24 is a limited access highway under the jurisdiction of the New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT). Route 24 runs between Interstate 287 in the northwest in a southeasterly direction connecting with Interstate 78. Route 24 provides two travel lanes per direction and has a posted speed limit of 55 mph . In the project area, a full interchange is provided between Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike.

## Intersections

## Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue

The intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue is a signalized, four-way intersection with a cycle length of 112 seconds. The eastbound approach along Columbia Turnpike consists of one exclusive left-turn lane, two through lanes and one exclusive channelized right-turn lane. The westbound approach along Columbia Turnpike consists of two exclusive left-turn lanes, two through lanes and one exclusive channelized right-turn lane. The northbound approach along Park Avenue consists of one exclusive left-turn lane, two through lanes and one exclusive channelized right-turn lane. The southbound approach along Park Avenue consists of two exclusive left-turn lanes, one exclusive through lane and one shared through and right-turn lane with a channelized right located at the intersection.

## Columbia Road and East Honeywell Access Road/ Normandy Heights Road

The intersection of Columbia Road and East Honeywell Access Road/ Normandy Heights Road is a signalized, four-way intersection with a cycle length of 100 seconds. The eastbound approach along Columbia Road consists of one shared left-turn and through lane, one exclusive through lane and one shared through and right-turn lane. The westbound approach along Columbia Road consists of one shared left-turn and through lane and one shared through and right-turn lane. The northbound approach along East Honeywell Access Road consists of one exclusive left-turn lane and one shared through and right-turn lane. The southbound approach along Normandy Heights Road consists of one shared left-turn, through and right-turn lane.

## Columbia Road and West Honeywell Access Road

The intersection of Columbia Road and West Honeywell Access Road is a signalized, "T"intersection with a cycle length of 100 seconds. The eastbound approach along Columbia Road consists of two through lanes and one shared through and right-turn lane. The westbound approach along Columbia Road consists of one shared left-turn and through lane and one
exclusive through lane. The northbound approach along West Honeywell Access Road consists of one shared left-turn and right-turn lane.

## Columbia Road and Normandy Parkway/ Normandy Heights Road

The intersection of Columbia Road and Normandy Parkway/Normandy Heights Road is a signalized, four-way intersection with a cycle length of 100 seconds. The eastbound approach along Columbia Road consists of one shared left-turn and through lane and one shared through and right-turn lane with a channelized right located at the intersection. The westbound approach along Columbia Road consists of one shared left-turn and through lane and one shared through and right-turn lane with a channelized right located at the intersection. The northbound approach along Normandy Parkway consists of one shared left-turn and through lane and one exclusive right-turn lane. The southbound approach along Normandy Heights Road consists of one shared left-turn and through lane and one exclusive right-turn lane.

## Madison Avenue and Normandy Parkway

The intersection of Madison Avenue and Normandy Parkway is a signalized, four-way intersection with a cycle length of 105 seconds. The eastbound approach along Madison Avenue consists of one exclusive left-turn lane and one shared through and right-turn lane. The westbound approach along Madison Avenue consists of one exclusive left-turn lane, one exclusive through lane and one exclusive channelized right-turn lane. The northbound approach along a Private Driveway consists of one shared left-turn, through and right-turn lane. The southbound approach along Normandy Parkway consists of one shared left-turn and through lane and one exclusive right-turn lane.

## Madison Avenue and Kahn Road/ Old Glen Road

The intersection of Madison Avenue and Kahn Road/Old Glen Road is a signalized, four-way intersection with a cycle length of 90 seconds. The eastbound approach along Madison Avenue consists of one exclusive left-turn lane and one shared through and right-turn lane. The westbound approach along Madison Avenue consists of one exclusive left-turn lane and one shared through and right-turn lane. The northbound approach along Old Glen Road consists of one exclusive left-turn lane and one shared through and right-turn lane. The southbound approach along Kahn Road consists of one exclusive left-turn lane and one shared through and right-turn lane.

## Park Avenue and Site Access Road/ County By-Pass Ramps

The future intersection of Park Avenue and Site Access Road/County By-Pass Ramps will be a signalized, four-way intersection with a cycle length of 100 seconds. The eastbound approach
along the Site Access Road will consist of one shared left-turn, through and right-turn lane. The westbound approach along the Country By-Pass Ramps will consist of two exclusive left-turn lanes and one through lane. The northbound approach along Park Avenue will consist of one shared left-turn and through lane, one exclusive through lane, and one exclusive channelized right-turn lane. The southbound approach along Park Avenue will consist of one exclusive through lane and one shared through and right-turn lane.

## Columbia Road and Lohman Road

The intersection of Columbia Road and Lohman Road is a T-shaped unsignalized intersection. The eastbound approach along Columbia Road consists of a shared left-turn and through lane, and two through lanes, which tapers down to one to the east of the intersection. The westbound approach along Columbia Road consists of a shared through and right-turn lane, and one exclusive through lane. The southbound approach along Lohman Road consists of a shared left-turn, through and right-turn lane.

## Kahn Road and Old Turnpike Road

The intersection of Kahn Road and Old Turnpike Road is a four-leg unsignalized intersection. The eastbound approach along Old Turnpike Road consists of a shared left-turn, through and right-turn lane. The westbound approach along Old Turnpike Road consists of a shared leftturn, through and right-turn lane. The northbound approach along Kahn Road consists of a shared left-turn, through and right-turn lane. The southbound approach along Kahn Road consists of a shared left-turn, through and right-turn lane.

## Traffic Volumes

To establish existing traffic conditions on the adjacent road system surrounding the site, manual turning movement traffic counts were conducted during peak periods on a weekday morning and evening at the study intersections. Specifically, manual turning movement counts were conducted on Wednesday, March 5, 2014 from 6:00 AM to 9:00 AM and from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM. Previous traffic count data for the study area intersections was collected on Tuesday, May 25, 2010 and Tuesday, October 4, 2011. This data was correlated with traffic count data documented in the other major regional traffic studies that have been conducted of this area. The data was balanced between intersections as appropriate to establish a representative traffic model of existing 2014 traffic conditions.

The manual traffic counts identify distinct times during the weekday morning and evening when traffic experienced its highest levels. According to the manual traffic count data collected, the weekday morning peak hour was 7:45 AM to 8:45 AM and the weekday evening peak hour was 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM.

Figure 2 illustrates the existing weekday morning and evening peak hour traffic volumes. Summaries of the manual traffic counts are contained in Appendix B.

## ESTIMATE OF FUTURE CONDITIONS

This section of the report covers background traffic growth, other planned developments, sitegenerated trips, trip distribution, and future traffic volumes. We anticipate the proposed development could be completed by the year 2023. Accordingly, we projected traffic volumes to include existing traffic and new traffic created by background growth to derive the 2023 Base traffic volumes. We accounted for trips generated by other planned developments and area vacancies to derive the 2023 Base traffic volumes. We then added site-generated trips based on re-occupancy of the existing development to derive the 2023 No-Build traffic volumes. Further, we then added the proposed development site-generated trips to the 2023 Base traffic volumes to derive the 2023 Build traffic volumes. In preparing the future projections, two scenarios were considered, one without construction of the interchange bypass improvements by Morris County and one with the County improvements.

## Background Traffic Growth

In order to project future 2023 base year traffic volumes, the 2014 existing traffic volumes were increased by a compounded annual growth rate of 0.5 percent. The background general growth pattern is consistent with the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA) population growth projections for the region.

## Other Planned Developments

In addition to general background growth, there are numerous approved developments that have been in development, exist with vacancies, or are to be developed that will influence traffic on the surrounding road network. In preparing the future traffic projections, we have included the traffic associated with these developments on the study area intersections. The following are the developments considered in the No-Build condition:

- Giralda Farms - Buildings One, Three and Four totaling 720,055 sf
- Hamilton Park - 68 room and 15,480 sf conference/meeting space expansion
- Triumph Square Phase I and Phase II-750,000 sf office space
- Park Place - approximately 63,000 sf vacant space in 200-300 Park Place
- Campus Drive - approximately 208,257 sf vacant space in 100-600 Campus Drive
- Green at Florham - 225 room hotel, 100,000 sf Sports Medicine Institute, 430,000 sf of office space, and 425 age restricted units.

Traffic associated with these developments was developed utilizing data published in the prior traffic studies previously noted. The collective traffic from these developments is shown on Figure 3 without the County By-Pass and Figure 4 with the County By-Pass. These volumes were used to develop the 2023 Base traffic volumes shown on Figures 5 and 6.

## No-Build Traffic Volumes

The campus is currently active and is developed with $1,156,182$ sf office/ lab space. Honeywell currently occupies only a portion of the existing square footage. The No-Build condition includes the campus at full re-occupancy. For purposes of the analyses, although the campus is currently used as a corporate headquarters, to be conservative, we have projected the reoccupancy traffic generation based upon the existing campus use being considered a Research and Development Center, which generates less traffic as compared to office uses. Accordingly, Table 1 summarizes the peak hour traffic that is generated by the campus based upon full re-occupancy of the current development space on the site.

Table 1 - Trip Generation Pre-Existing Development Program

| Time Period | In | Out | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weekday Morning Peak Hour | 906 | 186 | 1092 |
| Weekday Evening Peak Hour | 151 | 855 | 1006 |

The 2023 No-Build traffic volumes were derived by adding the re-populated trips, shown on Figure 8, to the 2023 Base traffic volumes. Figures 9 and 10 illustrate the 2023 No-Build weekday morning and evening peak hour volumes without and with the County improvements at Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue, respectively.

## Site-Generated Trips

The General Development Plan envisions development of the property to provide 715,000 sf of office/ lab space, 235 residential townhomes, and 185,000 sf of office/ lab space which will be retained by Honeywell and be occupied by approximately 105 Honeywell employees.

In order to project traffic associated with the existing, proposed, and potential build-out development scenario for the property, data as published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers in the publication Trip Generation, 9th Edition was utilized. Specifically, data contained within Land Use Codes 230 - Residential Condominium/Townhouse, Land Use Code 710 - Office, and Land Use Code 760 - Research and Development Center was utilized to estimate the peak hour traffic associated with the various development scenarios.

Table 2 provides a summary of the peak hour traffic generation associated with the proposed development program. The proposed development provides a mix of uses that reduces the overall existing office/R\&D space on site to 900,000 sf and provides for 235 residential homes. It is noted that for purposes of this traffic analyses, and to be conservative, all of the new
commercial building space ( 715,000 sf) is considered to be occupied as office space even though research/ lab space is a permitted use.. If some of this space were to be occupied for research and lab space uses, lower peak hour traffic generation would be experienced, since trip generation for research/ lab space in less than general office use.

Table 2 - Trip Generation Proposed Development Program

| Land Use Code 715 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Period | In | Out | Total |
| Weekday Morning Peak Hour | 812 | 111 | 923 |
| Weekday Evening Peak Hour | 149 | 730 | 879 |
| Land Use Code 230-Residential Condominium/Townhouse 235 dwelling units |  |  |  |
| Time Period | In | Out | Total |
| Weekday Morning Peak Hour | 17 | 85 | 102 |
| Weekday Evening Peak Hour | 81 | 40 | 121 |
| Land Use Code 760 - Research and Development Center $185 ; 000$ square feet ( 105 employees) |  |  |  |
| Time Period | In | Out | Total |
| Weekday Morning Peak Hour | 54 | 9 | 63 |
| Weekday Evening Peak Hour | 7 | 58 | 65 |
| Total Trips for Entire Site |  |  |  |
| Time Period | In | Out | Total |
| Weekday Morning Peak Hour | 883 | 205 | 1088 |
| Weekday Evening Peak Hour | 237 | 828 | 1065 |

Table 3 provides a comparison of traffic generated by the proposed development program as compared to the pre-existing development. It is noted that the traffic projection for the proposed development program is conservative and does not take into account the inherent reduction in traffic associated with internal interaction of the various uses on site, or the opportunity that the mix of uses creates an opportunity for enhanced transit opportunities for the site. Further, as previously noted, traffic generation estimates for re-occupancy of the existing campus space was projected assuming that the entire campus was a research and development center, while the proposed new commercial space of 715,000 sf was projected assuming that it would be $100 \%$ occupied by office uses. The actual traffic generation from the site may be 5 to 15 percent less than as projected in Table 3 and as used in our analyses.

Table 3 - Trip Generation Comparison
Proposed vs. Pre-Existing

| Time Period |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Out | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weekday Morning Peak Hour | -23 | +19 | -4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday Evening Peak Hour | +86 | -27 | +59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Trip Distribution

We determined the directional distribution of site-generated trips based on existing travel patterns in the study area and demographic data. The directional distribution of site traffic is shown in Table 4 and on figures 7, 11,12,17 and 18.

Table 4 - Trip Distribution

| Road Direction (To and From) | Distribution Percentage |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Madison Avenue (West) | OFFICE | BESIDENTIAL |
| Old Glen Road (South) | $17 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Columbia Turnpike (West) | $6 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Columbia Turnpike (East) | $16 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Park Avenue (North) | $6 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Park Avenue (South) | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Normandy Heights Road (North) | $9 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| NJ Route 24 (Northwest) | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| NJ Route 24 (Southeast) | $21 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Total | $19 \%$ | $17 \%$ |

The arrival/departure distributions associated with each component of the development plan are shown on Figures 11, 12, 17, and 18. The distribution patterns were developed both for the existing roadway network and with the proposed Columbia Turnpike/ Park Avenue By-Pass Ramps. The resultant traffic volume distribution for each component and the aggregate of the development plan are shown on Figures 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, and 22.

## Build Traffic Volumes

The 2023 Build traffic volumes were derived by adding the site-generated trips to the 2023 NoBuild traffic volumes. Figures 23 and 24 illustrate the 2023 Build weekday morning and evening peak hour traffic volumes without and with the County improvements at Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue, respectively.

## ANALYSIS OF TRAFFIC OPERATIONS

This section describes the capacity analysis we conducted to assess traffic operations for the Existing, No-Build and Build conditions. Capacity analysis provides an indication of the adequacy of road facilities to serve traffic demand.

## Level of Service Criteria

Level of Service (LOS) is the term used to denote different operating conditions that occur on a given road segment under various traffic volume demands. LOS is a qualitative measure that considers a number of factors including road geometry, speed, travel delay and freedom to maneuver. LOS designations range from $A$ to $F$ and provide an index of operational qualities of a road segment or an intersection. LOS A represents the best operating conditions; LOS F represents the worst.

LOS designations are reported differently for signalized and unsignalized intersections. For signalized intersections, the analysis considers the operation of all traffic entering the intersection. For unsignalized intersections, the analysis considers the operation of all movements that conflict with other movements, such as main-line left turns and traffic exiting a side street. The evaluation criteria used to analyze the study area intersections are based on the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), published by the Transportation Research Board and the latest version of the Highway Capacity Software (HCS).

The HCM defines LOS for signalized intersections as follows:

| LOS | Control Delay per Vehicle |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $<10 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| B | $\geq 10$ and $\leq 20 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| C | $\geq 20$ and $\leq 35 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| D | $\geq 35$ and $\leq 55 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| E | $\geq 55$ and $\leq 80 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| F | $>80 \mathrm{sec}$ |

The HCM defines LOS for unsignalized intersections as follows:

| $\frac{\text { LOS }}{\text { A }}$ | Delay Range (sec/veh) |
| :---: | :---: |
| B | $\geq 10 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| C | $\geq 10$ and $\leq 15 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| D | $\geq 25$ and $\leq 25 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| E | $\geq 35$ and $\leq 50 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| F | $>50 \mathrm{sec}$ |

## Capacity Analysis

Capacity analyses for the key intersections in the study area were conducted. Overall, the analyses show that the proposed development will not significantly impact operations in the study area during peak hours as compared to full re-occupancy of the existing facilities on the campus. Moreover, the proposed campus access points will operate acceptably during peak hours.

Tables 5 and 6 present a summary of the capacity analyses for the weekday morning and evening peak hours. Table 5 summarizes the results of our analyses for the existing condition, and the future 2023 No-Build traffic condition both without and with the county by-pass improvements at Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue. Table 6 summarizes the projected 2023 Build Condition. The scenarios analyzed include 2023 Build for the existing roadway network; 2023 Build with the county by-pass ramps assumed as constructed; 2023 Build with signal timing optimization at each of the study locations; and finally, 2023 Build with the long term intersection improvements identified within the January 2010 Morris County regional traffic study.

Morris County is pursuing improvements to the Columbia Turnpike/ Route 24/ Park Avenue interchange which will provide a by-pass of the Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue intersection for traffic traveling to and from Park Avenue arriving from the north on Route 24 and departing to the south on Route 24. The improvements being considered are shown on the attached Exhibit B-1. The flyover concept is the preferred scheme for several reasons including the desire to avoid an additional signal on Columbia Turnpike, and Utility conflicts. Scheme B-1 is estimated to cost $\$ 10,000,000$. No funding source has been identified or committed for construction. The interchange will fall under NJDOT jurisdiction, and will require NJDOT approvals. While the redevelopment plan does not rely on the construction of these improvements by others, the proposed access and circulation elements have been designed to be consistent with these improvements by others in the future.

In preparing our analyses, since funding for construction is not committed, we have evaluated two scenarios, one scenario based upon the existing roadway network, and the second scenario based upon the proposed implementation of the county preferred scheme.

## Table 5 - Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary - Existing and No-Build

| LOcATION | MOVEMENT |  | 2014 EXISTING |  | 2023 NO BUILD WITHOUTBYEPASS |  | 2023 NO-BUILD WITH BYEPASSROAD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM | PM ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | AM | PM | AM | 8M |
| SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Columbia Turnpike \& Park Avenue | EB | L | E(55.3) | D(54.9) | E(56.4) | E(57.8) | E(56.4) | E(55.6) |
|  |  | T | F(100.6) | D(51.8) | F(241.2) | F(143.3) | F(241.2) | F(118.2) |
|  |  | R | C(30.5) | B(16.9) | C(35.2) | B(18.7) | C(35.2) | B(17.2) |
|  | WB | L | E(71.2) | D(45.3) | F(363.0) | E(59.0) | F(80.4) | D(46.2) |
|  |  | T | C(24.6) | C(29.7) | C(32.1) | D(41.1) | C(32.1) | D(48.5) |
|  |  | R | A(8.3) | B(15.6) | A(8.7) | B(19.4) | A(8.7) | C(20.4) |
|  | NB | L | E(56.5) | E(68.1) | E(56.8) | F(170.8) | E (56.8) | F (147.1) |
|  |  | T | E(60.0) | F(138.3) | E(71.9) | F(247.4) | E(71.9) | F(208.9) |
|  |  | R | B(18.9) | C(24.3) | C(21.3) | D(45.2) | B(19.3) | C(24.8) |
|  | SB | L | D(52.1) | D(50.6) | E(56.1) | D(54.4) | E(56.1) | D(51.8) |
|  |  | T,R | F(186.8) | D(52.6) | F(420.2) | E(71.6) | F(420.2) | E(63.7) |
|  | OVERALL |  | E(78.2) | D(51.8) | F(200.3) | F(91.1) | F(145.7) | F(83.0) |
| Columbia Turnpike \& East Honeywell Access Road | EB | L, T, R | A(1.7) | A(2.9) | A(3.1) | B(11.0) |  |  |
|  | WB |  | A(3.3) | A(3.6) | C(23.1) | B(10.7) |  |  |
|  |  | T,R |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NB | L | D(41.0) | D(51.6) | $\mathrm{D}(49.7)$ | D(53.5) |  |  |
|  |  | T,R | A(0.2) | B(17.9) | A(0.7) | A(9.4) |  |  |
|  | SB | L, T, R | $\mathrm{D}(48.2)$ | D(38.8) | A(1.6) | A(0.2) |  |  |
|  | OVERALL |  | A(3.2) | A(5.1) | B(12.5) | B(12.5) |  |  |
|  <br> West Honeywell Access Road | EB | T,R | A(0.7) | A(3.2) | A(2.8) | A(9.0) |  |  |
|  | WB | L, T | A(0.9) | A(4.7) | A(5.6) | C(21.3) |  |  |
|  | NB | L,R | D(35.9) | D(36.9) | C(31.7) | D(41.4) |  |  |
|  | OVERALL |  | A(0.9) | A(5.9) | A(4.7) | B(19.6) |  |  |
| Columbia Turnpike \& Normandy Parkway/ Normandy Heights Road | EB | L, T, R | D(45.9) | D(35.7) | F(186.3) | D(37.5) |  |  |
|  | WB | L, T, R | D(35.3) | D(39.8) | D(38.2) | F(178.8) |  |  |
|  | NB | L, T | D(36.2) | D(41.6) | D(39.6) | D(43.2) |  |  |
|  |  | R | A(7.2) | A(8.9) | A(7.2) | A(9.0) |  |  |
|  | SB | L, T | D(51.8) | D(39.0) | E(62.6) | $\mathrm{D}(41.6)$ |  |  |
|  |  | R | C(29.3) | C(30.2) | C(30.4) | C(30.7) |  |  |
|  | OVERALL. |  | $\mathrm{D}(38.6)$ | C(34.9) | F(103.9) | F(113.8) |  |  |
| Madison Avenue \& Normandy Parkway | EB | L | D(52.7) | F(170.2) | D(53.9) | F(217.3) |  |  |
|  |  | T,R | B(17.8) | A(9.3) | $\mathrm{F}(120.6)$ | B(12.1) |  |  |
|  | WB | L | D(47.8) | N/A | D(47.8) | N/A |  |  |
|  |  | T | D(41.2) | F(88.1) | F(90.2) | F(370.7) |  |  |
|  |  | R | A(4.2) | A(3.0) | A(4.2) | A(5.2) |  |  |
|  | NB | L,T,R | A(0.0) | C(32.3) | A(0.0) | C(32.2) |  |  |
|  | SB | L, T | F(92.6) | E(72.4) | F(119.0) | E(75.5) |  |  |
|  |  | R | A(0.6) | A(0.5) | A(0.7) | A(0.7) |  |  |
|  | OVERALL |  | C(30.5) | E(59.5) | F(82.5) | F(175.3) |  |  |

Table 5 cont'd - Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary - Existing and No-Build

| LOCATION | MOVEMENT |  | $2014$ | STING | 2023N WITHOU | -BUILD TBYPPASS | 2023 <br> WITH B | BUILD <br> ASSROAD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | - AMM |  | (2) AM ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5 PM ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | AM | PM |
| Madison Avenue \& Kahn Road/Old Glen Road | EB | L | A(6.2) | A(4.0) | $\mathrm{B}(15.8)$ | $\mathrm{C}(27.9)$ |  |  |
|  |  | T, R | $\mathrm{B}(15.3)$ | A(6.8) | F(158.6) | B(13.2) |  |  |
|  | WB | L | A(7.3) | A(4.7) | $\mathrm{C}(22.3)$ | A(9.9) |  |  |
|  |  | T,R | A(8.0) | A(8.2) | B(13.2) | E(75.1) |  |  |
|  | NB | L | C(34.7) | D(45.2) | C(30.4) | D(43.7) |  |  |
|  |  | T,R | C(32.1) | B(14.6) | E(50.5) | B(13.8) |  |  |
|  | SB | L. | C(33.0) | C(34.7) | C(33.2) | C(30.8) |  |  |
|  |  | T, R | B(14.7) | C(31.7) | B(13.3) | D(42.5) |  |  |
|  | OVERALL |  | B(15.3) | B(10.5) | F(93.8) | D(47.8) |  |  |
|  <br> Site Access Road/Route 24 <br> East <br> On/Off Ramps | WB | L |  |  |  |  | D(42.1) | C(34.1) |
|  | NB | L, T |  |  |  |  | A(7.5) | $B(10.0)$ |
|  |  | R |  |  |  |  | A(0.1) | $\mathrm{A}(0.6)$ |
|  | SB | T,R |  |  |  |  | D(48.3) | A(5.6) |
|  | OVERALL |  |  |  |  |  | D(36.4) | A(9.1) |
|  |  | UNS | GNALIZE | RSECTIO |  |  | $4$ | 2ix |
| Columbia Road \& Lohman Road | EB | L | A(9.9) | $\mathrm{B}(11.2)$ | $\mathrm{B}(12.3)$ | $\mathrm{B}(13.6)$ |  |  |
|  |  | T | $\mathrm{A}(0.0)$ | A(0.0) | A(0.1) | A(0.1) |  |  |
|  | SB | L,R | B(13.2) | C(17.8) | C(18.9) | D(26.3) |  |  |
| Kahn Road \& Old Turnpike Road | EB | L,T,R | A(7.3) | A(7.4) | A(7.7) | A(7.9) |  |  |
|  | WB | L,T,R | A(7.4) | A(8.8) | A(7.9) | A(9.9) |  |  |
|  | NB | L,T,R | A(7.4) | A(7.2) | A(8.6) | A(8.0) |  |  |
|  | SB | L,T,R | A(7.1) | A(7.9) | A(7.5) | A(9.4) |  |  |

Table 6 - Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary - Build

| Location | MOVEMENT: |  | 2023 BUILD WITHOUT BYPASS ROAD |  | 2023 BUILD WITHBYPASS ROAD AND FULL ACCESS ROAD |  | 2023 BUILD WITH OPTIMIZED TIMING Modifications |  | 2023 BUILD WITH IMPR. IDENTIFIED IN REGIONALREPORT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | TPM | AME | PM |
| $2$ |  |  | 9 | SIGNALIZ | INTER | ONS |  |  | 580 |  |
| Columbia <br>  <br> Park Avenue | EB | L | E(56.5) | E(57.8) | E(56.4) | E(55.7) | E(63.5) | F(80.0) |  |  |
|  |  | T | F(247.9) | F(140.2) | F(229.9) | E(75.5) | F(170.4) | E(69.2) |  |  |
|  |  | R | C(34.7) | B(17.9) | C(34.7) | B(16.7) | D(46.1) | B(13.1) |  |  |
|  | WB | L | F(364.4) | E (62.0) | F(81.0) | D(46.4) | F(147.3) | E(69.9) |  |  |
|  |  | T | C(31.9) | D(42.2) | C (28.2) | D(45.8) | C(28.2) | D(49.8) |  |  |
|  |  | R | A(8.7) | B(19.4) | A(8.7) | C(20.3) | A(9.9) | C(26.9) |  |  |
|  | NB | L | E(57.5) | F(169.4) | E (57.5) | F(147.5) | F(246.5) | E(70.2) |  |  |
|  |  | T | E(71.9) | F(247.4) | E (71.9) | F(208.4) | D(49.8) | E(55.1) |  |  |
|  |  | R | C(21.3) | D(45.2) | B(19.3) | C(24.7) | B(19.1) | C(21.7) |  |  |
|  | SB | L. | E(56.1) | D(54.4) | E (56.1) | D(52.0) | E(78.2) | F(95.9) |  |  |
|  |  | T,R | F(410.5) | E (73.8) | F(409.7) | E(64.7) | F(134.6) | E(67.8) |  |  |
|  | OVERALL |  | F(200.9) | F(91.4) | F (145.2) | E(75.4) | F(102.9) | E(54.7) |  |  |
| Columbia <br>  <br> East Honeywell <br> Access Road | EB | L,T,R | B(12.8) | B(16.6) | A(9.9) | B(14.5) | B(10.7) | A(7.9) |  |  |
|  | WB | L | C(28.8) | A(6.0) | $\mathrm{B}(13.5)$ | A(5.1) | B(8.1) | A(4.8) |  |  |
|  |  | T,R | A(3.4) | A(7.5) | A(3.2) | A(7.3) | A(3.2) | A(7.3) |  |  |
|  | NB | L | $\mathrm{D}(51.8)$ | D(53.4) | D(51.8) | D(54.2) | D(51.8) | D(54.2) |  |  |
|  |  | T,R | A(0.5) | A(5.0) | A(0.3) | A(1.3) | A(0.3) | A(2.6) |  |  |
|  | SB | L, T, R | A(1.3) | A(0.2) | A(1.3) | A(0.2) | A(1.3) | A(0.2) |  |  |
|  | OVERALL |  | $\mathrm{B}(10.6)$ | $\mathrm{B}(12.8)$ | A(8.1) | $\mathrm{B}(11.9)$ | A(8.3) | A(9.4) |  |  |
| Columbia <br> Turnpike \& West Honeywell Access Road | EB | T,R | A(2.6) | A(8.3) | A(2.2) | A(7.3) | A(2.2) | A(6.9) |  |  |
|  | WB | L, T | B(11.3) | C(23.9) | A(6.8) | B(19.3) | A(7.3) | B(13.3) |  |  |
|  | NB | L,R | C(32.4) | D(42.1) | D(34.7) | D(43.7) | D(34.7) | D(48.1) |  |  |
|  | OVERALL |  | A(6.6) | C(20.5) | A(4.5) | B(17.4) | A(4.7) | B(14.4) |  |  |
| Columbia <br>  <br> Normandy <br> Parkway/ <br> Normandy <br> Heights Road | EB | L,T,R | F(190.3) | D(38.6) |  |  | E(61.7) | E(57.2) |  |  |
|  | WB | L,T,R | D(38.5) | F(181.5) |  |  | E(76.8) | E(70.8) |  |  |
|  | NB | L, T | D(44.4) | D(44.0) |  |  | E(59.5) | E (68.9) |  |  |
|  |  | R | A(7.1) | A(8.9) |  |  | A(7.7) | B(11.2) |  |  |
|  | SB | L, T | E(65.6) | D(41.5) |  |  | F(93.5) | E(79.2) |  |  |
|  |  | R | C(30.3) | C(30.7) |  |  | C(32.1) | D(36.8) |  |  |
|  | OVERALL |  | F(106.0) | F(114.2) |  |  | E(64.1) | E(61.0) |  |  |
| Madison Avenue \& Normandy Parkway | EB | L | D(53.8) | F(232.4) |  |  | E(78.5) | F(360.2) | C(22.3) | F(128.9) |
|  |  | T,R | F(119.2) | B(12.3) |  |  | F(82.5) | A(7.3) | F(119.2) | B (12.3) |
|  | WB | L | D(47.8) | N/A |  |  | D(47.8) | N/A | D(47.8) | N/A |
|  |  | T | F(88.0) | F(367.7) |  |  | D(39.6) | F(223.4) | C(24.8) | E(72.5) |
|  |  | R | A(4.2) | A(5.1) |  |  | A(2.8) | A(2.0) |  |  |
|  | NB | L,T,R | A(0.0) | C(32.2) |  |  | A(0.0) | D(48.2) | A(0.0) | C(32.2) |
|  | SB | L, T | F(121.9) | F(80.9) |  |  | F(237.5) | F(280.3) | F(121.9) | F(80.9) |
|  |  | R | A(0.7) | A(0.7) |  |  | A(0.7) | A(0.7) | $\mathrm{A}(0.7)$ | A(0.7) |
|  | OVERALL |  | F(81.6) | F(175.7) |  |  | E(69.3) | F(146.8) | E(66.4) | D(55.0) |

Table 6 cont'd - Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary - Build

| LOCATION | MOVEMENT |  | 2023 <br> WITHOU <br> RO | UILD BYPASS D | $\begin{aligned} & 2023 \\ & \text { WIH By } \\ & \text { AND FU } \end{aligned}$ | UILD <br> ISS ROAD ACCESS <br> AD | 2023 B OPTIMIZ MODIF | LDWITH <br> DTIMING CATIONS | $\begin{aligned} & 2023 \mathrm{BUI} \\ & \text { MPR. ID } \\ & \text { INREG } \\ & \text { RER } \end{aligned}$ | D WITH <br> NTIFIED ONAL <br> RT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM. | PM | AM | PM |
| Madison Avenue \& Kahn Road/Old Glen Road | EB | L | B(15.2) | D(46.2) |  |  | A(7.3) | D(41.6) | A(6.8) | A(7.2) |
|  |  | T,R | F(157.9) | B(13.1) |  |  | F(95.9) | A(9.7) | B(13.4) | B(12.2) |
|  | WB | L | C(22.2) | B(9.8) |  |  | $\mathrm{B}(17.9)$ | A(6.5) | A(6.2) | A(6.3) |
|  |  | T,R | B(13.1) | E (75.2) |  |  | A(7.6) | D(53.0) | B(11.5) | B(14.8) |
|  | NB | L | C(30.5) | D(43.2) |  |  | D(41.7) | D(54.7) | C(33.7) | D(46.0) |
|  |  | T, R | D(50.1) | B(13.8) |  |  | F(137.8) | B(16.7) | D(40.8) | B(13.5) |
|  | SB | L | C(31.9) | C(30.7) |  |  | D(40.4) | D(36.1) | D(35.1) | C(30.4) |
|  |  | T,R | B(12.1) | D(42.1) |  |  | B(16.4) | E(56.3) | B(13.2) | D(35.5) |
|  | OVERALL. |  | F(93.4) | D(48.0) |  |  | E(68.7) | D(37.3) | B(15.9) | B(16.2) |
| Park Avenue \& Site Access Road/ Route 24 East On/Off Ramps | EB | L,T,R |  |  | D(49.6) | E(64.9) | D(49.9) | E(64.9) |  |  |
|  | WB | L |  |  | D(51.4) | E(56.0) | D(51.4) | E(56.0) |  |  |
|  |  | T |  |  | D(39.7) | D(45.3) | D(39.7) | D(45.3) |  |  |
|  | NB | L, T |  |  | $\mathrm{B}(10.2)$ | C(20.9) | B(10.2) | C(20.9) |  |  |
|  |  | R |  |  | A(0.1) | A(0.6) | A(0.1) | A(0.6) |  |  |
|  | SB | T,R |  |  | E (76.3) | B(10.8) | E (76.3) | B(10.8) |  |  |
|  | OVERALL |  |  |  | D(54.0) | C(20.0) | D(54.0) | C(20.0) |  |  |
|  | EB L $\mathrm{B}(12.2)$ $\mathrm{B}(13.7)$ $\mathrm{B}(11.1)$ $\mathrm{B}(13.4)$ |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
| Columbia Road \& Lohman Road/ Proposed Site Access Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ |  |
|  | WB | L | B(13.8) | B(11.9) | B(13.6) | B(11.2) |  |  |  |  |
|  | NB | R | C(16.8) | B(14.0) | C(16.3) | B(13.2) |  |  |  |  |
|  | SB | L,T,R | D (28.0) | E(48.9) | C(22.2) | C(21.4) |  |  |  |  |
| Park Avenue \& Site Access Road | EB | R | $\mathrm{E}(41.2)$ | C(15.0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kahn Road \& Old Turnpike Road | EB | L,T,R | A(7.7) | A(8.0) | A(7.6) | A(8.0) |  |  |  |  |
|  | WB | L,T,R | A(7.9) | B(10.0) | A(7.9) | A(9.9) |  |  |  |  |
|  | NB | L,T,R | A(8.7) | A(8.2) | A(8.6) | A(8.2) |  |  |  |  |
|  | SB | L,T,R | A(7.5) | A(9.3) | A(7.5) | A(9.3) |  |  |  |  |

## Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue

## Without By-Pass

Under the No-Build condition, with re-occupancy of the existing campus the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS F during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours. Under the Build condition, the intersection is expected to continue to operate at an overall LOS F, but with a lower delay than the No-Build condition during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours.

## With By-Pass

Under the No-Build condition, with re-occupancy of the existing campus the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS F during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours. With the construction of the county by-pass the westbound left and northbound right movements are expected to operate at improved levels of service from the No-Build condition without the proposed improvement. Under the Build condition, the intersection is expected to continue to operate at an overall LOS F, but with a lower delay than the No-Build condition during the weekday morning peak hour. During the weekday evening peak hour the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS E, under the Build condition.

The by-pass ramps significantly improve the operation of the intersection, and provide an opportunity to optimize the traffic signal operation. With optimization, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS F and LOS E during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, respectively, with a significant decrease in the overall delay.

## Columbia Turnpike and East Honeywell Access Road/Normandy Heights Road

It is proposed to improve the lane geometry at the intersection by minor widening and restriping along the campus frontage to provide a separate left turn on the westbound and eastbound approaches, and re-alignment of the east access road to align with Normandy Heights Road. The provision for the left turn lanes will improve the intersection safety by separating left turning traffic from the through movement lanes, and will increase the capacity of the eastbound/westbound through movements.

## Without By-Pass

Under the No-Build condition, with re-occupancy of the existing campus the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS B during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours. Under the Build condition, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS B during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours.

## With By-Pass

Under the No-Build condition, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS B during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours. Under the Build condition, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS A and LOS B during the weekday morning and evening peak hour, respectively.

The by-pass ramps and proposed improvements effect the overall operation of the intersection, and provide an opportunity to optimize the traffic signal operation. With optimization, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS A during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours.

## Columbia Turnpike and West Honeywell Access Road

## Without By-Pass

Under the No-Build condition, with re-occupancy of the existing campus the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS A and LOS B during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, respectively. Under the Build condition, the intersection is expected to continue to operate at an overall LOS A and LOS C during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, respectively.

## With By-Pass

Under the No-Build condition, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS A and LOS B during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, respectively. Under the Build condition, the intersection is expected to continue to operate at an overall LOS A and LOS B during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, respectively.

The by-pass ramps effect the overall operation of the intersection, and provide an opportunity to optimize the traffic signal operation. With optimization, the intersection is expected to continue to operate at the same levels of service during both peak hours.

## Columbia Turnpike and Normandy Parkway/ Normandy Heights Road

Under the No-Build condition, with re-occupancy of the existing campus the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS F during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours. Under the Build condition, the intersection is expected to continue to operate at an overall LOS F during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours, but will operate with a lower overall delay.

Improvements to the intersection could be done through optimization of the traffic signal operation. With optimization, the intersection is expected to improve and operate at an overall LOS E during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours.

## Madison Avenue and Normandy Parkway

Under the No-Build condition, with re-occupancy of the existing campus the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS F during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours. Under the Build condition, the intersection is expected to continue to operate at an overall LOS F during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours, but will operate with a lower overall delay.

Improvements to the intersection could be done through optimization of the traffic signal operation. With optimization, the intersection is expected to improve to operate at an overall LOS E during the weekday morning peak hour. During the weekday evening peak hour the intersection is expected to continue to operate at an overall LOS F, but with a significant decrease in the overall delay.

Consistent with the findings of the January 2010 county study, this intersection will experience increased delays in the future. The long term improvements identified in the county study will alleviate the projected future intersection operation. Under the improvement from the study, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS E and LOS D during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, respectively.

## Madison Avenue and Kahn Road/ Old Glen Road

Under the No-Build condition, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS F and LOS D during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, respectively. Under the Build condition, the intersection is expected to continue to operate at an overall LOS F and LOS D during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, respectively, but with a lower overall delay than the No-Build condition.

Improvements to the intersection could be done through optimization of the traffic signal operation. With optimization, the intersection is expected to improve to operate at an overall LOS E and LOS D during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, respectively.

Consistent with the findings of the January 2010 county study, this intersection will experience increased delays in the future. The long term improvements identified in the county study will alleviate the projected future intersection operation and improve the overall operation of the intersection to LOS B during both the peak hours.

## Park Avenue and Site Access Road/ County By-Pass Ramps

The county is pursuing improvements to the Columbia Turnpike/ Route 24/ Park Avenue interchange. These improvements will result in the construction of a new signalized intersection opposite the Honeywell Park Avenue access road. Associated with the development of the campus, and construction of this new signal, it is proposed to provide a full access connection at this location opposite the new ramp termini. The access road at this location will reduce the amount of new traffic that will travel through the Columbia Turnpike/Park Avenue intersection during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours.

Associated with the construction of the new ramp terminal, it is recommended that the following improvements be implemented:

- Open the driveway to provide full access onto Park Avenue.
- Design the westbound ramp approach to provide a through lane in addition to the proposed two exclusive left turn lanes.
- Design the northbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane to the ramp.
- Design the signal operation to provide split phases for the eastbound and westbound approaches.
- Construct the eastbound exit approach from the Honeywell Campus to provide one lane.


## Without By-Pass

Under the Build condition, the unsignalized right turn in/out intersection is expected to operate at LOS E or better during the weekday morning peak hour and LOS C or better during the weekday evening peak hour.

## With By-Pass

Under the No-Build condition, the signalized intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS D during the weekday morning peak hour and LOS A during the weekday evening peak hour. Under the Build condition, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS D and LOS C during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, respectively.

## Columbia Road and Lohman Road/ Proposed Residential East Street

Access to the residential east district of the project is to be provided via a street that is proposed to intersect Columbia Road directly across from Lohman Road. It is proposed to widen and restripe Columbia Road to provide an exclusive left turn lane on both the westbound and eastbound direction, and continue to provide two through lanes in each direction on the Columbia Road approaches as well. The new street will be designed to restrict left turns out
and provide a channelized right turn lane. No changes are proposed for the southbound Lohman Road approach.

## Without By-Pass

Under the No-Build condition, all movements at the unsignalized intersection are expected to operate at LOS C or better during the weekday morning peak hour and LOS D or better during the weekday evening peak hour. Under the Build condition, all movements are expected to operate at LOS D or better in both the weekday morning and evening peak hours, with the exception of the southbound movement which is expected to operate at an LOS E during the weekday evening peak hour.

## With By-Pass

Under the No-Build condition, all movements at the unsignalized intersection are expected to operate at LOS C or better during the weekday morning peak hour and LOS D or better during the weekday evening peak hour. Under the Build condition, all movements are expected to operate at LOS C or better during both the weekday morning and evening peak hour.

## Kahn Road and Old Turnpike Road

## Without By-Pass

Under the No-Build condition, all movements at the unsignalized intersection are expected to operate at LOS A during both the weekday morning peak hour and evening peak hours. Under the Build condition, all movements are expected to operate at LOS A during the weekday morning peak hour and LOS B or better during the weekday evening peak hour.

## With By-Pass

Under the No-Build condition, all movements at the unsignalized intersection are expected to operate at LOS A during both the weekday morning peak hour and evening peak hours. Under the Build condition, all movements are expected to operate at LOS A during both the weekday morning evening peak hours.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the analyses as contained herein, it is determined that the proposed development will provide a mix of uses that reduces the overall office/lab space to 900,000 sf from the preexisting $1,156,182$ sf and provides for a residential development of 235 townhomes which will generate a level of traffic that is similar to the level of traffic generated by the existing campus upon full re-occupancy during both the weekday morning and evening peak hours. For purposes of this traffic impact study, when evaluating the pre-existing traffic impacts from the existing campus, the existing space was assumed to be fully utilized as a research and development center which generates lower traffic volumes than office and corporate office uses. It is noted that the existing campus is currently utilized by Honeywell as its Global Corporate Headquarters and for research and development activities. Further, the traffic projections for the new commercial space of 715,000 sf was assumed to be fully occupied by office users even though it is possible that some of the space may be occupied by research/ lab users which has a lower traffic generation as compared to office space use. Based upon our analyses, we have determined that the proposed development program traffic generation, even with the conservative traffic generation estimates described above, will be essentially the same as the traffic generation from the site if the existing campus space was re-occupied.

Based upon the traffic analyses as documented herein, it is concluded that the project will not significantly impact operations in the study area during peak hours as compared to the prior occupancy traffic generation from the campus. Moreover, the proposed site access roads will be improved and will operate acceptably during the peak hours.

The proposed site access roadways and internal circulation system as depicted on the General Development Circulation Plan will provide for safe and efficient access and on-site circulation.

[^1]
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## Traffic signal plans and timing





Revised June 15, 1999
NOTES:

1. THE CONTROLLER IS ON A 48-112 SECOND VARIABLE CYCLE.
2. VEHICLE INTERVAL IS TO BE 2 SECONDS.
3. MANUAL CONTROL IS TO BE OMITTED FROM THE CONTROLLER CABINET.
4. THE MEMORY CIRCUIT FOR THE LOOP DETECTORS IS TO BE DISCONNECTED
5. PEDESTRIAN ACTUATION IS TO PROVIDE A MINIMUM GREEN OF 18 SECONDS FOR PHASES $2 / 6$ AND 4/8
6. CONTROLLER SHALL REST IN PHASE $2 / 6$.
7. THE CONTROLLER SHALL HAVE THE CAPABILITY OF SKIPPING PHASE $1 / 5$ OR $3 / 7$ OR BOTH; SHALL PERMIT EITHER LEFT TURN MOVEMENT TO OCCUR OR TERMINATE WITHOUT THE OTHER AND ALLOW NON-CONFLICTING MOVEMENTS ON PARK AVENUE AND COLUMBIA TURNPIKE TO OCCUR; SHALL HAVE A DUAL MAXIMUM SETTING FOR EACH ACTUATED PHASE.
8. SCHEDULE I TIMING IS TO OCCUR FROM 5 AM TO 11 AM AND SCHEDULE II TIMING IS TO OCCUR AT ALL OTHER TIMES.
9. DURING SCHEDULE I, THE MAXIMUM LENGTH OF GREEN ARROW FOR SIGNALS 22 AND 24 IS TO BE 11 SECONDS.
10. DURING SCHEDULE II, THE MAXIMUM LENGTH OF GREEN ARROW FOR SIGNALS 21 AND 23 IS TO BE 12 SECONDS.
11. ALL SIGNALS WITH RIGHT TURN ARROWS (\#5-8, 17-20,30) ARE TO HAVE THEIR GREEN ARROWS TERMINATED CONCURRENTLY WITH THEIR CORRESPONDING OVERLAPPING LEFT TURN SIGNALS. A CONFLICT MONITOR IS TO BE MAINTAINED TO ENSURE THIS.

# State nt Axem Jerxey 

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
P.O.Box 600

Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0600

James Weinstein
Commissioner
AUTHORIZATION TO REVISE-Traffic Signal Columbia Tpk \& Park Ave Hanover \& Morris Twps. Morris County

March 5, 1999
Stephen W. Hammond, P.E.
Supervising Engineer
Admn. \& Records Bldg. - PO Box 900
Morristown, NJ 07963-0900
Dear Mr. Hammond:
This is in reference to your letter dated February 10, 1999, wherein you forwarded revised plans for the existing traffic control signal currently proposed for reconstruction at the above captioned intersection.

Submitted with the letter was your certification that the revisions are in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Therefore, authorization is hereby issued to proceed with the installation of the revised traffic signal layout and operation at the subject intersection in accordance with the enclosed Plan LTS-4695 bearing the latest revision date of February 18, 1999 and timing schedule most recently revised on November 23, 1998.

When you have completed the revisions to the traffic signal installation, you should then submit a certification with a Professional Engineer's Seal that the installation has been completed in accordance with the authorized design and has been inspected to ensure such conformance. At that point, the Commissioner's approval will be granted.

Sincerely,


William E. Anderson
Manager, Bureau of Traffic Engineering and Safety Programs


Enclosures

## Appendix " H "

## Aerial Plan and Photographs

## PROJECT LOCATION




Photo 1 - View of Columbia Turnpike/Park Avenue Interchange from West Approach.


Photo 2 - View of Columbia Turnpike/Park Avenue Interchange from East Approach.

## Improvements at Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange



Photo 3 - View of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue Interchange from MetLife parking lot (NE Quadrant).


Photo 4 - View of Columbia Turnpike WB from the intersection at Park Avenue.


Photo 5 - Vehicles cutting across lanes of traffic from Route 24 EB Ramp to Columbia Turnpike.


Photo 6 - Vehicles queued up to make the left onto Park Avenue SB.


Photo 7 - Vehicles queued up on Columbia Turnpike WB, the majority of which are turning left onto Park Avenue SB.


Photo 8 - Vehicles queued up on Columbia Turnpike EB bound for Route 24 and beyond.


Photo 9 - Driveway for Hyatt House from Park Avenue to be revoked.


Photo 10 - Vehicle queues on Park Avenue NB.

## Appendix "I"

## Straight Line Diagrams




SRI =14000623__ Date last inventoried: May 2011


| Street Name |
| ---: |
| Jurisdiction |
| Functional Class |
| Federal Aid - NHS Sy |
| Control Section |
| Speed Limit |
| Number of Lanes |
| Med. Type |
| Med. Width |
| Pavement |
| Shoulder |
| Traffic Volume |
| Traffic Sta. ID |
| Structure No. |
| Enlarged Views |

SRI = 14000623__ Date last inventoried: May 2011

## Appendix " J "

## Traffic Volumes

(TRAFFIC VOLUMES FOR ALTERNATIVE 3 AND ALTERNATIVE 3 - REVISED ARE SAME)

## Existing and No-Build volume worksheets

## and Synchro reports

$=$
\#


Lanes，Volumes，Timings
3：Park Avenue \＆Columbia Turnpike
12／23／2019

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 拲 | 7 | \％${ }^{\text {\％}}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 年 | 种 | F\％ | 年年 | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 14 | 817 | 281 | 1524 | 559 | 142 | 119 | 321 | 539 | 353 | 777 | 59 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 14 | 817 | 281 | 1524 | 559 | 142 | 119 | 321 | 539 | 353 | 777 | 59 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length（ft） | 220 |  | 220 | 0 |  | 350 | 160 |  | 175 | 240 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length（ft） | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.88 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.985 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1770 | 3574 | 1615 | 3433 | 3471 | 1524 | 1687 | 3505 | 2760 | 3467 | 3475 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1770 | 3574 | 1615 | 3433 | 3471 | 1524 | 1687 | 3505 | 2760 | 3467 | 3475 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 135 |  |  | 178 |  |  | 87 |  | 10 |  |
| Link Speed（mph） |  | 40 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |
| Link Distance（ft） |  | 841 |  |  | 361 |  |  | 556 |  |  | 1071 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 14.3 |  |  | 4.9 |  |  | 10.8 |  |  | 20.9 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.77 | 0.94 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.86 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.82 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 0.58 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 2\％ | 1\％ | 0\％ | 2\％ | 4\％ | 6\％ | 7\％ | 3\％ | 3\％ | 1\％ | 1\％ | 14\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 18 | 869 | 327 | 1712 | 650 | 178 | 140 | 391 | 613 | 401 | 893 | 102 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 18 | 869 | 327 | 1712 | 650 | 178 | 140 | 391 | 613 | 401 | 995 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（ft） |  | 24 |  |  | 24 |  |  | 24 |  |  | 24 |  |
| Link Offset（ft） |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（ft） |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed（mph） | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector（ft） | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 |  |
| Trailing Detector（ft） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position（ft） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size（ft） | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position（ft） |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（ft） |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |


| Detector 2 Type | Cl＋Ex |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | pm＋ov | Prot | NA | pm＋ov | Prot | NA | pm＋ov | Prot | NA |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 |

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis $\qquad$

Analyst: SMC
Agency/Co.:
IH
Date Performed:
Dec 2019
Analysis Time Period:
AM Peak
Freeway/Dir of Travel:
NJ 24 EB at CR 510
Weaving Location:
EB
Analysis Year:
2019
Description:
NJ 24/CR 510 CD

Inputs $\qquad$

Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, $N$
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL

## Terrain type

Grade
Length

Level

Freeway
One-Sided
3
600
65
15 2350
ln
ft
mi/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \ln$
0.00
0.00
\%
mi

Conversion to $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ Under Base Conditions $\qquad$ Volume Components

| Volume, V | 3376 | 149 | 612 | 0 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 938 | 41 | 170 | 0 |  |
| Trucks and buses | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |  |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 0.976 | 0.976 | 0.976 | 1.000 |  |
| Driver population adjustment, fP | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flow rate, v | 3845 | 170 | 697 | 0 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Volume ratio, VR
0.184

Configuration Characteristics

| Number of maneuver lanes, NWL | 2 | ln |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Interchange density, ID | 1.0 | int/mi |
| Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF | 1 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$ |


| Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR | 1 | $\mathrm{lc/pc}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR |  | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$ |
|  |  | 867 |
| Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN | 973 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Weaving lane changes, LCW | 231 |  |
| Non-weaving vehicle index, INW | 539 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Non-weaving lane change, LCNW | 1512 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds

| Weaving intensity factor, $w$ | 0.469 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Average weaving speed, SW | 49.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average non-weaving speed, SNW | 51.2 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

$\qquad$ Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity

```
Weaving segment speed, S 50.8 mi/h
Weaving segment density, D 30.9 pc/mi/ln
Level of service, LOS
Weaving segment v/c ratio 0.762
Weaving segment flow rate, v veh/h
Weaving segment capacity, cW veh/h
```

Limitations on Weaving Segments
If limit reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual | Note |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weaving length (ft) | 300 | 4373 | 600 | $\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}$ |
| Density-based capacty, |  | Maximum | Analyzed |  |
| cIWL (pc/h/ln) | 2350 | 2061 | c |  |
| v/c ratio | Maximum | Analyzed |  |  |
|  | 1.00 | 0.762 | d |  |

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment, under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is $F$.
E
NJDOT CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT - COLUMBIA TURNPIKE (C.R. 510) AND NJ ROUTE 24 MORRIS COUNTY, NEW JERSEY
\#


Lanes，Volumes，Timings
3：Park Avenue \＆Columbia Turnpike
12／23／2019

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 緭 | ${ }^{7}$ | 年 | 偁 | 7 | 年 | 脊 | 7t | 年年 | 朿 |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 18 | 935 | 75 | 858 | 1224 | 653 | 171 | 956 | 1185 | 419 | 315 | 26 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 18 | 935 | 75 | 858 | 1224 | 653 | 171 | 956 | 1185 | 419 | 315 | 26 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length（ ft ） | 220 |  | 220 | 0 |  | 350 | 160 |  | 175 | 240 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length（ft） | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.88 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.989 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 3467 | 3539 | 1599 | 1787 | 3610 | 2842 | 3467 | 3538 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 | 3467 | 3539 | 1599 | 1787 | 3610 | 2842 | 3467 | 3538 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 135 |  |  | 247 |  |  | 87 |  | 6 |  |
| Link Speed（mph） |  | 40 |  |  | 50 |  |  | 35 |  |  | 35 |  |
| Link Distance（ft） |  | 841 |  |  | 361 |  |  | 556 |  |  | 1071 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 14.3 |  |  | 4.9 |  |  | 10.8 |  |  | 20.9 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.63 | 0.92 | 0.70 | 0.78 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.96 | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.91 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 1\％ | 2\％ | 1\％ | 1\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 1\％ | 1\％ | 0\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 29 | 1016 | 107 | 1100 | 1677 | 895 | 192 | 1028 | 1234 | 559 | 366 | 29 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 29 | 1016 | 107 | 1100 | 1677 | 895 | 192 | 1028 | 1234 | 559 | 395 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（ft） |  | 24 |  |  | 24 |  |  | 24 |  |  | 24 |  |
| Link Offset（ft） |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（ft） |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed（mph） | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 | 15 |  | 9 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector（ft） | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 | 20 | 20 | 100 |  |
| Trailing Detector（ft） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position（ft） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size（ft） | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 | 20 | 20 | 6 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position（ft） |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |  | 94 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（ft） |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | $p \mathrm{~m}+\mathrm{ov}$ | Prot | NA | $p m+o v$ | Prot | NA | $p \mathrm{~m}+\mathrm{ov}$ | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 |  |

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis $\qquad$
Analyst: SMC
Agency/Co.: IH
Date Performed: Dec 2019
Analysis Time Period:
Freeway/Dir of Travel:
PM Peak
Weaving Location:
NJ 24 EB at CR 510
Analysis Year:
EB
Description:

## 2019

D NJ 24/CR 510 CD
Inputs

Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length

Level
Freeway
One-Sided 3 ln
600
$65 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$15 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$2350 \quad \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$
0.00
0.00
\%
mi

Conversion to $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ Under Base Conditions $\qquad$ Volume Components

| Volume, V | 2593 | 307 | 349 | 0 | veh/h |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 720 | 85 | 97 | 0 |  |
| Trucks and buses | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |  |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 0.976 | 0.976 | 0.976 | 1.000 |  |
| Driver population adjustment, fP | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flow rate, v | 2953 | 350 | 397 | 0 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Volume ratio, VR
0.202

Configuration Characteristics

| Number of maneuver lanes, NWL | 2 | ln |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Interchange density, ID | 1.0 | int/mi |
| Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF | 1 | lc/pc |


| Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR | 1 | lc/pc |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR |  | lc/pc |
| Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN | 747 | lc/h |
| Weaving lane changes, LCW | 853 | $l \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Non-weaving vehicle index, INW | 177 |  |
| Non-weaving lane change, LCNW | 356 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Total lane changes, LCALL | 1209 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds

| Weaving intensity factor, w | 0.393 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Average weaving speed, SW | 50.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average non-weaving speed, SNW | 53.7 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

$\qquad$ Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity

Weaving segment speed, S Weaving segment density, D Level of service, LOS Weaving segment $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio Weaving segment flow rate, v Weaving segment capacity, cW
53.1
23.2

C
0.603

3610 veh/h
5991 veh/h
$\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \ln$

Limitations on Weaving Segments $\qquad$
If limit reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | Note

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment, under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is $F$.
$\#$

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
3：Park Avenue \＆Columbia Turnpike

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 7 | 种 | 7 | \％${ }^{2}$ | 禹 | 7 | \％ | 悉 | Tr | ${ }^{7}$ | 禹 |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 38 | 1032 | 324 | 1703 | 1326 | 159 | 231 | 358 | 602 | 394 | 868 | 158 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 38 | 1032 | 324 | 1703 | 1326 | 159 | 231 | 358 | 602 | 394 | 868 | 158 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1885 | 1900 | 1870 | 1841 | 1811 | 1796 | 1856 | 1856 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 49 | 1098 | 377 | 1913 | 1542 | 199 | 272 | 437 | 684 | 448 | 998 | 272 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.77 | 0.94 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.86 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.82 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 0.58 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | ， | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 63 | 666 | 385 | 1193 | 1733 | 896 | 91 | 593 | 1421 | 308 | 567 | 154 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.35 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.09 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3582 | 1610 | 3456 | 3497 | 1535 | 1711 | 3526 | 2768 | 3483 | 2784 | 756 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 49 | 1098 | 377 | 1913 | 1542 | 199 | 272 | 437 | 684 | 448 | 640 | 630 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1781 | 1791 | 1610 | 1728 | 1749 | 1535 | 1711 | 1763 | 1384 | 1742 | 1791 | 1749 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 3.1 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 39.0 | 45.0 | 7.0 | 6.0 | 13.3 | 18.1 | 10.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 3.1 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 39.0 | 45.0 | 7.0 | 6.0 | 13.3 | 18.1 | 10.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.43 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 63 | 666 | 385 | 1193 | 1733 | 896 | 91 | 593 | 1421 | 308 | 365 | 356 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.77 | 1.65 | 0.98 | 1.60 | 0.89 | 0.22 | 2.99 | 0.74 | 0.48 | 1.45 | 1.76 | 1.77 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 158 | 666 | 385 | 1193 | 1733 | 896 | 91 | 593 | 1421 | 308 | 365 | 356 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 54.0 | 46.0 | 42.7 | 37.0 | 25.7 | 11.2 | 53.5 | 44.6 | 17.8 | 51.5 | 45.0 | 45.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 18.0 | 299.0 | 40.4 | 275.7 | 6.2 | 0.1 | 926.3 | 4.8 | 0.3 | 221.3 | 351.6 | 357.1 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 1.7 | 36.7 | 14.2 | 60.9 | 18.1 | 2.1 | 25.9 | 6.1 | 5.3 | 13.8 | 45.6 | 45.1 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 72.0 | 345.0 | 83.1 | 312.7 | 31.9 | 11.4 | 979.8 | 49.4 | 18.0 | 272.8 | 396.6 | 402.1 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | F | F | F | C | B | F | D | B | F | F | F |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1524 |  |  | 3654 |  |  | 1393 |  |  | 1718 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 271.4 |  |  | 177.8 |  |  | 215.7 |  |  | 366.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 15.0 | 26.0 | 44.0 | 28.0 | 11.0 | 30.0 | 9.0 | 63.0 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 10.0 | 19.0 | 39.0 | 21.0 | 6.0 | 23.0 | 10.0 | 50.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 12.0 | 20.1 | 41.0 | 23.0 | 8.0 | 25.0 | 5.1 | 47.0 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS | 240.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis
Analyst: SMC
Agency/Co.: IH
Date Performed:
Analysis Time Period:
Freeway/Dir of Travel:
Dec 2019

Weaving Location:
AM Peak
NJ 24 EB at CR 510
Analysis Year:
EB
2040
Description: NJ 24/CR 510 CD
Inputs $\qquad$

Segment Type Weaving configuration Number of lanes, $N$ Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length

Freeway
One-Sided
3 ln
600 ft
$65 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$15 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$2350 \quad \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level
0.00 \%
0.00 mi

Conversion to pc/h Under Base Conditions $\qquad$ Volume Components

| VFF | VRF | VFR | VRR |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3881 | 171 | 704 | 0 | veh/h |
| 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| 1078 | 48 | 196 | 0 |  |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | $\%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\%$ |
| 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |  |
| 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |  |
| 0.976 | 0.976 | 0.976 | 1.000 |  |
| 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| 4420 | 195 | 802 | 0 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Volume ratio, VR
0.184

Configuration Characteristics

| Number of maneuver lanes, NWL | 2 | ln |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Interchange density, ID | 1.0 | $\mathrm{int} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF | 1 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$ |


| Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR | 1 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$ |  |

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds

Weaving intensity factor, W Average weaving speed, SW Average non-weaving speed, SNW
0.529
$47.7 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$49.2 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity
Weaving segment speed, S $48.9 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ Weaving segment density, D $36.9 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service, LOS Weaving segment v/c ratio

E
Weaving segment flow rate, v
Weaving segment capacity, cW
0.876

5285
veh/h
6032 veh/h
Limitations on Weaving Segments $\qquad$
If limit reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual | Note |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weaving length (ft) | 300 | 4374 | 600 | $\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}$ |
|  |  | Maximum | Analyzed |  |
| Density-based capacty, <br> cIWL (pc/h/ln) |  | 2350 | 2061 | c |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c ratio |  | 1.00 | 0.876 | d |

## Notes:

a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment, under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F .
E

## \#


SCENARIO: No-Build

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
3：Park Avenue \＆Columbia Turnpike
12／23／2019

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | V | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\cdots$ | ＊ | 1 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 糔 | \％ | 氟 | 中4 | 「 | \％ | ＊ 4 | （\％「 | \％${ }^{\text {\％}}$ | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 114 | 1550 | 131 | 968 | 1496 | 729 | 207 | 1067 | 1323 | 468 | 357 | 47 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 114 | 1550 | 131 | 968 | 1496 | 729 | 207 | 1067 | 1323 | 468 | 357 | 47 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1885 | 1870 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 181 | 1685 | 187 | 1241 | 2049 | 999 | 233 | 1147 | 1378 | 624 | 415 | 52 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.63 | 0.92 | 0.70 | 0.78 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.96 | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 158 | 660 | 379 | 1202 | 1572 | 848 | 95 | 607 | 1455 | 308 | 652 | 81 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.09 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.35 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.09 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 | 3483 | 3554 | 1598 | 1795 | 3610 | 2834 | 3483 | 3205 | 399 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 181 | 1685 | 187 | 1241 | 2049 | 999 | 233 | 1147 | 1378 | 624 | 231 | 236 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 | 1742 | 1777 | 1598 | 1795 | 1805 | 1417 | 1742 | 1791 | 1813 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 10.0 | 21.0 | 11.5 | 39.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 6.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 10.0 | 13.3 | 13.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 10.0 | 21.0 | 11.5 | 39.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 6.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 10.0 | 13.3 | 13.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.22 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 158 | 660 | 379 | 1202 | 1572 | 848 | 95 | 607 | 1455 | 308 | 365 | 369 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 1.15 | 2.55 | 0.49 | 1.03 | 1.30 | 1.18 | 2.44 | 1.89 | 0.95 | 2.02 | 0.63 | 0.64 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 158 | 660 | 379 | 1202 | 1572 | 848 | 95 | 607 | 1455 | 308 | 365 | 369 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 51.5 | 46.0 | 37.1 | 37.0 | 31.5 | 26.5 | 53.5 | 47.0 | 26.1 | 51.5 | 41.1 | 41.2 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 117.1 | 702.6 | 1.0 | 34.6 | 141.1 | 92.2 | 680.4 | 406.5 | 13.1 | 472.2 | 3.5 | 3.7 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 9.5 | 73.4 | 4.4 | 21.2 | 50.2 | 41.5 | 20.7 | 42.7 | 18.1 | 24.5 | 6.2 | 6.3 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 168.6 | 748.6 | 38.1 | 71.6 | 172.6 | 118.7 | 733.9 | 453.5 | 39.2 | 523.7 | 44.7 | 44.9 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | F | D | F | F | F | F | F | D | F | D | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 2053 |  |  | 4289 |  |  | 2758 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 632.7 |  |  | 130.8 |  |  | 270.2 |  |  | 318.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ），$s$ | 15.0 | 26.0 | 44.0 | 28.0 | 11.0 | 30.0 | 15.0 | 57.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 10.0 | 19.0 | 39.0 | 21.0 | 6.0 | 23.0 | 10.0 | 50.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 12.0 | 21.0 | 41.0 | 23.0 | 8.0 | 15.5 | 12.0 | 52.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 289.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Phone:
HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
E-mail:
Fax:

Operational Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | SMC |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | IH |
| Date Performed: | Dec 2019 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | NJ 24 EB at CR 510 |
| Weaving Location: | EB |
| Analysis Year: | 2040 |
| Description: | NJ 24 EB at CR 510 CD |

Inputs

| Segment Type | Freeway |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weaving configuration | One-Sided |  |
| Number of lanes, N | 3 | ln |
| Weaving segment length, LS | 600 | ft |
| Freeway free-flow speed, FFS | 65 | mi |
| Minimum segment speed, SMIN | 15 | mi |
| Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL | 2350 | pc |
|  |  |  |
| Terrain type | Level |  |
| $\quad$ Grade | 0.00 | \% |
| $\quad$ Length | 0.00 | mi |

Conversion to $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ Under Base Conditions Volume Components

| Volume, V | 2983 | 352 | 401 | 0 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 829 | 98 | 111 | 0 |  |
| Trucks and buses | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\%$ |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |  |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 0.976 | 0.976 | 0.976 | 1.000 |  |
| Driver population adjustment, fP | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flow rate, v | 3397 | 401 | 457 | 0 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Volume ratio, VR 0.202

Configuration Characteristics

| Number of maneuver lanes, NWL | 2 | ln |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Interchange density, ID | 1.0 | $\mathrm{int} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF | 1 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$ |


| Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR | 1 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR |  | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN | 858 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Weaving lane changes, LCW | 964 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Non-weaving vehicle index, INW | 204 |  |
| Non-weaving lane change, LCNW | 447 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Total lane changes, LCALL | 1411 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds

| Weaving intensity factor, W | 0.444 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Average weaving speed, SW | 49.6 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average non-weaving speed, SNW | 52.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity |  |  |
| Weaving segment speed, S | 51.5 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Weaving segment density, D | 27.5 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LOS | C |  |
| Weaving segment v/c ratio | 0.693 |  |
| Weaving segment flow rate, v | 4152 | veh $/ \mathrm{h}$ |
| Weaving segment capacity, cW | 5994 | veh $/ \mathrm{h}$ | Limitations on Weaving Segments $\qquad$

If limit reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | Note

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment, under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is $F$.

# Year 2020 alternatives analysis volume worksheets and Synchro reports 

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 性 | F＇r | \％${ }^{*}$ | 个4 | 「 | \％ | 个个 | F＇T | \％${ }^{*}$ | 中t |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 34 | 934 | 293 | 562 | 1200 | 143 | 209 | 324 | 544 | 357 | 786 | 148 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 34 | 934 | 293 | 562 | 1200 | 143 | 209 | 324 | 544 | 357 | 786 | 148 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1885 | 1900 | 1870 | 1841 | 1811 | 1796 | 1856 | 1856 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 54 | 1015 | 419 | 721 | 1644 | 196 | 235 | 348 | 567 | 476 | 914 | 163 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.63 | 0.92 | 0.70 | 0.78 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.96 | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | ， | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 69 | 764 | 964 | 758 | 1378 | 839 | 217 | 897 | 1311 | 533 | 852 | 152 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.04 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.22 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.08 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3582 | 2834 | 3456 | 3497 | 1535 | 1711 | 3526 | 2768 | 3483 | 3037 | 541 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 54 | 1015 | 419 | 721 | 1644 | 196 | 235 | 348 | 567 | 476 | 539 | 538 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1781 | 1791 | 1417 | 1728 | 1749 | 1535 | 1711 | 1763 | 1384 | 1742 | 1791 | 1788 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 4.5 | 32.0 | 17.2 | 30.9 | 59.1 | 10.0 | 19.0 | 13.2 | 20.9 | 20.1 | 42.1 | 42.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 4.5 | 32.0 | 17.2 | 30.9 | 59.1 | 10.0 | 19.0 | 13.2 | 20.9 | 20.1 | 42.1 | 42.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.30 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 69 | 764 | 964 | 758 | 1378 | 839 | 217 | 897 | 1311 | 533 | 502 | 502 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.78 | 1.33 | 0.43 | 0.95 | 1.19 | 0.23 | 1.08 | 0.39 | 0.43 | 0.89 | 1.07 | 1.07 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 83 | 764 | 964 | 760 | 1378 | 839 | 217 | 897 | 1311 | 627 | 502 | 502 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 71.5 | 59.0 | 38.3 | 57.7 | 45.5 | 17.7 | 68.6 | 51.9 | 29.2 | 62.3 | 54.0 | 54.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 31.6 | 156.7 | 0.3 | 21.4 | 94.4 | 0.1 | 69.1 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 13.7 | 60.9 | 61.2 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 2.7 | 30.9 | 5.9 | 15.3 | 42.5 | 3.4 | 12.7 | 6.1 | 7.3 | 9.9 | 27.3 | 27.3 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 103.1 | 215.7 | 38.6 | 79.2 | 139.8 | 17.8 | 137.7 | 52.5 | 29.8 | 76.1 | 114.9 | 115.1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | F | F | D | E | F | B | F | D | C | E | F | F |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1488 |  |  | 2561 |  |  | 1150 |  | 1553 |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 161.8 |  |  | 113.4 |  | 58.7 |  | 103.1 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  | F |  |  | E |  | F |  |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 27.9 | 45.1 | 37.9 | 39.0 | 24.0 | 49.1 | 10.8 | 66.1 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 27.0 | 34.0 | 33.0 | 32.0 | 19.0 | 42.0 | 7.0 | 58.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 22.1 | 22.9 | 32.9 | 34.0 | 21.0 | 44.1 | 6.5 | 61.1 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.8 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 112.4

HCM 6th LOS
F

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
5：Park Avenue
02／04／2020

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7} 1$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 中4 | 「＇ | ${ }^{7} 1$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 16 | 14 | 1003 | 180 | 63 | 0 | 1014 | 92 | 112 | 1529 | 16 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 16 | 14 | 1003 | 180 | 63 | 0 | 1014 | 92 | 112 | 1529 | 16 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.85 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 0 | 17 | 15 | 1090 | 196 | 68 | 0 | 1102 | 100 | 122 | 1662 | 17 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 0 | 22 | 20 | 945 | 346 | 120 | 0 | 1827 | 1248 | 166 | 2134 | 22 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 0 | 916 | 809 | 3456 | 1264 | 439 | 0 | 3647 | 1585 | 3456 | 3604 | 37 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 32 | 1090 | 0 | 264 | 0 | 1102 | 100 | 122 | 819 | 860 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 0 | 0 | 1725 | 1728 | 0 | 1703 | 0 | 1777 | 1585 | 1728 | 1777 | 1864 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 41.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 32.8 | 2.1 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 41.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 32.8 | 2.1 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 0.47 | 1.00 |  | 0.26 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 42 | 945 | 0 | 465 | 0 | 1827 | 1248 | 166 | 1052 | 1104 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.76 | 1.15 | 0.00 | 0.57 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.08 | 0.73 | 0.78 | 0.78 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 207 | 945 | 0 | 465 | 0 | 1827 | 1248 | 267 | 1052 | 1104 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 72.7 | 54.5 | 0.0 | 46.9 | 0.0 | 25.7 | 3.6 | 66.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 23.4 | 81.4 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.6 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 27.9 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 14.1 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 96.1 | 135.9 | 0.0 | 48.5 | 0.0 | 27.2 | 3.7 | 68.6 | 1.7 | 1.6 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | F | F | A | D | A | C | A | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 32 |  |  | 1354 |  |  | 1202 |  |  | 1801 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 96.1 |  |  | 118.9 |  |  | 25.2 |  |  | 6.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 11.7 | 83.1 | 8.2 | 94.8 | 47.0 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 11.6 | 58.4 | 18.0 | 74.5 | 41.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 7.1 | 34.8 | 4.8 | 2.0 | 43.0 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 8.9 | 0.1 | 17.7 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 46.8
HCM 6th LOS

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | VJS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | IH |
| Date Performed: | Feb 2020 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak - Alt 1 |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | NJ 24 EB at CR 510 |
| Weaving Location: | EB |
| Analysis Year: | 2020 |
| Description: | NJ 24/CR 510 CD |

Inputs $\qquad$

Segment Type
Freeway
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
One-Sided
3 ln

600 ft
$65 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$15 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$2350 \quad \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$

Grade
Level

Length
0.00
\%
0.00 mi


Configuration Characteristics

| Number of maneuver lanes, NWL | 2 | ln |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Interchange density, ID | 1.0 | int/mi |
| Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF | 1 | lc/pc |
| Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR | 1 | lc/pc |
| Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR |  | lc/pc |
| Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN | 902 |  |
| Weaving lane changes, LCW | 1008 | lc/h |
| Non-weaving vehicle index, INW | 241 |  |
| Non-weaving lane change, LCNW | 576 | lc/h |
| Total lane changes, LCALL | 1584 | lc/h |

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, W 0.486

| Average weaving speed, SW | 48.6 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Average non-weaving speed, SNW | 50.6 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |



Limitations on Weaving Segments $\qquad$
If $\bar{l} \overline{\text { im }} \overline{i t}$ reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual | Note |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weaving length (ft) | 300 | 4366 | 600 | a, b |
| Density-based capacty, |  | Maximum | Analyzed |  |
| cIWL (pc/h/ln) | 2350 | 2062 | c |  |
| V/cratio |  |  | Maximum | Analyzed |

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment, under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
3：Park Avenue \＆Columbia Turnpike
02／04／2020

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个个 | T＇ | ${ }^{7}{ }^{*} 1$ | 个4 | 「 | \％ | 个4 | 「「 | \％ | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 103 | 1402 | 119 | 667 | 1354 | 660 | 188 | 966 | 1197 | 423 | 323 | 42 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 103 | 1402 | 119 | 667 | 1354 | 660 | 188 | 966 | 1197 | 423 | 323 | 42 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1885 | 1900 | 1870 | 1841 | 1811 | 1796 | 1856 | 1856 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 134 | 1491 | 138 | 749 | 1574 | 825 | 221 | 1178 | 1360 | 481 | 371 | 72 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.77 | 0.94 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.86 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.82 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 0.58 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 157 | 1279 | 1424 | 173 | 1116 | 724 | 249 | 947 | 882 | 533 | 827 | 159 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.09 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.05 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3582 | 2834 | 3456 | 3497 | 1535 | 1711 | 3526 | 2768 | 3483 | 2997 | 576 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 134 | 1491 | 138 | 749 | 1574 | 825 | 221 | 1178 | 1360 | 481 | 220 | 223 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1781 | 1791 | 1417 | 1728 | 1749 | 1535 | 1711 | 1763 | 1384 | 1742 | 1791 | 1782 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 10.4 | 50.0 | 3.6 | 7.0 | 44.7 | 44.7 | 18.0 | 37.6 | 37.6 | 19.0 | 14.2 | 14.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 10.4 | 50.0 | 3.6 | 7.0 | 44.7 | 44.7 | 18.0 | 37.6 | 37.6 | 19.0 | 14.2 | 14.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.32 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 157 | 1279 | 1424 | 173 | 1116 | 724 | 249 | 947 | 882 | 533 | 494 | 492 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.85 | 1.17 | 0.10 | 4.33 | 1.41 | 1.14 | 0.89 | 1.24 | 1.54 | 0.90 | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 165 | 1279 | 1424 | 173 | 1116 | 724 | 342 | 947 | 882 | 572 | 494 | 492 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 62.9 | 45.0 | 18.2 | 66.5 | 47.7 | 37.0 | 65.5 | 63.8 | 58.6 | 58.3 | 41.8 | 41.9 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 31.7 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 1514.1 | 190.2 | 78.7 | 2.2 | 110.8 | 244.8 | 17.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 6.0 | 36.3 | 1.1 | 39.3 | 48.1 | 38.8 | 8.5 | 32.5 | 45.6 | 9.6 | 6.7 | 6.8 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 94.7 | 128.3 | 18.2 | 1580.6 | 237.9 | 115.7 | 67.7 | 174.6 | 303.3 | 75.3 | 44.7 | 44.9 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | F | B | F | F | F | E | F | F | E | D | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1763 |  |  | 3148 |  |  | 2759 |  |  | 924 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 117.2 |  |  | 525.3 |  |  | 229.5 |  |  | 60.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 26.4 | 44.6 | 12.0 | 57.0 | 25.4 | 45.6 | 17.3 | 51.7 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 23.0 | 36.0 | 7.0 | 50.0 | 28.0 | 31.0 | 13.0 | 44.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 21.0 | 39.6 | 9.0 | 52.0 | 20.0 | 16.5 | 12.4 | 46.7 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 296.7
HCM 6th LOS F

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
5：Park Avenue \＆Alt 1 Ramp

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  | 7＊ | $\hat{F}$ |  |  | 个 $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％${ }^{1+1}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 15 | 16 | 545 | 98 | 34 | 0 | 2317 | 250 | 250 | 526 | 35 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 15 | 16 | 545 | 98 | 34 | 0 | 2317 | 250 | 250 | 526 | 35 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 0 | 16 | 17 | 592 | 107 | 37 | 0 | 2518 | 272 | 272 | 572 | 38 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 0 | 21 | 23 | 469 | 180 | 62 | 0 | 2118 | 1160 | 320 | 2437 | 162 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.19 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 0 | 830 | 882 | 3456 | 1328 | 459 | 0 | 3647 | 1585 | 3456 | 3382 | 224 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 33 | 592 | 0 | 144 | 0 | 2518 | 272 | 272 | 300 | 310 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 0 | 0 | 1712 | 1728 | 0 | 1788 | 0 | 1777 | 1585 | 1728 | 1777 | 1830 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 83.4 | 7.8 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 83.4 | 7.8 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 0.52 | 1.00 |  | 0.26 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.12 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 44 | 469 | 0 | 243 | 0 | 2118 | 1160 | 320 | 1280 | 1319 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.75 | 1.26 | 0.00 | 0.59 | 0.00 | 1.19 | 0.23 | 0.85 | 0.23 | 0.24 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | O | － | 220 | 469 | 0 | 243 | 0 | 2118 | 1160 | 402 | 1280 | 1319 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 67.7 | 60.5 | 0.0 | 56.9 | 0.0 | 28.3 | 6.1 | 56.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.8 | 134.3 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 90.1 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 16.8 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 59.5 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 89.5 | 194.8 | 0.0 | 60.7 | 0.0 | 118.4 | 6.6 | 57.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | F | F | A | E | A | F | A | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 33 |  |  | 736 |  |  | 2790 |  |  | 882 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 89.5 |  |  | 168.5 |  |  | 107.5 |  |  | 17.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 17.5 | 89.4 | 8.1 | 106.9 | 25.0 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 16.3 | 65.7 | 18.0 | 86.5 | 19.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 12.7 | 85.4 | 4.7 | 2.0 | 21.0 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 3.5 | 0.0 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 99.7

HCM 6th LOS F

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | VJS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | IH |
| Date Performed: | Feb 2020 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak - Alt 1 |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | NJ 24 EB at CR 510 |
| Weaving Location: | EB |
| Analysis Year: | 2020 |
| Description: | NJ 24/CR 510 CD |

Inputs $\qquad$

Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Freeway
One-Sided
$3 \quad \ln$

600 ft
$65 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$15 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$2350 \quad \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$

Grade
Level

Length
0.00
\%
0.00 mi


Configuration Characteristics

| Number of maneuver lanes, NWL | 2 | ln |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interchange density, ID | 1.0 | int/mi |
| Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF | 1 | lc/pc |
| Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR | 1 | lc/pc |
| Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR |  | lc/pc |
| Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN | 776 | lc/h |
| Weaving lane changes, LCW | 882 | lc/h |
| Non-weaving vehicle index, INW | 186 |  |
| Non-weaving lane change, LCNW | 384 | lc/h |
| Total lane changes, LCALL | 1266 | lc/h |

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, W 0.407

```
Average weaving speed, SW
50.5
    mi/h
Average non-weaving speed, SNW 53.2 mi/h
```



Limitations on Weaving Segments $\qquad$
$\overline{\text { If }} \bar{l} \overline{\text { im }} \overline{i t}$ reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | Note

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to
make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be
treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of
Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment,
under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.
EIH Engineers.P.C.
NJDOT CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT - COLUMBIA TURNPIKE (C.R. 510) AND NJ ROUTE 24 MORRIS COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

## 

Alt. 2

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | 44 | 「「で | ${ }^{7} 1$ | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 44 | 「「「 | ＊＊ | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 968 | 293 | 562 | 1200 | 143 | 209 | 358 | 544 | 357 | 786 | 148 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 968 | 293 | 562 | 1200 | 143 | 209 | 358 | 544 | 357 | 786 | 148 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 0 | 1885 | 1900 | 1870 | 1841 | 1811 | 1796 | 1856 | 1856 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 0 | 1052 | 419 | 721 | 1644 | 196 | 235 | 385 | 567 | 476 | 914 | 163 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.63 | 0.92 | 0.70 | 0.78 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.96 | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 0 | 788 | 1039 | 691 | 1585 | 930 | 251 | 942 | 1293 | 533 | 830 | 148 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.20 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.24 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.15 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 0 | 3676 | 2834 | 3456 | 3497 | 1535 | 1711 | 3526 | 2768 | 3483 | 3037 | 541 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 0 | 1052 | 419 | 721 | 1644 | 196 | 235 | 385 | 567 | 476 | 539 | 538 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 0 | 1791 | 1417 | 1728 | 1749 | 1535 | 1711 | 1763 | 1384 | 1742 | 1791 | 1788 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.0 | 33.0 | 16.5 | 30.0 | 68.0 | 8.6 | 20.2 | 11.1 | 18.8 | 20.1 | 41.0 | 41.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.0 | 33.0 | 16.5 | 30.0 | 68.0 | 8.6 | 20.2 | 11.1 | 18.8 | 20.1 | 41.0 | 41.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.30 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 0 | 788 | 1039 | 691 | 1585 | 930 | 251 | 942 | 1293 | 533 | 490 | 489 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.00 | 1.34 | 0.40 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 0.21 | 0.94 | 0.41 | 0.44 | 0.89 | 1.10 | 1.10 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 0 | 788 | 1039 | 691 | 1585 | 930 | 251 | 942 | 1293 | 627 | 490 | 489 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.67 | 1.67 | 1.67 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 58.5 | 35.3 | 60.0 | 41.0 | 13.3 | 55.9 | 33.5 | 19.9 | 62.3 | 54.5 | 54.5 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.0 | 159.4 | 0.3 | 46.0 | 32.8 | 0.1 | 33.7 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 13.7 | 71.0 | 71.2 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／In | 0.0 | 32.2 | 5.6 | 17.2 | 34.7 | 2.9 | 10.4 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 9.9 | 27.9 | 27.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 217.9 | 35.6 | 106.0 | 73.8 | 13.4 | 89.6 | 34.5 | 20.7 | 76.1 | 125.5 | 125.7 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | F | D | F | F | B | F | C | C | E | F | F |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1471 |  |  | 2561 |  |  | 1187 |  |  | 1553 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 165.9 |  |  | 78.2 |  |  | 38.8 |  |  | 110.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ），$s$ | 27.9 | 47.1 | 35.0 | 40.0 | 27.0 | 48.0 |  | 75.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 27.0 | 36.0 | 30.0 | 33.0 | 22.0 | 41.0 |  | 68.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 22.1 | 20.8 | 32.0 | 35.0 | 22.2 | 43.0 |  | 70.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.8 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 97.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
5: Park Avenue \& Alt 2 Ramp
02/04/2020

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7 * 1}$ | F |  |  | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{7 *}$ | 中t |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 30 | 9 | 1033 | 185 | 130 | 0 | 738 | 92 | 138 | 1745 | 3 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 30 | 9 | 1033 | 185 | 130 | 0 | 738 | 92 | 138 | 1745 | 3 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 0 | 33 | 10 | 1123 | 201 | 141 | 0 | 802 | 100 | 150 | 1897 | 3 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 0 | 43 | 13 | 991 | 293 | 206 | 0 | 1726 | 1224 | 194 | 2082 | 3 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.11 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 0 | 1378 | 417 | 3456 | 1023 | 718 | 0 | 3647 | 1585 | 3456 | 3640 | 6 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 43 | 1123 | 0 | 342 | 0 | 802 | 100 | 150 | 926 | 974 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 0 | 0 | 1795 | 1728 | 0 | 1741 | 0 | 1777 | 1585 | 1728 | 1777 | 1869 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 43.0 | 0.0 | 26.2 | 0.0 | 22.5 | 2.3 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 43.0 | 0.0 | 26.2 | 0.0 | 22.5 | 2.3 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 0.23 | 1.00 |  | 0.41 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 56 | 991 | 0 | 499 | 0 | 1726 | 1224 | 194 | 1016 | 1069 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.76 | 1.13 | 0.00 | 0.69 | 0.00 | 0.46 | 0.08 | 0.77 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 215 | 991 | 0 | 499 | 0 | 1726 | 1224 | 267 | 1016 | 1069 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 72.1 | 53.5 | 0.0 | 47.5 | 0.0 | 25.6 | 4.1 | 65.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.9 | 72.8 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 1.7 | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 28.0 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 91.0 | 126.3 | 0.0 | 51.4 | 0.0 | 26.5 | 4.3 | 67.4 | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | F | F | A | D | A | C | A | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 43 |  |  | 1465 |  |  | 902 |  |  | 2050 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 91.0 |  |  | 108.8 |  |  | 24.0 |  |  | 7.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 12.9 | 78.9 | 9.2 | 91.8 | 49.0 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.5 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 11.6 | 56.4 | 18.0 | 72.5 | 43.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 8.3 | 24.5 | 5.6 | 2.0 | 45.0 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.1 | 6.6 | 0.1 | 23.9 | 0.0 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 45.0
HCM 6th LOS

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 73.4 |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB | WB | SB | SW |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 239 | 2046 | 159 | 0 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 244 | 2087 | 162 | 0 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 124 | 0 | 1381 | 1381 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 1419 | 368 | 0 | 706 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 3.186 | 3.186 | 3.186 | 3.186 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 5.8 | 85.8 | 15.5 | 0.0 |
| Approach LOS | A | F | C | - |


| Lane | Left | Left | Right | Left |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Designated Moves | LT | LT | R | LR |
| Assumed Moves | LT | LT | R | LR |
| RT Channelized |  | 0.662 | 0.338 | 1.000 |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 4.293 | 4.113 | 4.113 |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.113 | 1381 | 706 | 162 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 244 | 1130 | 1130 | 430 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 1036 | 0.980 | 0.980 | 0.981 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.980 | 1354 | 692 | 159 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 239 | 1108 | 1108 | 422 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 1016 | 1.222 | 0.625 | 0.377 |
| VIC Ratio | 0.236 | 123.7 | 11.6 | 15.5 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 5.8 | F | B | C |
| LOS | 43 | 5 | 2 |  |

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis $\qquad$
Analyst: VJS
Agency/Co.: IH
Date Performed: Feb 2020
Analysis Time Period:
Freeway/Dir of Travel:
Weaving Location:
Analysis Year:
AM Peak
NJ 24 EB at CR 510
EB
Description: NJ $24 / \mathrm{CR} 510 \mathrm{CD}$ - ALT 2
Inputs $\qquad$
Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length
2020

| Segment Type | Freeway |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weaving configuration | One-Sided |  |
| Number of lanes, N | 3 | ln |
| Weaving segment length, LS | 1050 | ft |
| Freeway free-flow speed, FFS | 65 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Minimum segment speed, SMIN | 15 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL | 2350 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Terrain type |  |  |
| Grade | 0.00 |  |
| Length | 0.00 | mi |



Configuration Characteristics

| Number of maneuver lanes, NWL | 2 | ln |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Interchange density, ID | 1.0 | int/mi |
| Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF | 1 | lc/pc |
| Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR | 1 | lc/pc |
| Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR |  | lc/pc |
| Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN | 1680 | $1 \mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Weaving lane changes, LCW | 1847 | lc/h |
| Non-weaving vehicle index, INW | 421 |  |
| Non-weaving lane change, LCNW | 816 | lc/h |
| Total lane changes, LCALL | 2663 | $l c / h$ |

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, w 0.471

```
Average weaving speed, SW
49.0
    mi/h
Average non-weaving speed, SNW 43.8 mi/h
```

|  | Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity____ | 45.2 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Weaving segment speed, S | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| Weaving segment density, D | 41.9 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LoS | E |  |
| Weaving segment v/c ratio | 0.947 |  |
| Weaving segment flow rate, v | 5562 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Weaving segment capacity, cW | 5874 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Limitations on Weaving Segments $\qquad$
If limit reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual | Note |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weaving length (ft) | 300 | 5536 | 1050 | a, b |
| Density-based capacty, |  | Maximum | Analyzed |  |
| cIWL (pc/h/ln) | 2350 | 2007 | c |  |
| v/cratio |  |  | Maximum | Analyzed |

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft, weaving vehicles are assumed to
make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be
treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of
Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment,
under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.

IIH Engineers. P.C.
NJDOT CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT - COLUMBIA TURNPIKE (C.R. 510) AND NJ ROUTE 24 MORRIS COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

scenario: Alt-2 YEAR:
PEAK HOUR:

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | 44 | 「「 | 7 | 44 | F＇ | ${ }^{1}$ | 44 | 「「゙ | 7 | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 1505 | 119 | 334 | 1354 | 660 | 188 | 1069 | 1197 | 423 | 323 | 42 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 1505 | 119 | 334 | 1354 | 660 | 188 | 1069 | 1197 | 423 | 323 | 42 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 0 | 1885 | 1900 | 1870 | 1841 | 1811 | 1796 | 1856 | 1856 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 0 | 1601 | 138 | 375 | 1574 | 825 | 221 | 1304 | 1360 | 481 | 371 | 72 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.77 | 0.94 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.86 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.82 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 0.58 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 0 | 1356 | 1483 | 173 | 1624 | 877 | 248 | 1032 | 949 | 373 | 765 | 147 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.05 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 0 | 3676 | 2834 | 3456 | 3497 | 1535 | 1711 | 3526 | 2768 | 3483 | 2997 | 576 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 0 | 1601 | 138 | 375 | 1574 | 825 | 221 | 1304 | 1360 | 481 | 220 | 223 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 0 | 1791 | 1417 | 1728 | 1749 | 1535 | 1711 | 1763 | 1384 | 1742 | 1791 | 1782 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.0 | 53.0 | 3.4 | 7.0 | 61.4 | 65.0 | 18.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 15.0 | 14.6 | 14.9 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.0 | 53.0 | 3.4 | 7.0 | 61.4 | 65.0 | 18.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 15.0 | 14.6 | 14.9 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.32 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 0 | 1356 | 1483 | 173 | 1624 | 877 | 248 | 1032 | 949 | 373 | 457 | 455 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.00 | 1.18 | 0.09 | 2.17 | 0.97 | 0.94 | 0.89 | 1.26 | 1.43 | 1.29 | 0.48 | 0.49 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 0 | 1356 | 1483 | 173 | 1624 | 877 | 305 | 1032 | 949 | 373 | 457 | 455 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 43.5 | 16.7 | 66.5 | 36.5 | 27.8 | 65.6 | 63.2 | 57.8 | 62.5 | 44.3 | 44.4 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.0 | 89.2 | 0.0 | 545.3 | 15.6 | 17.7 | 2.9 | 119.1 | 195.5 | 148.8 | 3.6 | 3.7 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.0 | 39.5 | 1.1 | 16.1 | 27.9 | 27.3 | 8.5 | 36.6 | 42.6 | 14.3 | 6.9 | 7.1 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 132.7 | 16.8 | 611.8 | 52.2 | 45.5 | 68.5 | 182.3 | 253.3 | 211.3 | 47.9 | 48.1 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | F | B | F | D | D | E | F | F | F | D | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1739 |  |  | 2774 |  |  | 2885 |  |  | 924 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 123.5 |  |  | 125.8 |  |  | 207.1 |  |  | 133.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R c$ ），$s$ | 20.0 | 48.0 | 12.0 | 60.0 | 25.3 | 42.7 |  | 72.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 15.0 | 41.0 | 7.0 | 53.0 | 25.0 | 31.0 |  | 65.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 17.0 | 43.0 | 9.0 | 55.0 | 20.0 | 16.9 |  | 67.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 2.1 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 154.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
5：Park Avenue \＆Alt 2 Ramp
02／04／2020

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  | \％＊ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 个个 | 「 | ${ }^{7} 1$ | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 15 | 16 | 545 | 98 | 137 | 0 | 2317 | 250 | 250 | 526 | 35 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 15 | 16 | 545 | 98 | 137 | 0 | 2317 | 250 | 250 | 526 | 35 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 0 | 16 | 17 | 592 | 107 | 149 | 0 | 2518 | 272 | 272 | 572 | 38 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 0 | 21 | 23 | 469 | 96 | 134 | 0 | 2118 | 1160 | 320 | 2437 | 162 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.19 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 0 | 830 | 882 | 3456 | 708 | 985 | 0 | 3647 | 1585 | 3456 | 3382 | 224 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 33 | 592 | 0 | 256 | 0 | 2518 | 272 | 272 | 300 | 310 |
| Grp Sat Flow（ s ，veh／h／ln | 0 | 0 | 1712 | 1728 | 0 | 1693 | 0 | 1777 | 1585 | 1728 | 1777 | 1830 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 83.4 | 7.8 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 83.4 | 7.8 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 0.52 | 1.00 |  | 0.58 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.12 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 44 | 469 | 0 | 230 | 0 | 2118 | 1160 | 320 | 1280 | 1319 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.75 | 1.26 | 0.00 | 1.11 | 0.00 | 1.19 | 0.23 | 0.85 | 0.23 | 0.24 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 220 | 469 | 0 | 230 | 0 | 2118 | 1160 | 402 | 1280 | 1319 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 67.7 | 60.5 | 0.0 | 60.5 | 0.0 | 28.3 | 6.1 | 56.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.8 | 134.3 | 0.0 | 93.4 | 0.0 | 90.1 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 16.8 | 0.0 | 13.9 | 0.0 | 59.5 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 89.5 | 194.8 | 0.0 | 153.9 | 0.0 | 118.4 | 6.6 | 57.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | F | F | A | F | A | F | A | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 33 |  |  | 848 |  |  | 2790 |  |  | 882 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 89.5 |  |  | 182.4 |  |  | 107.5 |  |  | 17.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 17.5 | 89.4 | 8.1 | 106.9 | 25.0 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 16.3 | 65.7 | 18.0 | 86.5 | 19.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 12.7 | 85.4 | 4.7 | 2.0 | 21.0 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 3.5 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 104.0
HCM 6th LOS
F

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB | SB | SW |
| Entry Lanes | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 560 |  | 1131 | 384 | 0 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 571 |  | 1154 | 391 | 0 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 277 |  | 0 | 751 | 751 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 865 |  | 848 | 0 | 403 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 3.186 |  | 3.186 | 3.186 | 3.186 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#h | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 |  | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 13.1 |  | 10.7 | 15.9 | 0.0 |
| Approach LOS | B |  | B | C | . |
| Lane | Left | Left | Right | Left |  |
| Designated Moves | LT | LT | R | LR |  |
| Assumed Moves | LT | LT | R | LR |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 0.651 | 0.349 | 1.000 |  |
| Critical Headway, s | 4.113 | 4.293 | 4.113 | 4.113 |  |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 571 | 751 | 403 | 391 |  |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 931 | 1130 | 1130 | 668 |  |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.980 | 0.980 | 0.980 | 0.982 |  |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 560 | 736 | 395 | 384 |  |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 913 | 1108 | 1108 | 656 |  |
| VIC Ratio | 0.613 | 0.665 | 0.357 | 0.585 |  |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 13.1 | 12.8 | 6.8 | 15.9 |  |
| LOS | B | B | A | C |  |
| 95th \%tile Queue, veh | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 |  |

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis $\qquad$
Analyst: VJS
Agency/Co.: IH
Date Performed: Feb 2020
Analysis Time Period:
Freeway/Dir of Travel:
Weaving Location:
Analysis Year:
PM Peak
NJ 24 EB at CR 510
EB
Description: NJ $24 / \mathrm{CR} 510 \mathrm{CD}$ - ALT 2
Inputs $\qquad$
Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length
2020

| Segment Type | Freeway |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weaving configuration | One-S |  |
| Number of lanes, N | 3 | 1 n |
| Weaving segment length, LS | 1050 | ft |
| Freeway free-flow speed, FFS | 65 | mi/h |
| Minimum segment speed, SMIN | 15 | mi/h |
| Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL | 2350 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Terrain type | Level |  |
| Grade | 0.00 | \% |
| Length | 0.00 | mi |



Configuration Characteristics

| Number of maneuver lanes, NWL | 2 | 1 n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interchange density, ID | 1.0 | int/mi |
| Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF | 1 | lc/pc |
| Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR | 1 | lc/pc |
| Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR |  | lc/pc |
| Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN | 1168 | lc/h |
| Weaving lane changes, LCW | 1335 | lc/h |
| Non-weaving vehicle index, INW | 324 |  |
| Non-weaving lane change, LCNW | 626 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Total lane changes, LCALL | 1961 | lc/h |

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, w 0.370

```
Average weaving speed, SW
51.5
    mi/h
Average non-weaving speed, SNW
49.8
mi/h
```

Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity

$\overline{\text { If }}$ limit reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | Note

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to
make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be
treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of
Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment,
under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
3: Park Avenue \& Columbia Turnpike


[^2]|  | $\dagger$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | \％ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{4}{ }^{\text {M }}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | 螌 | 1 | 哏 | 瑯 |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 23 | 7 | 1027 | 256 | 1 | 0 | 875 | 100 | 245 | 1664 | 16 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 23 | 7 | 1027 | 256 | 1 | 0 | 875 | 100 | 245 | 1664 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ， | 0 | 0 | 875 | 100 | 0 | 1604 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 0 | 25 | 8 | 1116 | 278 | 1 | 0 | 951 | 109 | 266 | 1809 | 17 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 2 | ， | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0.92 |
| Cap，veh／h | 0 | 45 | 14 | 1002 | 658 | 2 | 0 | 1651 | 1196 | 319 | 2116 | 20 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.09 | 0.59 | 0.59 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 0 | 1358 | 434 | 3456 | 1862 | 7 | 0 | 3647 | 1585 | 3456 | 3607 | 34 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 33 | 1116 | 0 | 279 | 0 | 951 | 109 | 266 | 890 | 936 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 0 | 0 | 1792 | 1728 | 0 | 1869 | 0 | 1777 | 1585 | 1728 | 1777 | 1864 |
| $Q$ Serve（g＿s），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 43.5 | 0.0 | 17.0 | 0.0 | 29.4 | 2.7 | 11.4 | 62.2 | 62.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 43.5 | 0.0 | 17.0 | 0.0 | 29.4 | 2.7 | 11.4 | 62.2 | 62.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 0.24 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 60 | 1002 | 0 | 660 | 0 | 1651 | 1196 | 319 | 1042 | 1094 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.55 | 1.11 | 0.00 | 0.42 | 0.00 | 0.58 | 0.09 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.86 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 215 | 1002 | 0 | 822 | 0 | 1651 | 1196 | 463 | 1042 | 1094 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 53.2 | 0.0 | 36.9 | 0.0 | 29.4 | 4.9 | 67.0 | 25.7 | 25.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 65.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 8.5 | 8.9 | 8.6 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 12.8 | 0.8 | 5.3 | 26.5 | 27.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh        |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 79.1 | 118.2 | 0.0 | 37.3 | 0.0 | 30.8 | 5.0 | 75.5 | 34.6 | 34.4 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | E | F | A | D | A | C | A | E | C | ， |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 33 |  |  | 1395 |  |  | 1060 |  |  | 2092 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 79.1 |  |  | 102.0 |  |  | 28.2 |  |  | 39.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ），$s$ | 18.3 | 74.2 | 48.0 | 9.5 |  | 92.5 |  | 57.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ）， s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 20.1 | 50.4 | 43.5 | 18.0 |  | 75.0 |  | 66.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 13.4 | 31.4 | 45.5 | 4.7 |  | 64.5 |  | 19.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.5 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  | 7.7 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 56.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | SMC |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | IH |
| Date Performed: | Dec 2019 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | NJ 24 EB at CR 510 |
| Weaving Location: | EB |
| Analysis Year: | 2020 |
| Description: | NJ 24/CR 510 CD - Alt 3 |

Inputs $\qquad$

## Segment Type

Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
vel
Grade
Length
0.00

Freeway
One-Sided 3 ln
600 ft
$65 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$15 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$2350 \quad \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$

Conversion to $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ Under Base Conditions $\qquad$ Volume Components
\%
0.00 mi

| VFF | VRF | VFR | VRR |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2865 | 155 | 1360 | 560 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |
| 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |  |
| 796 | 43 | 378 | 156 |  |  |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | $\%$ |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\%$ |  |
| 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |  |  |
| 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |  |  |
| 0.976 | 0.976 | 0.976 | 1.000 |  |  |
| 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| 3263 | 177 | 1549 | 622 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |

Volume ratio, VR 0.308

Configuration Characteristics

Number of maneuver lanes, NWL
Interchange density, ID
Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF

## 2

$1.0 \quad$ int/mi
$1 \quad 1 \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{pc}$

| Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR | 1 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR |  | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN | 1726 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Weaving lane changes, LCW | 1832 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Non-weaving vehicle index, INW | 233 |  |
| Non-weaving lane change, LCNW | 548 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Total lane changes, LCALL | 2380 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds

| Weaving intensity factor, W | 0.670 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Average weaving speed, SW | 44.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average non-weaving speed, SNW | 43.6 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Average non-weaving speed, SNW
$43.6 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$

|  | Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Weaving segment speed, S | 44.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Weaving segment density, D | 42.5 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LoS | E |  |
| Weaving segment v/c ratio | 0.956 |  |
| Weaving segment flow rate, v | 5489 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Weaving segment capacity, cW | 5742 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Limitations on Weaving Segments $\qquad$
If limit reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual | Note |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weaving length (ft) | 300 | 5666 | 600 | $\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}$ |
| Density-based capacty, |  | Maximum | Analyzed |  |
| cIWL (pc/h/ln) | 2350 | 1962 | c |  |
| v/c ratio | Maximum | Analyzed |  |  |
|  | 1.00 | 0.956 | d |  |

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment, under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is $F$.
NJDOT CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT - COLUMBIA TURNPIKE (C.R. 510) AND NJ ROUTE 24 MORRIS COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

|  | ＊ | $\rightarrow$ | － | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | \％ | ＊ | $\downarrow$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 中爯 | \％${ }^{\text {F }}$ | 止年 | 禹 | 7 | \％ | 中4 | $\mathrm{Cl}^{\prime \prime}$ | 年年 | 車 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 103 | 1071 | 450 | 219 | 1354 | 660 | 188 | 966 | 778 | 224 | 522 | 42 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 103 | 1071 | 450 | 219 | 1354 | 660 | 188 | 966 | 778 | 224 | 522 | 42 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1885 | 1900 | 1870 | 1841 | 1811 | 1796 | 1856 | 1856 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 134 | 1139 | 523 | 246 | 1574 | 825 | 221 | 1178 | 884 | 255 | 600 | 72 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.77 | 0.94 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.86 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.82 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 0.58 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 131 | 1271 | 1407 | 294 | 1282 | 695 | 242 | 1106 | 1104 | 300 | 833 | 100 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.07 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.09 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.14 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.09 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3582 | 2834 | 3456 | 3497 | 1535 | 1711 | 3526 | 2768 | 3483 | 3221 | 386 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 134 | 1139 | 523 | 246 | 1574 | 825 | 221 | 1178 | 884 | 255 | 333 | 339 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1781 | 1791 | 1417 | 1728 | 1749 | 1535 | 1711 | 1763 | 1384 | 1742 | 1791 | 1816 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 11.0 | 45.1 | 17.1 | 10.5 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 19.1 | 47.1 | 42.3 | 10.8 | 25.4 | 25.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 11.0 | 45.1 | 17.1 | 10.5 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 19.1 | 47.1 | 42.3 | 10.8 | 25.4 | 25.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.21 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 131 | 1271 | 1407 | 294 | 1282 | 695 | 242 | 1106 | 1104 | 300 | 463 | 469 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 1.03 | 0.90 | 0.37 | 0.84 | 1.23 | 1.19 | 0.91 | 1.06 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.72 | 0.72 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 131 | 1271 | 1407 | 369 | 1282 | 695 | 262 | 1106 | 1104 | 325 | 463 | 469 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（1） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 69.5 | 45.8 | 23.3 | 67.6 | 47.5 | 41.0 | 63.5 | 51.5 | 39.8 | 67.6 | 50.7 | 50.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 85.8 | 8.6 | 0.2 | 12.7 | 109.4 | 98.2 | 32.3 | 46.1 | 6.1 | 17.7 | 9.3 | 9.3 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 8.1 | 21.2 | 5.5 | 5.1 | 42.4 | 43.1 | 10.5 | 27.6 | 14.7 | 5.5 | 12.6 | 12.8 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 155.3 | 54.4 | 23.5 | 80.3 | 156.9 | 139.2 | 95.7 | 97.6 | 45.9 | 85.3 | 59.9 | 60.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | D | C | F | F | F | F | F | D | F | E | E |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1796 |  |  | 2645 |  |  | 2283 |  |  | 927 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 52.9 |  |  | 144.3 |  |  | 77.4 |  |  | 66.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R c$ ），$s$ | 17.9 | 54.1 | 17.8 | 60.2 | 26.2 | 45.8 | 16.0 | 62.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 14.0 | 46.0 | 16.0 | 50.0 | 23.0 | 37.0 | 11.0 | 55.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 12.8 | 49.1 | 12.5 | 47.1 | 21.1 | 27.5 | 13.0 | 57.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 0.1 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 93.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\hat{F}$ |  | ${ }^{7} 1$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | 俭 | ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | \% ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 20 | 11 | 352 | 49 | 1 | 0 | 1932 | 415 | 566 | 590 | 35 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 20 | 11 | 352 | 49 | 1 | 0 | 1932 | 415 | 566 | 590 | 35 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 0 | 22 | 12 | 383 | 53 | 1 | 0 | 2100 | 451 | 615 | 641 | 38 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 0 | 39 | 21 | 392 | 330 | 6 | 0 | 1898 | 1026 | 654 | 2575 | 153 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.19 | 0.76 | 0.76 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 0 | 1138 | 621 | 3456 | 1830 | 35 | 0 | 3647 | 1585 | 3456 | 3409 | 202 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 34 | 383 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 2100 | 451 | 615 | 334 | 345 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 0 | 0 | 1759 | 1728 | 0 | 1864 | 0 | 1777 | 1585 | 1728 | 1777 | 1834 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 74.8 | 19.6 | 24.6 | 7.9 | 7.9 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 74.8 | 19.6 | 24.6 | 7.9 | 7.9 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 0.35 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.11 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 61 | 392 | 0 | 336 | 0 | 1898 | 1026 | 654 | 1342 | 1386 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.56 | 0.98 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 1.11 | 0.44 | 0.94 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 226 | 392 | 0 | 511 | 0 | 1898 | 1026 | 654 | 1342 | 1386 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.5 | 61.9 | 0.0 | 48.4 | 0.0 | 32.6 | 12.2 | 56.0 | 5.2 | 5.2 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 38.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 56.3 | 1.4 | 21.7 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 45.5 | 6.6 | 12.3 | 2.5 | 2.6 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 74.4 | 100.8 | 0.0 | 48.7 | 0.0 | 89.0 | 13.5 | 77.7 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | E | F | A | D | A | F | B | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 34 |  |  | 437 |  |  | 2551 |  |  | 1294 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 74.4 |  |  | 94.3 |  |  | 75.6 |  |  | 39.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), $s$ | 31.0 | 79.3 | 20.4 | 9.3 |  | 110.3 |  | 29.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 26.5 | 61.6 | 15.9 | 18.0 |  | 92.6 |  | 38.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l1), s | 26.6 | 76.8 | 17.5 | 4.7 |  | 9.9 |  | 5.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  | 4.0 |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 66.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis
Analyst: BMS
Agency/Co.: IH
Date Performed: 2020
Analysis Time Period: PM Peak
Freeway/Dir of Travel: NJ 24 EB at CR 510
Weaving Location: EB
Analysis Year: 2020
Description: NJ 24/CR 510 CD - Alt 3
Inputs $\qquad$

Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, $N$
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length

Freeway
One-Sided
3 ln
600 ft
$65 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$15 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$2350 \quad \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level
0.00
0.00
\%
mi

Conversion to $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ Under Base Conditions $\qquad$
Volume Components

| Volume, V | 2531 | 307 | 764 | 219 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Peak hour factor, PHF | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 703 | 85 | 212 | 61 |  |
| Trucks and buses | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | $\%$ |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \% |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |  |
| Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV | 0.976 | 0.976 | 0.976 | 1.000 |  |
| Driver population adjustment, fP | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flow rate, v | 2883 | 350 | 870 | 243 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Volume ratio, VR
0.281

Configuration Characteristics

Number of maneuver lanes, NWL
Interchange density, ID
Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF

2
$1.0 \quad$ int/mi
$1 \quad \mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$

| Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR | 1 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$ |  |

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds $\qquad$

| Weaving intensity factor, W | 0.518 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Average weaving speed, SW | 47.9 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average non-weaving speed, SNW | 49.3 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity
Weaving segment speed, S $48.9 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
Weaving segment density, D 29.6 pc/mi/ln Level of service, LOS D Weaving segment v/c ratio 0.731
Weaving segment flow rate, $v$
4246 veh/h
Weaving segment capacity, cW
5807 veh/h
Limitations on Weaving Segments
If limit reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual | Note |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weaving length (ft) | 300 | 5378 | 600 | $\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}$ |
| Density-based capacty, |  | Maximum | Analyzed |  |
| cIWL (pc/h/ln) | 2350 | 1984 | c |  |
| v/c ratio |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum | Analyzed |  |  |  |
|  | 1.00 | 0.731 | d |  |

## Notes:

a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment, under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F .
1 ${ }^{E}$ IH Engineers. P.C.
NJDOT CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT - COLUMBIA TURNPIKE (C.R. 510) AND NJ ROUTE 24 MORRIS COUNTY, NEW JERSEY


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1 /}$ | 44 | 「 | 1 | 44 | 「＇ | ${ }^{1 /}$ | 44 | 「「「 | 7 | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 34 | 934 | 293 | 375 | 1200 | 143 | 209 | 324 | 544 | 357 | 786 | 148 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 34 | 934 | 293 | 375 | 1200 | 143 | 209 | 324 | 544 | 357 | 786 | 148 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1885 | 1900 | 1870 | 1841 | 1811 | 1796 | 1856 | 1856 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 54 | 1015 | 419 | 481 | 1644 | 196 | 235 | 348 | 567 | 476 | 914 | 163 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.63 | 0.92 | 0.70 | 0.78 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.96 | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 69 | 1144 | 679 | 538 | 1526 | 907 | 175 | 728 | 1002 | 539 | 787 | 140 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.04 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.16 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.10 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.15 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3582 | 1610 | 3456 | 3497 | 1535 | 1711 | 3526 | 2768 | 3483 | 3037 | 541 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 54 | 1015 | 419 | 481 | 1644 | 196 | 235 | 348 | 567 | 476 | 539 | 538 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1781 | 1791 | 1610 | 1728 | 1749 | 1535 | 1711 | 1763 | 1384 | 1742 | 1791 | 1788 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 4.4 | 39.5 | 29.8 | 20.0 | 64.0 | 8.8 | 15.0 | 12.8 | 24.1 | 19.6 | 38.0 | 38.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 4.4 | 39.5 | 29.8 | 20.0 | 64.0 | 8.8 | 15.0 | 12.8 | 24.1 | 19.6 | 38.0 | 38.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.30 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 69 | 1144 | 679 | 538 | 1526 | 907 | 175 | 728 | 1002 | 539 | 464 | 463 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.78 | 0.89 | 0.62 | 0.89 | 1.08 | 0.22 | 1.34 | 0.48 | 0.57 | 0.88 | 1.16 | 1.16 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 109 | 1144 | 679 | 636 | 1526 | 907 | 175 | 728 | 1002 | 688 | 464 | 463 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 69.9 | 47.4 | 33.2 | 60.7 | 41.4 | 14.1 | 65.9 | 51.3 | 37.5 | 60.7 | 54.4 | 54.4 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 16.9 | 8.7 | 1.7 | 13.6 | 47.1 | 0.1 | 187.8 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 10.8 | 94.2 | 94.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／In | 2.3 | 18.6 | 11.5 | 9.6 | 36.0 | 2.9 | 15.6 | 5.7 | 8.0 | 9.4 | 29.1 | 29.1 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 86.7 | 56.1 | 34.9 | 74.3 | 88.4 | 14.2 | 253.6 | 51.7 | 38.3 | 71.5 | 148.6 | 148.9 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | E | C | E | F | B | F | D | D | E | F | F |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1488 |  |  | 2321 |  |  | 1150 |  |  | 1553 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 51.2 |  |  | 79.2 |  |  | 86.4 |  |  | 125.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R c$ ），$s$ | 27.7 | 37.3 | 27.8 | 53.9 | 20.0 | 45.0 | 10.7 | 71.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 29.0 | 24.0 | 27.0 | 46.0 | 15.0 | 38.0 | 9.0 | 64.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋l1），s | 21.6 | 26.1 | 22.0 | 41.5 | 17.0 | 40.0 | 6.4 | 66.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 85.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis $\qquad$
Analyst: VJS
Agency/Co.: IH
Date Performed: Feb 2020
Analysis Time Period:
Freeway/Dir of Travel:
Weaving Location:
Analysis Year:
AM Peak
NJ 24 EB at CR 510
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Analysis Year: } & 2020 \\ \text { Description: } & \text { NJ } 24 / C R 510 \text { CD - Alt } 4\end{array}$
Inputs $\qquad$
Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length
Nu 24/CR 510 CD - Alt 4

| Segment Type | Freeway |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weaving configuration | One-S |  |
| Number of lanes, $N$ | 3 | 1 n |
| Weaving segment length, LS | 600 | ft |
| Freeway free-flow speed, FFS | 65 | mi/h |
| Minimum segment speed, SMIN | 15 | mi/h |
| Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL | 2350 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Terrain type | Level |  |
| Grade | 0.00 | \% |
| Length | 0.00 | mi |



Configuration Characteristics

| Number of maneuver lanes, NWL | 2 | 1 n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interchange density, ID | 1.0 | int/mi |
| Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF | 1 | lc/pc |
| Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR | 1 | lc/pc |
| Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR |  | lc/pc |
| Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN |  | lc/h |
| Weaving lane changes, LCW |  | lc/h |
| Non-weaving vehicle index, INW |  |  |
| Non-weaving lane change, LCNW |  | lc/h |
| Total lane changes, LCALL |  | lc/h |

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, W

```
Average weaving speed, SW
    mi/h
Average non-weaving speed, SNW mi/h
Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity
```

$\qquad$

```
W-_\overline{Wing-_segment speed, S Speed, Density, Level of Service}
Weaving segment density, D pc/mi/ln
Level of service, LOS F
Weaving segment v/c ratio 1.050
Weaving segment flow rate, v veh/h
Weaving segment capacity, cW ve07 veh/h
Limitations on Weaving Segments
``` \(\qquad\)
```

$\overline{\text { If }} \bar{l} \overline{\text { im }} \overline{i t}$ reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | Note

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft, weaving vehicles are assumed to
make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be
treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of
Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment,
under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.

```

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis \(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Analyst: & VJS \\
Agency/Co.: & IH \\
Date Performed: & Feb 2020 \\
Analysis Time Period: & AM Peak \\
Freeway/Dir of Travel: & NJ 24 EB at CR 510 \\
Weaving Location: & EB \\
Analysis Year: & 2020 \\
Description: & NJ \(24 / C R 510\) CD - Alt 4, Weave 2
\end{tabular}

Inputs \(\qquad\)
Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length
NJ 24/CR 510 CD - Alt 4, Weave 2
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Segment Type & Freeway & \\
Weaving configuration & One-Sided & \\
Number of lanes, N & 3 & ln \\
Weaving segment length, LS & 900 & ft \\
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS & 65 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Minimum segment speed, SMIN & 15 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL & 2350 & \(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}\) \\
Terrain type & & \\
Grade & 0.00 & \\
Length & 0.00 & mi
\end{tabular}


Configuration Characteristics
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Number of maneuver lanes, NWL & 2 & ln \\
Interchange density, ID & 1.0 & int/mi \\
Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF & 1 & \(l \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{pc}\) \\
Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR & 1 & \(\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}\) \\
Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR & & \(l \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{pc}\) \\
Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN & & \\
Weaving lane changes, LCW & 1938 & \(l \mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Non-weaving vehicle index, INW & 376 & \\
Non-weaving lane change, LCNW & 770 & \(l c / h\) \\
Total lane changes, LCALL & 2708 & \(l c / h\)
\end{tabular}

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, W 0.539
```

Average weaving speed, SW
47.5
mi/h
Average non-weaving speed, SNW 42.6 mi/h
Average non-weaving speed, SNW 42.6 mi/h

```


Limitations on Weaving Segments \(\qquad\)
\(\overline{\text { If }}\) limit reached, see note.
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
& Minimum & Maximum & Actual
\end{tabular} Note
Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to
    make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be
    treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of
    Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment,
    under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Movement & EBL & EBT & EBR & WBL & WBT & WBR & NBL & NBT & NBR & SBL & SBT & SBR \\
\hline Lane Configurations & \％ & 个个 & 7 & \％\({ }^{*}\) & 个 4 & F & \％ & 个4 & 「「「 & \％\({ }^{1}\) & 中t & \\
\hline Traffic Volume（veh／h） & 103 & 1402 & 119 & 216 & 1354 & 660 & 188 & 966 & 1197 & 423 & 323 & 42 \\
\hline Future Volume（veh／h） & 103 & 1402 & 119 & 216 & 1354 & 660 & 188 & 966 & 1197 & 423 & 323 & 42 \\
\hline Initial \(\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})\) ，veh & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 \\
\hline Parking Bus，Adj & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Work Zone On Approach & & No & & & No & & & No & & & No & \\
\hline Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln & 1870 & 1885 & 1900 & 1870 & 1841 & 1811 & 1796 & 1856 & 1856 & 1885 & 1885 & 1885 \\
\hline Adj Flow Rate，veh／h & 163 & 1524 & 170 & 277 & 1855 & 904 & 211 & 1039 & 1247 & 564 & 376 & 46 \\
\hline Peak Hour Factor & 0.63 & 0.92 & 0.70 & 0.78 & 0.73 & 0.73 & 0.89 & 0.93 & 0.96 & 0.75 & 0.86 & 0.91 \\
\hline Percent Heavy Veh，\％ & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 4 & 6 & 7 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline Cap，veh／h & 109 & 1428 & 806 & 336 & 1521 & 940 & 174 & 575 & 720 & 620 & 769 & 93 \\
\hline Arrive On Green & 0.06 & 0.40 & 0.40 & 0.10 & 0.43 & 0.43 & 0.10 & 0.16 & 0.16 & 0.18 & 0.24 & 0.24 \\
\hline Sat Flow，veh／h & 1781 & 3582 & 1610 & 3456 & 3497 & 1535 & 1711 & 3526 & 2768 & 3483 & 3215 & 391 \\
\hline Grp Volume（v），veh／h & 163 & 1524 & 170 & 277 & 1855 & 904 & 211 & 1039 & 1247 & 564 & 208 & 214 \\
\hline Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln & 1781 & 1791 & 1610 & 1728 & 1749 & 1535 & 1711 & 1763 & 1384 & 1742 & 1791 & 1815 \\
\hline Q Serve（g＿s），s & 9.0 & 58.7 & 8.7 & 11.6 & 64.0 & 64.0 & 15.0 & 24.0 & 24.0 & 23.4 & 14.7 & 14.9 \\
\hline Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s & 9.0 & 58.7 & 8.7 & 11.6 & 64.0 & 64.0 & 15.0 & 24.0 & 24.0 & 23.4 & 14.7 & 14.9 \\
\hline Prop In Lane & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 0.22 \\
\hline Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h & 109 & 1428 & 806 & 336 & 1521 & 940 & 174 & 575 & 720 & 620 & 428 & 434 \\
\hline V／C Ratio（X） & 1.50 & 1.07 & 0.21 & 0.82 & 1.22 & 0.96 & 1.21 & 1.81 & 1.73 & 0.91 & 0.49 & 0.49 \\
\hline Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h & 109 & 1428 & 806 & 634 & 1521 & 940 & 174 & 575 & 720 & 686 & 462 & 469 \\
\hline HCM Platoon Ratio & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Upstream Filter（l） & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Uniform Delay（d），s／veh & 69.1 & 44.2 & 20.5 & 65.2 & 41.6 & 26.9 & 66.1 & 61.6 & 54.4 & 59.3 & 48.2 & 48.3 \\
\hline Incr Delay（d2），s／veh & 265.4 & 43.9 & 0.1 & 5.1 & 105.1 & 20.5 & 136.0 & 370.2 & 334.8 & 15.4 & 0.9 & 0.9 \\
\hline Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln & 12.1 & 33.9 & 3.2 & 5.2 & 48.2 & 31.8 & 13.1 & 40.2 & 46.4 & 11.6 & 6.7 & 6.9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrrrrrrrrr} 
LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh & 334.5 & 88.2 & 20.6 & 70.3 & 146.7 & 47.4 & 202.1 & 431.8 & 389.3 & 74.7 & 49.1 & 49.2 \\
LnGrp LOS & F & F & C & E & F & D & F & F & F & E & D & D \\
\hline Approach Vol，veh／h & 1857 & & & 3036 & & & 2497 & & 986 \\
Approach Delay，slveh & & 103.6 & & & 110.1 & & 391.1 & & 63.8 \\
Approach LOS & F & & & F & & & F & & E
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrrrrr} 
Timer－Assigned Phs & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
\hline Phs Duration \((G+Y+R c)\) ，s & 31.2 & 31.0 & 19.3 & 65.7 & 20.0 & 42.2 & 14.0 & 71.0 \\
Change Period（Y＋Rc），s & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 \\
Max Green Setting（Gmax），s & 29.0 & 24.0 & 27.0 & 46.0 & 15.0 & 38.0 & 9.0 & 64.0 \\
Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s & 25.4 & 26.0 & 13.6 & 60.7 & 17.0 & 16.9 & 11.0 & 66.0 \\
Green Ext Time（p＿C），s & 0.8 & 0.0 & 0.7 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 2.3 & 0.0 & 0.0
\end{tabular}

\section*{Intersection Summary}

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 187.0
HCM 6th LOS
F

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis \(\qquad\)
Analyst: VJS
Agency/Co.: IH
Date Performed: Feb 2020
Analysis Time Period:
Freeway/Dir of Travel:
Weaving Location:
Analysis Year:
PM Peak
NJ 24 EB at CR 510
EB
Description: NJ \(24 / C R 510\) CD - Alt 4
Inputs \(\qquad\)
Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length
2020
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Segment Type & Freeway & \\
Weaving configuration & One-Sided & \\
Number of lanes, N & 3 & ln \\
Weaving segment length, LS & 600 & ft \\
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS & 65 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Minimum segment speed, SMIN & 15 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL & 2350 & \(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}\) \\
Terrain type & & \\
Grade & 0.00 & \\
Length & 0.00 & mi
\end{tabular}


Configuration Characteristics
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\hline Number of maneuver lanes, NWL & 2 & ln \\
Interchange density, ID & 1.0 & int/mi \\
Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF & 1 & \(l \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{pc}\) \\
Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR & 1 & lc/pc \\
Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR & & lc/pc \\
Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN & 1268 & \\
Weaving lane changes, LCW & 1374 & lc/h \\
Non-weaving vehicle index, INW & 200 & \\
Non-weaving lane change, LCNW & 434 & lc/h \\
Total lane changes, LCALL & 1808 & \(l c / h\)
\end{tabular}

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, W 0.540
```

Average weaving speed, SW
mi/h

```
Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity
\(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Weaving segment speed, S & 48.2 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Weaving segment density, D & 31.8 & \(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi}\) \\
Level of service, LOS & D & \\
Weaving segment v/c ratio & 0.771 & \\
Weaving segment flow rate, v & 4490 & \(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}\)
\end{tabular}
Weaving segment capacity, cW

5821
veh/h

Limitations on Weaving Segments \(\qquad\)
\(\overline{\text { If }} \bar{l} \overline{\text { im }} \overline{i t}\) reached, see note.
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
& Minimum & Maximum & Actual
\end{tabular} Note

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment, under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis \(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Analyst: & VJS \\
Agency/Co.: & IH \\
Date Performed: & Feb 2020 \\
Analysis Time Period: & PM Peak \\
Freeway/Dir of Travel: & NJ 24 EB at CR 510 \\
Weaving Location: & EB \\
Analysis Year: & 2020 \\
Description: & NJ \(24 / C R 510\) CD - Alt 4, Weave 2
\end{tabular}

Inputs \(\qquad\)
Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length
NJ 24/CR 510 CD - Alt 4, Weave 2
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Segment Type & Freeway & \\
Weaving configuration & One-Sided & \\
Number of lanes, N & 3 & ln \\
Weaving segment length, LS & 900 & ft \\
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS & 65 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Minimum segment speed, SMIN & 15 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL & 2350 & \(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}\) \\
Terrain type & & \\
Grade & 0.00 & \\
Length & 0.00 & mi
\end{tabular}


Configuration Characteristics
\begin{tabular}{lll}
\hline Number of maneuver lanes, NWL & 2 & ln \\
Interchange density, ID & 1.0 & int/mi \\
Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF & 1 & \(l \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{pc}\) \\
Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR & 1 & lc/pc \\
Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR & & lc/pc \\
Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN & 1834 & \\
Weaving lane changes, LCW & 1984 & lc/h \\
Non-weaving vehicle index, INW & 309 & \\
Non-weaving lane change, LCNW & 618 & lc/h \\
Total lane changes, LCALL & 2602 & lc/h
\end{tabular}

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, w 0.522
```

Average weaving speed, SW


Limitations on Weaving Segments $\qquad$
If limit reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | Note

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment, under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.

# Year 2040 alternatives analysis volume worksheets and Synchro reports 

1.1 IH Engineers. P.C.
NJDOT CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT - COLUMBIA TURNPIKE (C.R. 510) AND NJ ROUTE 24
MORRIS COUNTY, NEWJERSEY

ALt. 1

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1 /}$ | 44 | 「「 | ${ }^{7} 1$ | 中4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 | 「「゙ | 7\％ | 虫 |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 38 | 1037 | 325 | 624 | 1332 | 159 | 232 | 360 | 604 | 396 | 872 | 164 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 38 | 1037 | 325 | 624 | 1332 | 159 | 232 | 360 | 604 | 396 | 872 | 164 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1885 | 1900 | 1870 | 1841 | 1811 | 1796 | 1856 | 1856 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 60 | 1127 | 464 | 800 | 1825 | 218 | 261 | 387 | 629 | 528 | 1014 | 180 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.63 | 0.92 | 0.70 | 0.78 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.96 | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 77 | 836 | 1058 | 714 | 1389 | 869 | 240 | 813 | 1210 | 590 | 790 | 140 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.04 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.21 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.23 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.17 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3582 | 2834 | 3456 | 3497 | 1535 | 1711 | 3526 | 2768 | 3483 | 3040 | 539 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 60 | 1127 | 464 | 800 | 1825 | 218 | 261 | 387 | 629 | 528 | 597 | 597 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1781 | 1791 | 1417 | 1728 | 1749 | 1535 | 1711 | 1763 | 1384 | 1742 | 1791 | 1788 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 5.0 | 35.0 | 18.4 | 31.0 | 59.6 | 10.8 | 21.0 | 12.4 | 24.7 | 22.3 | 39.0 | 39.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 5.0 | 35.0 | 18.4 | 31.0 | 59.6 | 10.8 | 21.0 | 12.4 | 24.7 | 22.3 | 39.0 | 39.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.30 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 77 | 836 | 1058 | 714 | 1389 | 869 | 240 | 813 | 1210 | 590 | 466 | 465 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.78 | 1.35 | 0.44 | 1.12 | 1.31 | 0.25 | 1.09 | 0.48 | 0.52 | 0.89 | 1.28 | 1.28 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 107 | 836 | 1058 | 714 | 1389 | 869 | 240 | 813 | 1210 | 720 | 466 | 465 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.67 | 1.67 | 1.67 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 71.1 | 57.5 | 35.2 | 59.5 | 45.2 | 16.4 | 57.5 | 39.3 | 24.5 | 61.0 | 55.5 | 55.5 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 21.8 | 164.7 | 0.3 | 71.8 | 146.6 | 0.1 | 61.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 12.0 | 142.3 | 143.7 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 2.7 | 34.7 | 6.2 | 20.3 | 52.9 | 3.7 | 12.5 | 5.0 | 6.4 | 10.8 | 35.8 | 36.0 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 92.9 | 222.2 | 35.5 | 131.3 | 191.9 | 16.6 | 119.3 | 40.0 | 25.1 | 73.0 | 197.8 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | F | D | F | F | B | F | D | C | E | F |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1651 |  |  | 2843 |  |  | 1277 |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 165.1 |  |  | 161.4 |  | 48.9 | 1722 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  | F |  |  | D | 160.0 |  |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 30.4 | 41.6 | 36.0 | 42.0 | 26.0 | 46.0 | 11.4 | 66.6 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 31.0 | 29.0 | 31.0 | 35.0 | 21.0 | 39.0 | 9.0 | 57.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋I1），s | 24.3 | 26.7 | 33.0 | 37.0 | 23.0 | 41.0 | 7.0 | 61.6 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 142.7

HCM 6th LOS F

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
5：Park Avenue
02／04／2020

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1}$ |  | ${ }^{1+1}$ | $\hat{}$ |  |  | 个个 | 「 | ${ }^{1+1}$ | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 18 | 16 | 1113 | 200 | 70 | 0 | 1125 | 102 | 124 | 1698 | 18 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 18 | 16 | 1113 | 200 | 70 | 0 | 1125 | 102 | 124 | 1698 | 18 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.85 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 0 | 20 | 17 | 1210 | 217 | 76 | 0 | 1223 | 111 | 135 | 1846 | 20 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 0 | 26 | 22 | 945 | 345 | 121 | 0 | 1802 | 1237 | 180 | 2122 | 23 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 0 | 934 | 794 | 3456 | 1260 | 441 | 0 | 3647 | 1585 | 3456 | 3601 | 39 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 37 | 1210 | 0 | 293 | 0 | 1223 | 111 | 135 | 909 | 957 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 0 | 0 | 1727 | 1728 | 0 | 1702 | 0 | 1777 | 1585 | 1728 | 1777 | 1863 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 41.0 | 0.0 | 22.7 | 0.0 | 38.8 | 2.5 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 41.0 | 0.0 | 22.7 | 0.0 | 38.8 | 2.5 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 0.46 | 1.00 |  | 0.26 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 48 | 945 | 0 | 465 | 0 | 1802 | 1237 | 180 | 1047 | 1098 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.78 | 1.28 | 0.00 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 0.68 | 0.09 | 0.75 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 0 | 0 | 207 | 945 | 0 | 465 | 0 | 1802 | 1237 | 290 | 1047 | 1098 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 72.5 | 54.5 | 0.0 | 47.8 | 0.0 | 27.8 | 3.9 | 66.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 23.2 | 134.6 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％oile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 16.8 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 95.6 | 189.1 | 0.0 | 50.6 | 0.0 | 29.9 | 4.0 | 66.8 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | F | F | A | D | A | C | A | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 37 |  |  | 1503 |  |  | 1334 |  |  | 2001 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 95.6 |  |  | 162.1 |  |  | 27.7 |  | 5.4 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 12.3 | 82.1 | 8.6 | 94.4 | 47.0 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 12.6 | 57.4 | 18.0 | 74.5 | 41.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 7.7 | 40.8 | 5.2 | 2.0 | 43.0 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿C），s | 0.1 | 8.4 | 0.1 | 23.0 | 0.0 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 60.5
HCM 6th LOS

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | VJS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | IH |
| Date Performed: | Feb 2020 |
| Analysis Time Period: | AM Peak - Alt 1 |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | NJ 24 EB at CR 510 |
| Weaving Location: | EB |
| Analysis Year: | 2040 |
| Description: | NJ 24/CR 510 CD |

Inputs $\qquad$

Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Freeway
One-Sided
3 In

600 ft
65 mi/h
$15 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$2350 \quad \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$

Grade
Level

Length
0.00
\%
0.00 mi


Configuration Characteristics

| Number of maneuver lanes, NWL | 2 | ln |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Interchange density, ID | 1.0 | int/mi |
| Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF | 1 | lc/pc |
| Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR | 1 | lc/pc |
| Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR |  | lc/pc |
|  |  |  |
| Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN | 1001 | lc/h |
| Weaving lane changes, LCW | 1107 | lc/h |
| Non-weaving vehicle index, INW | 268 |  |
| Non-weaving lane change, LCNW | 667 | lc/h |
| Total lane changes, LCALL | 1774 | lc/h |

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, w 0.532

```
Average weaving speed, SW
47.6
    mi/h
Average non-weaving speed, SNW 49.1 mi/h
```



Limitations on Weaving Segments $\qquad$
$\overline{\text { If }}$ limit reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | Note

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft, weaving vehicles are assumed to
make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be
treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of
Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment,
under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
3：Park Avenue \＆Columbia Turnpike
02／04／2020

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个4 | F＇7 | \％${ }^{1+1}$ | 个4 | 「 | \％ | 个4 | 「「＇ | ＊＊ | 中t |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 114 | 1557 | 132 | 370 | 1502 | 733 | 209 | 1073 | 1330 | 470 | 359 | 47 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 114 | 1557 | 132 | 370 | 1502 | 733 | 209 | 1073 | 1330 | 470 | 359 | 47 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ， | 0 | 0 | ， | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1885 | 1900 | 1870 | 1841 | 1811 | 1796 | 1856 | 1856 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 148 | 1656 | 153 | 416 | 1747 | 916 | 246 | 1309 | 1511 | 534 | 413 | 81 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.77 | 0.94 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.86 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.82 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 0.58 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 163 | 1254 | 1447 | 173 | 1078 | 691 | 275 | 911 | 853 | 493 | 715 | 139 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.09 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.05 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.24 | 0.24 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3582 | 2834 | 3456 | 3497 | 1535 | 1711 | 3526 | 2768 | 3483 | 2990 | 582 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 148 | 1656 | 153 | 416 | 1747 | 916 | 246 | 1309 | 1511 | 534 | 246 | 248 |
| Grp Sat Flow（ s ，veh／h／ln | 1781 | 1791 | 1417 | 1728 | 1749 | 1535 | 1711 | 1763 | 1384 | 1742 | 1791 | 1780 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 9.9 | 42.0 | 3.4 | 6.0 | 37.0 | 37.0 | 17.2 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 17.0 | 14.5 | 14.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 9.9 | 42.0 | 3.4 | 6.0 | 37.0 | 37.0 | 17.2 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 17.0 | 14.5 | 14.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.33 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 163 | 1254 | 1447 | 173 | 1078 | 691 | 275 | 911 | 853 | 493 | 429 | 426 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.91 | 1.32 | 0.11 | 2.41 | 1.62 | 1.33 | 0.89 | 1.44 | 1.77 | 1.08 | 0.57 | 0.58 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 163 | 1254 | 1447 | 173 | 1078 | 691 | 299 | 911 | 853 | 493 | 429 | 426 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 54.0 | 39.0 | 15.2 | 57.0 | 41.5 | 33.0 | 55.8 | 54.9 | 50.5 | 51.5 | 40.3 | 40.3 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 44.4 | 150.1 | 0.0 | 650.8 | 283.3 | 156.7 | 3.4 | 197.3 | 347.2 | 64.5 | 5.5 | 5.7 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 6.4 | 43.8 | 1.0 | 18.1 | 57.5 | 48.3 | 8.2 | 39.6 | 54.1 | 11.7 | 7.0 | 7.1 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 98.3 | 189.1 | 15.2 | 707.8 | 324.8 | 189.7 | 59.2 | 252.2 | 397.7 | 116.0 | 45.8 | 46.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | F | F | B | F | F | F | E | F | F | F | D | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1957 |  |  | 3079 |  |  | 3066 |  | 1028 |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 168.7 |  |  | 336.4 |  |  | 308.4 |  | 82.3 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  | F |  |  | $F$ |  | F |  |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 22.0 | 38.0 | 11.0 | 49.0 | 24.3 | 35.7 | 16.0 | 44.0 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$ ，s | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 17.0 | 31.0 | 6.0 | 42.0 | 21.0 | 27.0 | 11.0 | 37.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 19.0 | 33.0 | 8.0 | 44.0 | 19.2 | 16.8 | 11.9 | 39.0 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿C），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 262.4
HCM 6th LOS
F

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
5: Park Avenue \& Alt 1 Ramp

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{17}$ | $\hat{1}$ |  |  | 个4 | F' | ${ }^{1+1}$ | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 17 | 17 | 605 | 109 | 38 | 0 | 2571 | 278 | 278 | 584 | 39 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 17 | 17 | 605 | 109 | 38 | 0 | 2571 | 278 | 278 | 584 | 39 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 0 | 18 | 18 | 658 | 118 | 41 | 0 | 2795 | 302 | 302 | 635 | 42 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 0 | 25 | 25 | 518 | 199 | 69 | 0 | 1955 | 1110 | 331 | 2312 | 153 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.10 | 0.68 | 0.68 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 0 | 858 | 858 | 3456 | 1326 | 461 | 0 | 3647 | 1585 | 3456 | 3383 | 224 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 36 | 658 | 0 | 159 | 0 | 2795 | 302 | 302 | 333 | 344 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 0 | 0 | 1716 | 1728 | 0 | 1787 | 0 | 1777 | 1585 | 1728 | 1777 | 1830 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 66.0 | 8.5 | 10.4 | 8.8 | 8.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 66.0 | 8.5 | 10.4 | 8.8 | 8.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.00 |  | 0.50 | 1.00 |  | 0.26 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.12 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 50 | 518 | 0 | 268 | 0 | 1955 | 1110 | 331 | 1214 | 1251 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 1.27 | 0.00 | 0.59 | 0.00 | 1.43 | 0.27 | 0.91 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 257 | 518 | 0 | 268 | 0 | 1955 | 1110 | 331 | 1214 | 1251 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.8 | 51.0 | 0.0 | 47.6 | 0.0 | 27.0 | 6.7 | 53.7 | 7.4 | 7.4 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.6 | 135.8 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 196.5 | 0.6 | 4.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 17.3 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 79.2 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 75.4 | 186.8 | 0.0 | 51.1 | 0.0 | 223.5 | 7.3 | 57.7 | 7.5 | 7.5 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | E | F | A | D | A | F | A | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 36 |  |  | 817 |  |  | 3097 |  |  | 979 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 75.4 |  |  | 160.4 |  |  | 202.4 |  |  | 23.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 16.0 | 72.0 | 8.0 | 88.0 | 24.0 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.5 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 11.5 | 51.5 | 18.0 | 67.5 | 18.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 12.4 | 68.0 | 4.5 | 10.8 | 20.0 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 4.0 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 158.9
HCM 6th LOS
F

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | VJS |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | IH |
| Date Performed: | Feb 2020 |
| Analysis Time Period: | PM Peak - Alt 1 |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | NJ 24 EB at CR 510 |
| Weaving Location: | EB |
| Analysis Year: | 2040 |
| Description: | NJ 24/CR 510 CD |

Inputs $\qquad$

Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Freeway
One-Sided
3 In

600 ft
65 mi/h
$15 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$
$2350 \quad \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$

Grade
Level

Length
0.00
\%
0.00 mi


Configuration Characteristics

| Number of maneuver lanes, NWL | 2 | ln |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Interchange density, ID | 1.0 | int/mi |
| Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF | 1 | $l \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{pc}$ |
| Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR | 1 | $\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}$ |
| Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR |  | $l \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{pc}$ |
| Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN | 861 |  |
| Weaving lane changes, LCW | 967 | $l c / h$ |
| Non-weaving vehicle index, INW | 206 |  |
| Non-weaving lane change, LCNW | 455 |  |
| Total lane changes, LCALL | 1422 | $l c / h$ |

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, W 0.446

```
Average weaving speed, SW 
```



```
Limitations on Weaving Segments
``` \(\qquad\)
```

If limit reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual | Note |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weaving length (ft) | 300 | 4541 | 600 | a, b |
| Density-based capacty, |  | Maximum | Analyzed |  |
| cIWL (pc/h/ln) | 2350 | 2049 | c |  |
| v/cratio |  |  | Maximum | Analyzed |

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft, weaving vehicles are assumed to
make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be
treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of
Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment,
under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.

```
E
IH Engineers. p.c.
NJDOT CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT - COLUMBIA TURNPIKE (C.R. 510) AND NJ ROUTE 24
MORRIS COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Movement & EBL & EBT & EBR & WBL & WBT & WBR & NBL & NBT & NBR & SBL & SBT & SBR \\
\hline Lane Configurations & & 44 & 「「 & 71 & 44 & 「 & \({ }^{1 /}\) & 44 & 「「で & 7\％ & 㻢 & \\
\hline Traffic Volume（veh／h） & 0 & 1075 & 325 & 624 & 1332 & 159 & 232 & 397 & 603 & 396 & 872 & 164 \\
\hline Future Volume（veh／h） & 0 & 1075 & 325 & 624 & 1332 & 159 & 232 & 397 & 603 & 396 & 872 & 164 \\
\hline Initial Q（Qb），veh & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 \\
\hline Parking Bus，Adj & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Work Zone On Approach & & No & & & No & & & No & & & No & \\
\hline Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln & 0 & 1885 & 1900 & 1870 & 1841 & 1811 & 1796 & 1856 & 1856 & 1885 & 1885 & 1885 \\
\hline Adj Flow Rate，veh／h & 0 & 1168 & 464 & 800 & 1825 & 218 & 261 & 427 & 628 & 528 & 1014 & 180 \\
\hline Peak Hour Factor & 0.63 & 0.92 & 0.70 & 0.78 & 0.73 & 0.73 & 0.89 & 0.93 & 0.96 & 0.75 & 0.86 & 0.91 \\
\hline Percent Heavy Veh，\％ & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 4 & 6 & 7 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline Cap，veh／h & 0 & 812 & 1058 & 714 & 1632 & 976 & 251 & 836 & 1228 & 590 & 790 & 140 \\
\hline Arrive On Green & 0.00 & 0.23 & 0.23 & 0.21 & 0.47 & 0.47 & 0.24 & 0.40 & 0.40 & 0.17 & 0.26 & 0.26 \\
\hline Sat Flow，veh／h & 0 & 3676 & 2834 & 3456 & 3497 & 1535 & 1711 & 3526 & 2768 & 3483 & 3040 & 539 \\
\hline Grp Volume（v），veh／h & 0 & 1168 & 464 & 800 & 1825 & 218 & 261 & 427 & 628 & 528 & 597 & 597 \\
\hline Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln & 0 & 1791 & 1417 & 1728 & 1749 & 1535 & 1711 & 1763 & 1384 & 1742 & 1791 & 1788 \\
\hline Q Serve（g＿s），s & 0.0 & 34.0 & 18.4 & 31.0 & 70.0 & 9.0 & 22.0 & 13.8 & 24.1 & 22.3 & 39.0 & 39.0 \\
\hline Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s & 0.0 & 34.0 & 18.4 & 31.0 & 70.0 & 9.0 & 22.0 & 13.8 & 24.1 & 22.3 & 39.0 & 39.0 \\
\hline Prop In Lane & 0.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 0.30 \\
\hline Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h & 0 & 812 & 1058 & 714 & 1632 & 976 & 251 & 836 & 1228 & 590 & 466 & 465 \\
\hline V／C Ratio（X） & 0.00 & 1.44 & 0.44 & 1.12 & 1.12 & 0.22 & 1.04 & 0.51 & 0.51 & 0.89 & 1.28 & 1.28 \\
\hline Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h & 0 & 812 & 1058 & 714 & 1632 & 976 & 251 & 836 & 1228 & 720 & 466 & 465 \\
\hline HCM Platoon Ratio & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.67 & 1.67 & 1.67 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Upstream Filter（I） & 0.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 0.30 & 0.30 & 0.30 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Uniform Delay（d），s／veh & 0.0 & 58.0 & 35.2 & 59.5 & 40.0 & 11.6 & 56.6 & 38.7 & 23.7 & 61.0 & 55.5 & 55.5 \\
\hline Incr Delay（d2），s／veh & 0.0 & 204.4 & 0.3 & 71.8 & 62.1 & 0.1 & 42.1 & 0.7 & 0.5 & 12.0 & 142.3 & 143.7 \\
\hline Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln & 0.0 & 38.2 & 6.2 & 20.3 & 42.3 & 2.9 & 11.7 & 5.4 & 6.2 & 10.8 & 35.8 & 36.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrrrrrrrrr} 
LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh & 0.0 & 262.4 & 35.5 & 131.3 & 102.1 & 11.7 & 98.7 & 39.4 & 24.1 & 73.0 & 197.8 & 199.2 \\
LnGrp LOS & A & F & D & F & F & B & F & D & C & E & F & F \\
\hline Approach Vol，veh／h & 1632 & & & 2843 & & 1316 & & 1722 \\
Approach Delay，s／veh & 197.9 & & & 103.4 & & & 43.9 & & 160.0 \\
Approach LOS & F & & & F & & & D & F
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrrrr} 
Timer－Assigned Phs & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 8 \\
\hline Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s & 30.4 & 42.6 & 36.0 & 41.0 & 27.0 & 46.0 & 77.0 \\
Change Period（Y＋Rc），s & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 & 7.0 \\
Max Green Setting（Gmax），s & 31.0 & 30.0 & 31.0 & 34.0 & 22.0 & 39.0 & 70.0 \\
Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s & 24.3 & 26.1 & 33.0 & 36.0 & 24.0 & 41.0 & 72.0 \\
Green Ext Time（p＿c），s & 1.2 & 2.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0
\end{tabular}

\section*{Intersection Summary}

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 126.5
HCM 6th LOS F

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
5：Park Avenue \＆Alt 2 Ramp
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Movement & EBL & EBT & EBR & WBL & WBT & WBR & NBL & NBT & NBR & SBL & SBT & SBR \\
\hline Lane Configurations & & \(\uparrow\) & & \％\({ }^{1 / 1}\) & \(\hat{\beta}\) & & & 个 \(\uparrow\) & 「 & \({ }^{7} 1\) & 性 & \\
\hline Traffic Volume（veh／h） & 0 & 17 & 15 & 1113 & 200 & 108 & 0 & 1125 & 102 & 124 & 1698 & 18 \\
\hline Future Volume（veh／h） & 0 & 17 & 15 & 1113 & 200 & 108 & 0 & 1125 & 102 & 124 & 1698 & 18 \\
\hline Initial Q（Qb），veh & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 \\
\hline Parking Bus，Adj & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Work Zone On Approach & & No & & & No & & & No & & & No & \\
\hline Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln & 0 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 0 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 \\
\hline Adj Flow Rate，veh／h & 0 & 18 & 16 & 1210 & 217 & 117 & 0 & 1223 & 111 & 135 & 1846 & 20 \\
\hline Peak Hour Factor & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 \\
\hline Percent Heavy Veh，\％ & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline Cap，veh／h & 0 & 23 & 20 & 991 & 328 & 177 & 0 & 1763 & 1241 & 180 & 2082 & 23 \\
\hline Arrive On Green & 0.00 & 0.03 & 0.03 & 0.29 & 0.29 & 0.29 & 0.00 & 0.50 & 0.50 & 0.10 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Sat Flow，veh／h & 0 & 913 & 811 & 3456 & 1143 & 616 & 0 & 3647 & 1585 & 3456 & 3601 & 39 \\
\hline Grp Volume（v），veh／h & 0 & 0 & 34 & 1210 & 0 & 334 & 0 & 1223 & 111 & 135 & 909 & 957 \\
\hline Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln & 0 & 0 & 1724 & 1728 & 0 & 1759 & 0 & 1777 & 1585 & 1728 & 1777 & 1863 \\
\hline Q Serve（g＿s），s & 0.0 & 0.0 & 2.9 & 43.0 & 0.0 & 25.1 & 0.0 & 39.7 & 2.5 & 5.7 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s & 0.0 & 0.0 & 2.9 & 43.0 & 0.0 & 25.1 & 0.0 & 39.7 & 2.5 & 5.7 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline Prop In Lane & 0.00 & & 0.47 & 1.00 & & 0.35 & 0.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 0.02 \\
\hline Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h & 0 & 0 & 44 & 991 & 0 & 504 & 0 & 1763 & 1241 & 180 & 1027 & 1077 \\
\hline V／C Ratio（X） & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.78 & 1.22 & 0.00 & 0.66 & 0.00 & 0.69 & 0.09 & 0.75 & 0.89 & 0.89 \\
\hline Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h & 0 & 0 & 207 & 991 & 0 & 504 & 0 & 1763 & 1241 & 290 & 1027 & 1077 \\
\hline HCM Platoon Ratio & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 2.00 & 2.00 & 2.00 \\
\hline Upstream Filter（l） & 0.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 0.09 & 0.09 & 0.09 \\
\hline Uniform Delay（d），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 72.7 & 53.5 & 0.0 & 47.1 & 0.0 & 29.0 & 3.8 & 66.2 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline Incr Delay（d2），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 25.3 & 108.8 & 0.0 & 3.2 & 0.0 & 2.3 & 0.1 & 0.6 & 1.2 & 1.2 \\
\hline Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline \％ile BackOfQ（ \(50 \%\) ），veh／ln & 0.0 & 0.0 & 1.6 & 33.0 & 0.0 & 11.1 & 0.0 & 17.2 & 2.2 & 2.4 & 0.3 & 0.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh} \\
\hline LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 98.0 & 162.3 & 0.0 & 50.3 & 0.0 & 31.3 & 4.0 & 66.8 & 1.2 & 1.2 \\
\hline LnGrp LOS & A & A & F & F & A & D & A & C & A & E & A & A \\
\hline Approach Vol，veh／h & & 34 & & & 1544 & & & 1334 & & & 2001 & \\
\hline Approach Delay，s／veh & & 98.0 & & & 138.1 & & & 29.0 & & & 5.6 & \\
\hline Approach LOS & & F & & & F & & & C & & & A & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrr} 
Timer－Assigned Phs & 1 & 2 & 4 & 6 & 8 \\
\hline Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s & 12.3 & 80.4 & 8.3 & 92.7 & 49.0 \\
Change Period（Y＋Rc），s & 4.5 & 6.0 & 4.5 & 6.0 & 6.0 \\
Max Green Setting（Gmax），s & 12.6 & 55.4 & 18.0 & 72.5 & 43.0 \\
Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s & 7.7 & 41.7 & 4.9 & 2.0 & 45.0 \\
Green Ext Time（p＿c），s & 0.1 & 7.5 & 0.1 & 22.9 & 0.0
\end{tabular}

\section*{Intersection Summary}

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 54.2
HCM 6th LOS D
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{Intersection} \\
\hline Intersection Delay, s/veh & 105.7 & & & \\
\hline Intersection LOS & F & & & \\
\hline Approach & EB & WB & SB & SW \\
\hline Entry Lanes & 1 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\
\hline Conflicting Circle Lanes & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline Adj Approach Flow, veh/h & 265 & 2271 & 176 & 0 \\
\hline Demand Flow Rate, veh/h & 270 & 2316 & 180 & 0 \\
\hline Vehicles Circulating, veh/h & 138 & 0 & 1533 & 1533 \\
\hline Vehicles Exiting, veh/h & 1575 & 408 & 0 & 783 \\
\hline Follow-Up Headway, s & 3.186 & 3.186 & 3.186 & 3.186 \\
\hline Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Ped Cap Adj & 1.000 & 1.000 & 1.000 & 1.000 \\
\hline Approach Delay, s/veh & 6.2 & 124.0 & 19.9 & 0.0 \\
\hline Approach LOS & A & F & C & . \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrrr} 
Lane & Left & Left & Right & Left \\
\hline Designated Moves & LT & LT & R & LR \\
Assumed Moves & LT & LT & R & LR \\
RT Channelized & 1.000 & 0.662 & 0.338 & 1.000 \\
\hline Lane Util & 4.113 & 4.293 & 4.113 & 4.113 \\
\hline Critical Headway, s & 270 & 1533 & 783 & 180 \\
Entry Flow, veh/h & 1026 & 1130 & 1130 & 386 \\
Cap Entry Lane, veh/h & 0.980 & 1503 & 0.981 & 0.978 \\
Entry HV Adj Factor & 265 & 1108 & 1108 & 176 \\
Flow Entry, veh/h & 1006 & 1.357 & 0.693 & 378 \\
Cap Entry, veh/h & 0.263 & 180.3 & 13.7 & 0.466 \\
VIC Ratio & F & B & 19.9 \\
Control Delay, s/veh & 6.2 & 59 & 6 & C \\
LOS & A & & 2
\end{tabular}

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis \(\qquad\)
Analyst: VJS
Agency/Co.: IH
Date Performed: Feb 2020
Analysis Time Period:
Freeway/Dir of Travel:
Weaving Location:
Analysis Year:
AM Peak
NJ 24 EB at CR 510

2040
Description: NJ \(24 / C R 510\) CD - ALT 2
Inputs \(\qquad\)

Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Freeway
One-Sided
\(3 \quad \ln\)

1050 ft
\(65 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\)
\(15 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\)
\(2350 \quad \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}\)

Grade
Level

Length
0.00
\%
0.00 mi


Configuration Characteristics
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Number of maneuver lanes, NWL & 2 & ln \\
Interchange density, ID & 1.0 & int/mi \\
Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF & 1 & \(l \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{pc}\) \\
Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR & 1 & lc/pc \\
Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR & & lc/pc \\
Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN & & lc/h \\
Weaving lane changes, LCW & lc/h \\
Non-weaving vehicle index, INW & & \\
Non-weaving lane change, LCNW & & lc/h \\
Total lane changes, LCALL
\end{tabular}

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, W
```

Average weaving speed, SW
mi/h
Average non-weaving speed, SNW
mi/h
Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity

```
\(\qquad\)
```

| Weaving segment speed, S |  | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Weaving segment density, D | $\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |  |
| Level of service, Los |  |  |
| Weaving segment v/c ratio | 1.051 |  |
| Weaving segment flow rate, v | 6174 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Weaving segment capacity, cW | 5874 | $\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}$ |

Limitations on Weaving Segments

``` \(\qquad\)
```

$\overline{\text { If }} \bar{l} \overline{\text { im }} \overline{i t}$ reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual | Note |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weaving length (ft) | 300 | 5535 | 1050 | a, b |
| Density-based capacty, |  | Maximum | Analyzed |  |
| cIWL (pc/h/ln) | 2350 | 2007 | c |  |
| v/cratio |  |  | Maximum | Analyzed |

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft, weaving vehicles are assumed to
make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be
treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of
Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment,
under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.

```
IH Engineers. P.C.
NJDOT CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT - COLUMBIA TURNPIKE (C.R. 510) AND NJ ROUTE 24
MORRIS COUNTY, NEW JERSEY
\# -

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Movement & EBL & EBT & EBR & WBL & WBT & WBR & NBL & NBT & NBR & SBL & SBT & SBR \\
\hline Lane Configurations & & 44 & 「「で & 7 & 44 & 「＇ & \({ }^{7}\) & 中4 & 「「゙ & 71 & 㻢 & \\
\hline Traffic Volume（veh／h） & 0 & 1671 & 132 & 371 & 1503 & 733 & 209 & 1187 & 1329 & 470 & 359 & 47 \\
\hline Future Volume（veh／h） & 0 & 1671 & 132 & 371 & 1503 & 733 & 209 & 1187 & 1329 & 470 & 359 & 47 \\
\hline Initial Q（Qb），veh & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 \\
\hline Parking Bus，Adj & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Work Zone On Approach & & No & & & No & & & No & & & No & \\
\hline Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln & 0 & 1885 & 1900 & 1870 & 1841 & 1811 & 1796 & 1856 & 1856 & 1885 & 1885 & 1885 \\
\hline Adj Flow Rate，veh／h & 0 & 1778 & 153 & 417 & 1748 & 916 & 246 & 1448 & 1510 & 534 & 413 & 81 \\
\hline Peak Hour Factor & 0.77 & 0.94 & 0.86 & 0.89 & 0.86 & 0.80 & 0.85 & 0.82 & 0.88 & 0.88 & 0.87 & 0.58 \\
\hline Percent Heavy Veh，\％ & 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 4 & 6 & 7 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline Cap，veh／h & 0 & 1323 & 1498 & 159 & 1587 & 850 & 272 & 1058 & 958 & 348 & 720 & 140 \\
\hline Arrive On Green & 0.00 & 0.37 & 0.37 & 0.05 & 0.45 & 0.45 & 0.05 & 0.10 & 0.10 & 0.10 & 0.24 & 0.24 \\
\hline Sat Flow，veh／h & 0 & 3676 & 2834 & 3456 & 3497 & 1535 & 1711 & 3526 & 2768 & 3483 & 2990 & 582 \\
\hline Grp Volume（v），veh／h & 0 & 1778 & 153 & 417 & 1748 & 916 & 246 & 1448 & 1510 & 534 & 246 & 248 \\
\hline Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln & 0 & 1791 & 1417 & 1728 & 1749 & 1535 & 1711 & 1763 & 1384 & 1742 & 1791 & 1780 \\
\hline Q Serve（g＿s），s & 0.0 & 48.0 & 3.5 & 6.0 & 59.0 & 59.0 & 18.6 & 39.0 & 39.0 & 13.0 & 15.7 & 16.0 \\
\hline Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s & 0.0 & 48.0 & 3.5 & 6.0 & 59.0 & 59.0 & 18.6 & 39.0 & 39.0 & 13.0 & 15.7 & 16.0 \\
\hline Prop In Lane & 0.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 0.33 \\
\hline Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h & 0 & 1323 & 1498 & 159 & 1587 & 850 & 272 & 1058 & 958 & 348 & 431 & 429 \\
\hline V／C Ratio（X） & 0.00 & 1.34 & 0.10 & 2.61 & 1.10 & 1.08 & 0.90 & 1.37 & 1.58 & 1.53 & 0.57 & 0.58 \\
\hline Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h & 0 & 1323 & 1498 & 159 & 1587 & 850 & 290 & 1058 & 958 & 348 & 431 & 429 \\
\hline HCM Platoon Ratio & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 0.33 & 0.33 & 0.33 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Upstream Filter（I） & 0.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 0.09 & 0.09 & 0.09 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Uniform Delay（d），s／veh & 0.0 & 41.0 & 15.3 & 62.0 & 35.5 & 29.0 & 60.6 & 58.6 & 53.8 & 58.5 & 43.4 & 43.5 \\
\hline Incr Delay（d2），s／veh & 0.0 & 160.1 & 0.0 & 744.4 & 55.7 & 53.9 & 3.9 & 166.6 & 259.7 & 253.9 & 5.4 & 5.6 \\
\hline Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／In & 0.0 & 49.8 & 1.1 & 19.0 & 35.4 & 36.2 & 8.9 & 43.0 & 50.3 & 18.0 & 7.6 & 7.7 \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh} \\
\hline LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh & 0.0 & 201.1 & 15.3 & 806.4 & 91.2 & 82.9 & 64.5 & 225.2 & 313.6 & 312.4 & 48.8 & 49.1 \\
\hline LnGrp LOS & A & F & B & F & F & F & E & F & F & F & D & D \\
\hline Approach Vol，veh／h & & 1931 & & & 3081 & & & 3204 & & & 1028 & \\
\hline Approach Delay，s／veh & & 186.4 & & & 185.5 & & & 254.5 & & & 185.8 & \\
\hline Approach LOS & & F & & & F & & & F & & & F & \\
\hline Timer－Assigned Phs & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & & 8 & & & & \\
\hline Phs Duration（ \(G+Y+R c\) ），\(s\) & 18.0 & 46.0 & 11.0 & 55.0 & 25.7 & 38.3 & & 66.0 & & & & \\
\hline Change Period（Y＋Rc），s & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 & & 7.0 & & & & \\
\hline Max Green Setting（Gmax），s & 13.0 & 39.0 & 6.0 & 48.0 & 22.0 & 30.0 & & 59.0 & & & & \\
\hline Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋l1），s & 15.0 & 41.0 & 8.0 & 50.0 & 20.6 & 18.0 & & 61.0 & & & & \\
\hline Green Ext Time（p＿c），s & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.1 & 2.3 & & 0.0 & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{Intersection Summary} \\
\hline HCM 6th Ctrl Delay & & & 209.7 & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline HCM 6th LOS & & & F & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
5：Park Avenue \＆Alt 2 Ramp
02／04／2020
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Movement & EBL & EBT & EBR & WBL & WBT & WBR & NBL & NBT & NBR & SBL & SBT & SBR \\
\hline Lane Configurations & & \(\uparrow\) & & \％\({ }^{1+1}\) & F & & & 个4 & 「 & \({ }^{7 *}\) & 中 \({ }^{\text {c }}\) & \\
\hline Traffic Volume（veh／h） & 0 & 16 & 17 & 605 & 109 & 152 & 0 & 2572 & 278 & 278 & 583 & 39 \\
\hline Future Volume（veh／h） & 0 & 16 & 17 & 605 & 109 & 152 & 0 & 2572 & 278 & 278 & 583 & 39 \\
\hline Initial Q（Qb），veh & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 \\
\hline Parking Bus，Adj & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Work Zone On Approach & & No & & & No & & & No & & & No & \\
\hline Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln & 0 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 0 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 \\
\hline Adj Flow Rate，veh／h & 0 & 17 & 18 & 658 & 118 & 165 & 0 & 2796 & 302 & 302 & 634 & 42 \\
\hline Peak Hour Factor & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 \\
\hline Percent Heavy Veh，\％ & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline Cap，veh／h & 0 & 23 & 24 & 478 & 98 & 137 & 0 & 2032 & 1126 & 348 & 2392 & 158 \\
\hline Arrive On Green & 0.00 & 0.03 & 0.03 & 0.14 & 0.14 & 0.14 & 0.00 & 0.57 & 0.57 & 0.20 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Sat Flow，veh／h & 0 & 831 & 880 & 3456 & 706 & 987 & 0 & 3647 & 1585 & 3456 & 3383 & 224 \\
\hline Grp Volume（v），veh／h & 0 & 0 & 35 & 658 & 0 & 283 & 0 & 2796 & 302 & 302 & 333 & 343 \\
\hline Grp Sat Flow（ s ，veh／h／ln & 0 & 0 & 1712 & 1728 & 0 & 1693 & 0 & 1777 & 1585 & 1728 & 1777 & 1830 \\
\hline Q Serve（g＿s），s & 0.0 & 0.0 & 2.6 & 18.0 & 0.0 & 18.0 & 0.0 & 74.3 & 8.9 & 11.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s & 0.0 & 0.0 & 2.6 & 18.0 & 0.0 & 18.0 & 0.0 & 74.3 & 8.9 & 11.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline Prop In Lane & 0.00 & & 0.51 & 1.00 & & 0.58 & 0.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 0.12 \\
\hline Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h & 0 & 0 & 47 & 478 & 0 & 234 & 0 & 2032 & 1126 & 348 & 1256 & 1294 \\
\hline V／C Ratio（X） & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.74 & 1.38 & 0.00 & 1.21 & 0.00 & 1.38 & 0.27 & 0.87 & 0.26 & 0.27 \\
\hline Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h & 0 & 0 & 237 & 478 & 0 & 234 & 0 & 2032 & 1126 & 364 & 1256 & 1294 \\
\hline HCM Platoon Ratio & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 2.00 & 2.00 & 2.00 \\
\hline Upstream Filter（l） & 0.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 0.09 & 0.09 & 0.09 \\
\hline Uniform Delay（d），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 62.7 & 56.0 & 0.0 & 56.0 & 0.0 & 27.8 & 6.7 & 51.1 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline Incr Delay（d2），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 20.1 & 181.6 & 0.0 & 126.4 & 0.0 & 172.4 & 0.6 & 2.2 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln & 0.0 & 0.0 & 1.4 & 19.7 & 0.0 & 15.7 & 0.0 & 78.0 & 4.8 & 4.3 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh} \\
\hline LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 82.8 & 237.6 & 0.0 & 182.4 & 0.0 & 200.2 & 7.3 & 53.3 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline LnGrp LOS & A & A & F & F & A & F & A & F & A & D & A & A \\
\hline Approach Vol，veh／h & & 35 & & & 941 & & & 3098 & & & 978 & \\
\hline Approach Delay，s／veh & & 82.8 & & & 221.0 & & & 181.4 & & & 16.5 & \\
\hline Approach LOS & & F & & & F & & & F & & & B & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrr} 
Timer－Assigned Phs & 1 & 2 & 4 & 6 & 8 \\
\hline Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s & 17.6 & 80.3 & 8.1 & 97.9 & 24.0 \\
Change Period（Y＋Rc），s & 4.5 & 6.0 & 4.5 & 6.0 & 6.0 \\
Max Green Setting（Gmax），s & 13.7 & 59.3 & 18.0 & 77.5 & 18.0 \\
Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s & 13.0 & 76.3 & 4.6 & 2.0 & 20.0 \\
Green Ext Time（p＿c），s & 0.1 & 0.0 & 0.1 & 4.0 & 0.0
\end{tabular}

\section*{Intersection Summary}
\begin{tabular}{lr}
\hline HCM 6th Ctrl Delay & 156.2 \\
HCM 6th LOS & F
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Intersection} \\
\hline Intersection Delay, s/veh & 15.1 & & & & & & \\
\hline Intersection LOS & C & & & & & & \\
\hline Approach & & EB & & WB & & SB & SW \\
\hline Entry Lanes & & 1 & & 2 & & 1 & 0 \\
\hline Conflicting Circle Lanes & & 2 & & 2 & & 2 & 2 \\
\hline Adj Approach Flow, veh/h & & 622 & & 1255 & & 426 & 0 \\
\hline Demand Flow Rate, veh/h & & 634 & & 1280 & & 434 & 0 \\
\hline Vehicles Circulating, veh/h & & 308 & & 0 & & 833 & 833 \\
\hline Vehicles Exiting, veh/h & & 959 & & 942 & & 0 & 447 \\
\hline Follow-Up Headway, s & & 3.186 & & 3.186 & & 3.186 & 3.186 \\
\hline Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Ped Cap Adj & & 1.000 & & 1.000 & & 1.000 & 1.000 \\
\hline Approach Delay, s/veh & & 16.2 & & 12.6 & & 21.1 & 0.0 \\
\hline Approach LOS & & C & & B & & C & - \\
\hline Lane & Left & & Left & Right & Left & & \\
\hline Designated Moves & LT & & LT & R & LR & & \\
\hline Assumed Moves & LT & & LT & R & LR & & \\
\hline RT Channelized & & & & & & & \\
\hline Lane Util & 1.000 & & 0.651 & 0.349 & 1.000 & & \\
\hline Critical Headway, s & 4.113 & & 4.293 & 4.113 & 4.113 & & \\
\hline Entry Flow, veh/h & 634 & & 833 & 447 & 434 & & \\
\hline Cap Entry Lane, veh/h & 911 & & 1130 & 1130 & 631 & & \\
\hline Entry HV Adj Factor & 0.980 & & 0.980 & 0.980 & 0.982 & & \\
\hline Flow Entry, veh/h & 622 & & 817 & 438 & 426 & & \\
\hline Cap Entry, veh/h & 893 & & 1108 & 1107 & 619 & & \\
\hline VIC Ratio & 0.696 & & 0.737 & 0.396 & 0.688 & & \\
\hline Control Delay, s/veh & 16.2 & & 15.4 & 7.3 & 21.1 & & \\
\hline LOS & C & & C & A & C & & \\
\hline 95th \%tile Queue, veh & 6 & & 7 & 2 & 5 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis \(\qquad\)
Analyst: VJS
Agency/Co.: IH
Date Performed: Feb 2020
Analysis Time Period:
Freeway/Dir of Travel:
Weaving Location:
Analysis Year:
PM Peak
NJ 24 EB at CR 510
EB
Description: NJ \(24 / \mathrm{CR} 510 \mathrm{CD}\) - ALT 2
Inputs \(\qquad\)
Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length
2040
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Segment Type & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Freeway} \\
\hline Weaving configuration & One-S & \\
\hline Number of lanes, N & 3 & 1 n \\
\hline Weaving segment length, LS & 1050 & ft \\
\hline Freeway free-flow speed, FFS & 65 & mi/h \\
\hline Minimum segment speed, SMIN & 15 & mi/h \\
\hline Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL & 2350 & \(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}\) \\
\hline Terrain type & Level & \\
\hline Grade & 0.00 & \% \\
\hline Length & 0.00 & mi \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Configuration Characteristics
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Number of maneuver lanes, NWL & 2 & ln \\
Interchange density, ID & 1.0 & int/mi \\
Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF & 1 & \(l \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{pc}\) \\
Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR & 1 & \(\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}\) \\
Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR & & \(l \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{pc}\) \\
Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN & 1297 & \\
Weaving lane changes, LCW & 1464 & \(l \mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Non-weaving vehicle index, INW & 359 & \\
Non-weaving lane change, LCNW & 696 & \(l c / h\) \\
Total lane changes, LCALL & 2160 & \(l c / h\)
\end{tabular}

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, w 0.399
```

Average weaving speed, SW
50.7
mi/h
Average non-weaving speed, SNW
48.1 mi/h

```
Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity
\(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{llc} 
Weaving segment speed, S & 48.8 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Weaving segment density, D & 32.2 & \(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi}\) \\
Level of service, LOS & D & \\
Weaving segment v/c ratio & 0.779 & \\
Weaving segment flow rate, v & 4614 & \(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}\)
\end{tabular}
Weaving segment capacity, cW
veh/h

Limitations on Weaving Segments \(\qquad\)
If limit reached, see note.
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
& Minimum & Maximum & Actual & Note \\
Weaving length (ft) & 300 & 5316 & 1050 & a, b \\
Density-based capacty, & & Maximum & Analyzed & \\
cIWL (pc/h/ln) & 2350 & 2024 & c \\
v/cratio & & & Maximum & Analyzed
\end{tabular}

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment, under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.
\#

\({ }^{2}\)

NJDOT CONCEPT DEVEELOPMENT - COLUMBIA TURNPIKE (C.R. 510) AND NJ ROUTE 24
MORRIS COUNTY, NEW JERSEY
COUNTY ROUTE 510

HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
3: Park Avenue \& Columbia Turnpike


\footnotetext{
Alt 3B AM Peak - 2020 8:00 am 01/18/2017 2020 Alt 3B AM BMS-IH
}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 4 & & & \(\checkmark\) & & 4 & 4 & \(\uparrow\) & \(p\) & & \(\downarrow\) & \(\downarrow\) \\
\hline Movement & EBL & EBT & EBR & WBL & WBT & WBR & NBL & NBT & NBR & SBL & SBT & SBR \\
\hline Lane Configurations & & A & & 年市 & \(\hat{\beta}\) & & & 性 & 7 & 7\％\({ }^{\text {\％}}\) & 性 & \\
\hline Traffic Volume（veh／h） & ， & 26 & 8 & 1140 & 285 & 1 & 0 & 972 & 111 & 272 & 1847 & 18 \\
\hline Future Volume（veh／h） & 0 & 26 & 8 & 1140 & 285 & 1 & 0 & 972 & 111 & 272 & 1847 & 18 \\
\hline Initial \(Q(Q b)\) ，veh & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 \\
\hline Parking Bus，Adj & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Work Zone On Approach & & No & & & No & & & No & & & No & \\
\hline Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln & 0 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 0 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 \\
\hline Adj Flow Rate，veh／h & 0 & 28 & 9 & 1239 & 310 & 1 & 0 & 1057 & 121 & 296 & 2008 & 20 \\
\hline Peak Hour Factor & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 \\
\hline Percent Heavy Veh，\％ & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & ， & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline Cap，veh／h & 0 & 46 & 15 & 1002 & 660 & 2 & 0 & 1618 & 1181 & 348 & 2112 & 21 \\
\hline Arrive On Green & 0.00 & 0.03 & 0.03 & 0.29 & 0.35 & 0.35 & 0.00 & 0.46 & 0.46 & 0.10 & 0.59 & 0.59 \\
\hline Sat Flow，veh／h & ， & 1356 & 436 & 3456 & 1863 & 0.3 & 0 & 3647 & 1585 & 3456 & 3605 & ． 36 \\
\hline Grp Volume（v），veh／h． & 0 & 0 & 37 & 1239 & 0 & 311 & 0 & 1057 & 121 & 296 & 988 & 1040 \\
\hline Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln & 0 & 0 & 1792 & 1728 & 0 & 1869 & 0 & 1777 & 1585 & 1728 & 1777 & 1864 \\
\hline Q Serve（g＿s），s & 0.0 & 0.0 & 3.1 & 43.5 & 0.0 & 19.3 & 0.0 & 34.6 & 3.2 & 12.6 & 77.8 & 78.4 \\
\hline Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s & 0.0 & 0.0 & 3.1 & 43.5 & 0.0 & 19.3 & 0.0 & 34.6 & 3.2 & 12.6 & 77.8 & 78.4 \\
\hline Prop In Lane & 0.00 & & 0.24 & 1.00 & & 0.00 & 0.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 0.02 \\
\hline Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h & 0 & 0 & 61 & 1002 & 0 & 662 & 0 & 1618 & 1181 & 348 & 1041 & 1092 \\
\hline VIC Ratio（X） & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.60 & 1.24 & 0.00 & 0.47 & 0.00 & 0.65 & 0.10 & 0.85 & 0.95 & 0.95 \\
\hline Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h & 0 & 0 & 215 & 1002 & 0 & 822 & 0 & 1618 & 1181 & 463 & 1041 & 1092 \\
\hline HCM Platoon Ratio & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Upstream Filter（I） & 0.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Uniform Delay（d），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 71.4 & 53.2 & 0.0 & 37.5 & 0.0 & 31.7 & 5.3 & 66.3 & 29.0 & 29.1 \\
\hline Incr Delay（d2），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 9.3 & 115.0 & 0.0 & 0.5 & 0.0 & 2.1 & 0.2 & 11.0 & 18.0 & 17.9 \\
\hline Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{llllllllllllll} 
Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 80.7 & 168.3 & 0.0 & 38.0 & 0.0 & 33.8 & 5.4 & 77.3 & 47.0 & 47.0 \\
\hline LnGrp LOS & A & A & F & F & A & D & A & C & A & E & D & ， \\
\hline Approach Vol，veh／h & & 37 & & & 1550 & & & 1178 & & & 2324 & \\
\hline Approach Delay，s／veh & & 80.7 & & & 142.2 & & & 30.9 & & & 50.9 & \\
\hline Approach LOS & & F & & & F & & & C & & & D & \\
\hline Timer－Assigned Phs & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & & 6 & & 8 & & & & \\
\hline Phs Duration（ \(G+Y+\mathrm{Rc}\) ），\(s\) & 19.6 & 72.8 & 48.0 & 9.6 & & 92.4 & & 57.6 & & & & \\
\hline Change Period（ \(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}\) ），s & 4.5 & 4.5 & 4.5 & 4.5 & & 4.5 & & 4.5 & & & & \\
\hline Max Green Setting（Gmax），s & 20.1 & 50.4 & 43.5 & 18.0 & & 75.0 & & 66.0 & & & & \\
\hline Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋1），s & 14.6 & 36.6 & 45.5 & 5.1 & & 80.4 & & 21.3 & & & & \\
\hline Green Ext Time（p＿c），s & 0.5 & 6.5 & 0.0 & 0.1 & & 0.0 & & 1.7 & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{Intersection Summary} \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 74.3} \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{HCM 6th LOS E} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis \(\qquad\)

Analyst: SMC
Agency/Co.:
IH
Date Performed:
Analysis Time Period:
Freeway/Dir of Travel:
Dec 2019
AM Peak

Weaving Location:
NJ 24 EB at CR 510
Analysis Year:
EB

Description:

\section*{2040}

NJ 24/CR 510 CD - Alt 3

Inputs \(\qquad\)

Segment Type Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N Weaving segment length, LS Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length

Level
Freeway
One-Sided
3 ln
600 ft
\(65 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\)
\(15 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\)
\(2350 \quad \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}\)
0.00
\%
0.00 mi

Conversion to \(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}\) Under Base Conditions \(\qquad\) Volume Components
VFF VRF VFR VRR

Volume, V
Peak hour factor, PHF
Peak 15-min volume, v15
\(3181173 \quad 1510 \quad 622\) veh/h
\(0.90 \quad 0.90 \quad 0.90 \quad 0.90\)

Trucks and buses 5
Recreational vehicles 0
Trucks and buses PCE, ET
Recreational vehicle PCE, ER
Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
\(884 \quad 48 \quad 419 \quad 173\)
\(\begin{array}{llll}5 & 5 & 5 & 0\end{array}\)
\%
\(\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)

Driver population adjustment, fP
\(\begin{array}{llll}1.5 & 1.5 & 1.5 & 1.5\end{array}\)
\(\begin{array}{llll}1.2 & 1.2 & 1.2 & 1.2\end{array}\)
\(0.976 \quad 0.976 \quad 0.976 \quad 1.000\)
\(\begin{array}{llll}1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00\end{array}\)
Flow rate, v
\(36231971720 \quad 691 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}\)
Volume ratio, VR
0.308

Configuration Characteristics

Number of maneuver lanes, NWL
Interchange density, ID
Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF

\section*{2}
1.0

1
ln
int/mi
1c/pc
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR & 1 & \(\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}\) \\
Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR & \(\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}\)
\end{tabular}

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, W
Average weaving speed, SW \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\)
Average non-weaving speed, SNW mi/h
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \(\qquad\) Weaving Segment Spee Weaving segment speed, S & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Level of Service and Capacity} \\
\hline Weaving segment density, D & & pc/mi \\
\hline Level of service, LOS & F & \\
\hline Weaving segment v/c ratio & 1.062 & \\
\hline Weaving segment flow rate, v & 6096 & veh/h \\
\hline Weaving segment capacity, cW & 5742 & veh/h \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Limitations on Weaving Segments
If limit reached, see note.
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
& Minimum & Maximum & Actual & Note \\
Weaving length (ft) & 300 & 5666 & 600 & \(\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}\) \\
& & Maximum & Analyzed & \\
Density-based capacty, & & 2350 & 1962 & c \\
cIWL (pc/h/ln) & & & \\
v/c ratio & & 1.00 & Analyzed & \\
& & 1.062 & d
\end{tabular}

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment, under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F .
E
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Movement & EBL & EBT & EBR & WBL & WBT & WBR & NBL & NBT & NBR & SBL & SBT & SBR \\
\hline Lane Configurations & \％ & 中4 & Tr & \％ 7 & 众 & フr & \({ }^{7}\) & 种 & Tr & \％ & 平 \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & \\
\hline Traffic Volume（veh／h） & 115 & 1189 & 500 & 243 & 1503 & 733 & 209 & 1073 & 864 & 249 & 580 & 47 \\
\hline Future Volume（veh／h） & 115 & 1189 & 500 & 243 & 1503 & 733 & 209 & 1073 & 864 & 249 & 580 & 47 \\
\hline Initial \(Q(Q b)\) ，veh & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 \\
\hline Parking Bus，Adj & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Work Zone On Approach & & No & & & No & & & No & & & No & \\
\hline Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln & 1870 & 1885 & 1900 & 1870 & 1841 & 1811 & 1796 & 1856 & 1856 & 1885 & 1885 & 1885 \\
\hline Adj Flow Rate，veh／h & 149 & 1265 & 581 & 273 & 1748 & 916 & 246 & 1309 & 982 & 283 & 667 & 81 \\
\hline Peak Hour Factor & 0.77 & 0.94 & 0.86 & 0.89 & 0.86 & 0.80 & 0.85 & 0.82 & 0.88 & 0.88 & 0.87 & 0.58 \\
\hline Percent Heavy Veh，\％ & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 4 & 6 & 7 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline Cap，veh／h & 131 & 1244 & 1419 & 320 & 1282 & 706 & 262 & 1081 & 1105 & 325 & 793 & 96 \\
\hline Arrive On Green & 0.07 & 0.35 & 0.35 & 0.09 & 0.37 & 0.37 & 0.15 & 0.31 & 0.31 & 0.09 & 0.25 & 0.25 \\
\hline Sat Flow，veh／h & 1781 & 3582 & 2834 & 3456 & 3497 & 1535 & 1711 & 3526 & 2768 & 3483 & 3216 & 390 \\
\hline Grp Volume（v），veh／h & 149 & 1265 & 581 & 273 & 1748 & 916 & 246 & 1309 & 982 & 283 & 371 & 377 \\
\hline Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln & 1781 & 1791 & 1417 & 1728 & 1749 & 1535 & 1711 & 1763 & 1384 & 1742 & 1791 & 1815 \\
\hline Q Serve（g＿s），s & 11.0 & 52.1 & 19.3 & 11.7 & 55.0 & 55.0 & 21.3 & 46.0 & 46.0 & 12.0 & 29.5 & 29.6 \\
\hline Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s & 11.0 & 52.1 & 19.3 & 11.7 & 55.0 & 55.0 & 21.3 & 46.0 & 46.0 & 12.0 & 29.5 & 29.6 \\
\hline Prop In Lane & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 0.21 \\
\hline Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h & 131 & 1244 & 1419 & 320 & 1282 & 706 & 262 & 1081 & 1105 & 325 & 442 & 448 \\
\hline V／C Ratio（X） & 1.14 & 1.02 & 0.41 & 0.85 & 1.36 & 1.30 & 0.94 & 1.21 & 0.89 & 0.87 & 0.84 & 0.84 \\
\hline Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h & 131 & 1244 & 1419 & 369 & 1282 & 706 & 262 & 1081 & 1105 & 325 & 442 & 448 \\
\hline HCM Platoon Ratio & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Upstream Filter（1） & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Uniform Delay（d），s／veh & 69.5 & 48.9 & 23.5 & 67.1 & 47.5 & 40.5 & 62.8 & 52.0 & 42.0 & 67.1 & 53.7 & 53.7 \\
\hline Incr Delay（d2），s／veh & 121.5 & 29.7 & 0.2 & 15.7 & 168.5 & 144.2 & 39.0 & 103.6 & 10.7 & 21.6 & 17.3 & 17.2 \\
\hline Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／In & 9.4 & 27.9 & 6.3 & 5.7 & 52.9 & 52.7 & 12.1 & 35.6 & 17.8 & 6.3 & 15.4 & 15.6 \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh} \\
\hline LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh & 191.0 & 78.6 & 23.7 & 82.8 & 216.0 & 184.7 & 101.8 & 155.6 & 52.7 & 88.7 & 71.0 & 70.9 \\
\hline LnGrp LOS & F & F & C & F & F & F & F & F & D & F & E & E \\
\hline Approach Vol，veh／h & & 1995 & & & 2937 & & & 2537 & & & 1031 & \\
\hline Approach Delay，s／veh & & 71.0 & & & 193.8 & & & 110.5 & & & 75.8 & \\
\hline Approach LOS & & E & & & F & & & F & & & E & \\
\hline Timer－Assigned Phs & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & & & & \\
\hline Phs Duration（ \(G+Y+R \mathrm{c}\) ），\(s\) & 19.0 & 53.0 & 18.9 & 59.1 & 28.0 & 44.0 & 16.0 & 62.0 & & & & \\
\hline Change Period（ \(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}\) ），\(s\) & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 & & & & \\
\hline Max Green Setting（Gmax），s & 14.0 & 46.0 & 16.0 & 50.0 & 23.0 & 37.0 & 11.0 & 55.0 & & & & \\
\hline Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋l1），s & 14.0 & 48.0 & 13.7 & 54.1 & 23.3 & 31.6 & 13.0 & 57.0 & & & & \\
\hline Green Ext Time（p＿c），s & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.2 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 2.1 & 0.0 & 0.0 & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{Intersection Summary} \\
\hline HCM 6th Ctrl Delay & & & 125.8 & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline HCM 6th LOS & & & F & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

12：Park Avenue \＆Alt 3 Ramp
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Movement & EBL & EBT & EBR & WBL & WBT & WBR & NBL & NBT & NBR & SBL & SBT & SBR \\
\hline Lane Configurations & & \(\hat{\beta}\) & & 介年 & \(\hat{\square}\) & & & 个个 & 「 & 74 & 館 & \\
\hline Traffic Volume（veh／h） & 0 & 22 & 13 & 391 & 52 & 2 & 0 & 2145 & 461 & 628 & 655 & 39 \\
\hline Future Volume（veh／h） & 0 & 22 & 13 & 391 & 52 & 2 & 0 & 2145 & 461 & 628 & 655 & 39 \\
\hline Initial \(Q(Q b)\) ，veh & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 \\
\hline Parking Bus，Adj & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Work Zone On Approach & & No & & & No & & & No & & & No & \\
\hline Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln & 0 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 0 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 \\
\hline Adj Flow Rate，veh／h & 0 & 24 & 14 & 425 & 57 & 2 & 0 & 2332 & 501 & 683 & 712 & 42 \\
\hline Peak Hour Factor & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 \\
\hline Percent Heavy Veh，\％ & 0 & 2 & 2 & & 2 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline Cap，veh／h & 0 & 39 & 23 & 392 & 325 & 11 & 0 & 1895 & 1025 & 654 & 2573 & 152 \\
\hline Arrive On Green & 0.00 & 0.04 & 0.04 & 0.11 & 0.18 & 0.18 & 0.00 & 0.53 & 0.53 & 0.19 & 0.75 & 0.75 \\
\hline Sat Flow，veh／h & 0 & 1108 & 646 & 3456 & 1796 & 63 & 0 & 3647 & 1585 & 3456 & 3410 & 201 \\
\hline Grp Volume（v），veh／h & 0 & 0 & 38 & 425 & 0 & 59 & 0 & 2332 & 501 & 683 & 371 & 383 \\
\hline Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln & 0 & 0 & 1754 & 1728 & 0 & 1859 & 0 & 1777 & 1585 & 1728 & 1777 & 1834 \\
\hline Q Serve（g＿s），s & 0.0 & 0.0 & 3.0 & 15.9 & 0.0 & 3.8 & 0.0 & 74.7 & 22.9 & 26.5 & 9.1 & 9.1 \\
\hline Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s & 0.0 & 0.0 & 3.0 & 15.9 & 0.0 & 3.8 & 0.0 & 74.7 & 22.9 & 26.5 & 9.1 & 9.1 \\
\hline Prop In Lane & 0.00 & & 0.37 & 1.00 & & 0.03 & 0.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 0.11 \\
\hline Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h & 0 & 0 & 62 & 392 & 0 & 337 & 0 & 1895 & 1025 & 654 & 1341 & 1384 \\
\hline V／C Ratio（X） & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.61 & 1.08 & 0.00 & 0.18 & 0.00 & 1.23 & 0.49 & 1.04 & 0.28 & 0.28 \\
\hline Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h & 0 & 0 & 226 & 392 & 0 & 510 & 0 & 1895 & 1025 & 654 & 1341 & 1384 \\
\hline HCM Platoon Ratio & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Upstream Filter（l） & 0.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Uniform Delay（d），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 66.6 & 62.0 & 0.0 & 48.5 & 0.0 & 32.7 & 12.8 & 56.8 & 5.3 & 5.3 \\
\hline Incr Delay（d2），slveh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 9.5 & 69.5 & 0.0 & 0.2 & 0.0 & 108.6 & 1.7 & 47.2 & 0.5 & 0.5 \\
\hline Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln & 0.0 & 0.0 & 1.5 & 10.6 & 0.0 & 1.7 & 0.0 & 59.1 & 7.8 & 15.5 & 2.9 & 3.0 \\
\hline \multicolumn{13}{|l|}{Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh} \\
\hline LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 76.0 & 131.5 & 0.0 & 48.7 & 0.0 & 141.3 & 14.4 & 104.0 & 5.8 & 5.8 \\
\hline LnGrp LOS & A & A & E & F & A & D & A & F & B & F & A & A \\
\hline Approach Vol，veh／h & & 38 & & & 484 & & & 2833 & & & 1437 & \\
\hline Approach Delay，s／veh & & 76.0 & & & 121.4 & & & 118.8 & & & 52.5 & \\
\hline Approach LOS & & E & & & F & & & F & & & D & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrrr}
\hline Timer－Assigned Phs & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 6 & 8 \\
\hline Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s & 31.0 & 79.2 & 20.4 & 9.4 & 110.2 & 29.8 \\
Change Period（Y＋Rc），s & 4.5 & 4.5 & 4.5 & 4.5 & 4.5 & 4.5 \\
Max Green Setting（Gmax），s & 26.5 & 61.6 & 15.9 & 18.0 & 92.6 & 38.4 \\
\hline Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s & 28.5 & 76.7 & 17.9 & 5.0 & 11.1 & 5.8 \\
Green Ext Time（p＿c），s & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.1 & 4.6 & 0.2
\end{tabular}

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay
98.9

HCM 6th LOS
F

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Analyst: & SMC \\
Agency/Co.: & IH \\
Date Performed: & 2020 \\
Analysis Time Period: & PM Peak \\
Freeway/Dir of Travel: & NJ 24 EB at CR 510 \\
Weaving Location: & EB \\
Analysis Year: & 2040 \\
Description: & NJ \(24 / C R\) 510 CD - Alt 3
\end{tabular}

Inputs \(\qquad\)


Configuration Characteristics
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Number of maneuver lanes, NWL & 2 & ln \\
Interchange density, ID & 1.0 & int/mi \\
Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF & 1 & \(\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}\)
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR & 1 & \(\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}\) \\
Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR & & \(\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{pc}\) \\
& & \\
Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN & 1354 & \(\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Weaving lane changes, LCW & 1460 & \(\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Non-weaving vehicle index, INW & 208 & \\
Non-weaving lane change, LCNW & 463 & \(\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Total lane changes, LCALL & 1923 & \(\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}\)
\end{tabular}

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Weaving intensity factor, W & 0.567 & \\
Average weaving speed, SW & 46.9 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Average non-weaving speed, SNW & 47.5 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\)
\end{tabular}
Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity

Weaving segment speed, S \(47.4 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) Weaving segment density, D \(34.0 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}\) Level of service, LOS Weaving segment v/c ratio

D Weaving segment flow rate, v Weaving segment capacity, cW0.811
```

Weaving segment capacity, cW

```
4715 veh/h
5810 veh/h

Limitations on Weaving Segments \(\qquad\)
If limit reached, see note.
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
& Minimum & Maximum & Actual
\end{tabular} Note

\section*{Notes:}
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment, under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is \(F\).

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Movement & EBL & EBT & EBR & WBL & WBT & WBR & NBL & NBT & NBR & SBL & SBT & SBR \\
\hline Lane Configurations & \({ }^{*}\) & 个个 & 「 & \({ }^{*}{ }^{*}\) & 个4 & 「 & \％ & ¢ \(\uparrow\) & F＂ & \({ }^{*}{ }^{*}\) & 个 \({ }_{\text {d }}\) & \\
\hline Traffic Volume（veh／h） & 38 & 1037 & 325 & 416 & 1332 & 159 & 232 & 360 & 604 & 396 & 873 & 164 \\
\hline Future Volume（veh／h） & 38 & 1037 & 325 & 416 & 1332 & 159 & 232 & 360 & 604 & 396 & 873 & 164 \\
\hline Initial Q（Qb），veh & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & － & 0 \\
\hline Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 \\
\hline Parking Bus，Adj & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Work Zone On Approach & & No & & & No & & & No & & & No & \\
\hline Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln & 1870 & 1885 & 1900 & 1870 & 1841 & 1811 & 1796 & 1856 & 1856 & 1885 & 1885 & 1885 \\
\hline Adj Flow Rate，veh／h & 60 & 1127 & 464 & 533 & 1825 & 218 & 261 & 387 & 629 & 528 & 1015 & 180 \\
\hline Peak Hour Factor & 0.63 & 0.92 & 0.70 & 0.78 & 0.73 & 0.73 & 0.89 & 0.93 & 0.96 & 0.75 & 0.86 & 0.91 \\
\hline Percent Heavy Veh，\％ & 2 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 4 & 6 & 7 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline Cap，veh／h & 77 & 1113 & 664 & 583 & 1527 & 929 & 173 & 669 & 992 & 587 & 781 & 138 \\
\hline Arrive On Green & 0.04 & 0.31 & 0.31 & 0.17 & 0.44 & 0.44 & 0.10 & 0.19 & 0.19 & 0.17 & 0.26 & 0.26 \\
\hline Sat Flow，veh／h & 1781 & 3582 & 1610 & 3456 & 3497 & 1535 & 1711 & 3526 & 2768 & 3483 & 3041 & 538 \\
\hline Grp Volume（v），veh／h & 60 & 1127 & 464 & 533 & 1825 & 218 & 261 & 387 & 629 & 528 & 597 & 598 \\
\hline Grp Sat Flow（ s ，veh／h／ln & 1781 & 1791 & 1610 & 1728 & 1749 & 1535 & 1711 & 1763 & 1384 & 1742 & 1791 & 1788 \\
\hline Q Serve（g＿s），s & 4.9 & 46.0 & 35.2 & 22.4 & 64.6 & 9.7 & 15.0 & 14.8 & 27.9 & 22.0 & 38.0 & 38.0 \\
\hline Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s & 4.9 & 46.0 & 35.2 & 22.4 & 64.6 & 9.7 & 15.0 & 14.8 & 27.9 & 22.0 & 38.0 & 38.0 \\
\hline Prop In Lane & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 0.30 \\
\hline Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h & 77 & 1113 & 664 & 583 & 1527 & 929 & 173 & 669 & 992 & 587 & 460 & 459 \\
\hline V／C Ratio（X） & 0.78 & 1.01 & 0.70 & 0.91 & 1.19 & 0.23 & 1.51 & 0.58 & 0.63 & 0.90 & 1.30 & 1.30 \\
\hline Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h & 108 & 1113 & 664 & 631 & 1527 & 929 & 173 & 669 & 992 & 683 & 460 & 459 \\
\hline HCM Platoon Ratio & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Upstream Filter（l） & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Uniform Delay（d），s／veh & 70.1 & 51.0 & 35.9 & 60.4 & 41.7 & 13.4 & 66.5 & 54.6 & 39.4 & 60.3 & 55.0 & 55.0 \\
\hline Incr Delay（d2），s／veh & 21.0 & 30.0 & 3.2 & 17.2 & 94.5 & 0.1 & 254.9 & 1.2 & 1.3 & 13.6 & 149.6 & 151.1 \\
\hline Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln & 2.7 & 24.8 & 13.9 & 11.0 & 46.3 & 3.2 & 18.8 & 6.7 & 9.4 & 10.8 & 36.1 & 36.2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrrrrrrrrr} 
LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh & 91.1 & 81.0 & 39.2 & 77.6 & 136.1 & 13.6 & 321.4 & 55.8 & 40.7 & 73.9 & 204.6 & 206.1 \\
LnGrp LOS & F & F & D & E & F & B & F & E & D & E & F & F \\
\hline Approach Vol，veh／h & & 1651 & & & 2576 & & & 1277 & & 1723 \\
Approach Delay，s／veh & & 69.6 & & & 113.7 & & & 102.7 & & 165.1 \\
Approach LOS & E & & & F & & & F & & F
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrrrrr} 
Timer－Assigned Phs & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
\hline Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s & 29.9 & 35.1 & 30.0 & 53.0 & 20.0 & 45.0 & 11.4 & 71.6 \\
Change Period（Y＋Rc），s & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 \\
Max Green Setting（Gmax），s & 29.0 & 24.0 & 27.0 & 46.0 & 15.0 & 38.0 & 9.0 & 64.0 \\
Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋I1），s & 24.0 & 29.9 & 24.4 & 48.0 & 17.0 & 40.0 & 6.9 & 66.6 \\
Green Ext Time（p＿c），s & 1.0 & 0.0 & 0.6 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0
\end{tabular}

\section*{Intersection Summary}

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 113.9
HCM 6th LOS
F

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis \(\qquad\)
Analyst: VJS
Agency/Co.: IH
Date Performed: Feb 2020
Analysis Time Period:
Freeway/Dir of Travel:
Weaving Location:
Analysis Year:
AM Peak
NJ 24 EB at CR 510
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { Analysis Year: } & 2040 \\ \text { Description: } & \text { NJ } 24 / C R 510 \text { CD - Alt } 4\end{array}\)
Inputs \(\qquad\)
Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length
Nu 24/CR 510 CD - Alt 4
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Segment Type & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Freeway} \\
\hline Weaving configuration & One-S & \\
\hline Number of lanes, \(N\) & 3 & 1 n \\
\hline Weaving segment length, LS & 600 & ft \\
\hline Freeway free-flow speed, FFS & 65 & mi/h \\
\hline Minimum segment speed, SMIN & 15 & mi/h \\
\hline Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL & 2350 & \(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}\) \\
\hline Terrain type & Level & \\
\hline Grade & 0.00 & \% \\
\hline Length & 0.00 & mi \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Configuration Characteristics
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Number of maneuver lanes, NWL & 2 & ln \\
Interchange density, ID & 1.0 & int/mi \\
Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF & 1 & \(l \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{pc}\) \\
Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR & 1 & lc/pc \\
Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR & & lc/pc \\
Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN & & lc/h \\
Weaving lane changes, LCW & lc/h \\
Non-weaving vehicle index, INW & & \\
Non-weaving lane change, LCNW & & lc/h \\
Total lane changes, LCALL
\end{tabular}

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, W
```

Average weaving speed, SW
mi/h
Average non-weaving speed, SNW
mi/h
Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity

```
\(\qquad\)
```

\overline{Weaving segment speed, S}
mi/h
Weaving segment density, D pc/mi/ln
Level of service, LOS F
Weaving segment v/c ratio 1.165
Weaving segment flow rate, v veh/h
Weaving segment capacity, cW v810 veh/h
Limitations on Weaving Segments

``` \(\qquad\)
```

$\overline{\text { If }} \bar{l} \overline{\text { im }} \overline{i t}$ reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | Note

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft, weaving vehicles are assumed to
make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be
treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of
Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment,
under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.

```

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis \(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Analyst: & VJS \\
Agency/Co.: & IH \\
Date Performed: & Feb 2020 \\
Analysis Time Period: & AM Peak \\
Freeway/Dir of Travel: & NJ 24 EB at CR 510 \\
Weaving Location: & EB \\
Analysis Year: & 2040 \\
Description: & NJ \(24 / C R 510\) CD - Alt 4, Weave 2
\end{tabular}

Inputs \(\qquad\)

Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Level

Length
0.00
\%
0.00 mi


Configuration Characteristics
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Number of maneuver lanes, NWL & 2 & In \\
\hline Interchange density, ID & 1.0 & int/mi \\
\hline Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF & 1 & lc/pc \\
\hline Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR & 1 & lc/pc \\
\hline Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR & & lc/pc \\
\hline Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN & & \(1 \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
\hline Weaving lane changes, LCW & & lc/h \\
\hline Non-weaving vehicle index, INW & & \\
\hline Non-weaving lane change, LCNW & & lc/h \\
\hline Total lane changes, LCALL & & lc/h \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, W
```

Average weaving speed, SW
mi/h
Average non-weaving speed, SNW
mi/h
Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity

```
\(\qquad\)
```

\overline{Weaving segment speed, S}
mi/h
Weaving segment density, D pc/mi/ln
Level of service, LOS F
Weaving segment v/c ratio 1.108
Weaving segment flow rate, v veh/h
Weaving segment capacity, cW 5830 veh/h
Limitations on Weaving Segments

``` \(\qquad\)
```

$\overline{\text { If }} \bar{l} \overline{\text { im }} \overline{i t}$ reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | Note

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft, weaving vehicles are assumed to
make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be
treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of
Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment,
under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.

```

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Movement & EBL & EBT & EBR & WBL & WBT & WBR & NBL & NBT & NBR & SBL & SBT & SBR \\
\hline Lane Configurations & \％ & 个 \(\uparrow\) & F & \％\({ }^{1+1}\) & 个4 & 「 & \％ & 个4 & 「「＇ & \％\({ }^{1 / 1}\) & 中t & \\
\hline Traffic Volume（veh／h） & 114 & 1556 & 132 & 240 & 1503 & 732 & 209 & 1072 & 1329 & 470 & 358 & 47 \\
\hline Future Volume（veh／h） & 114 & 1556 & 132 & 240 & 1503 & 732 & 209 & 1072 & 1329 & 470 & 358 & 47 \\
\hline Initial Q（Qb），veh & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & ， & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 \\
\hline Parking Bus，Adj & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Work Zone On Approach & & No & & & No & & & No & & & No & \\
\hline Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln & 1870 & 1870 & 1870 & 1885 & 1870 & 1885 & 1885 & 1900 & 1900 & 1885 & 1885 & 1885 \\
\hline Adj Flow Rate，veh／h & 148 & 1655 & 153 & 270 & 1748 & 915 & 246 & 1307 & 1510 & 534 & 411 & 81 \\
\hline Peak Hour Factor & 0.77 & 0.94 & 0.86 & 0.89 & 0.86 & 0.80 & 0.85 & 0.82 & 0.88 & 0.88 & 0.87 & 0.58 \\
\hline Percent Heavy Veh，\％ & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline Cap，veh／h & 170 & 1540 & 877 & 163 & 1367 & 796 & 215 & 890 & 831 & 395 & 717 & 140 \\
\hline Arrive On Green & 0.10 & 0.43 & 0.43 & 0.05 & 0.38 & 0.38 & 0.12 & 0.25 & 0.25 & 0.11 & 0.24 & 0.24 \\
\hline Sat Flow，veh／h & 1781 & 3554 & 1585 & 3483 & 3554 & 1598 & 1795 & 3610 & 2834 & 3483 & 2987 & 584 \\
\hline Grp Volume（v），veh／h & 148 & 1655 & 153 & 270 & 1748 & 915 & 246 & 1307 & 1510 & 534 & 245 & 247 \\
\hline Grp Sat Flow（ s ，veh／h／ln & 1781 & 1777 & 1585 & 1742 & 1777 & 1598 & 1795 & 1805 & 1417 & 1742 & 1791 & 1780 \\
\hline Q Serve（g＿s），s & 12.3 & 65.0 & 7.2 & 7.0 & 57.7 & 57.7 & 18.0 & 37.0 & 37.0 & 17.0 & 18.1 & 18.4 \\
\hline Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s & 12.3 & 65.0 & 7.2 & 7.0 & 57.7 & 57.7 & 18.0 & 37.0 & 37.0 & 17.0 & 18.1 & 18.4 \\
\hline Prop In Lane & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 1.00 & 1.00 & & 0.33 \\
\hline Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h & 170 & 1540 & 877 & 163 & 1367 & 796 & 215 & 890 & 831 & 395 & 430 & 427 \\
\hline V／C Ratio（X） & 0.87 & 1.07 & 0.17 & 1.66 & 1.28 & 1.15 & 1.14 & 1.47 & 1.82 & 1.35 & 0.57 & 0.58 \\
\hline Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h & 178 & 1540 & 877 & 163 & 1367 & 796 & 215 & 890 & 831 & 395 & 430 & 427 \\
\hline HCM Platoon Ratio & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Upstream Filter（l） & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 \\
\hline Uniform Delay（d），s／veh & 67.0 & 42.5 & 16.6 & 71.5 & 46.1 & 37.6 & 66.0 & 56.5 & 53.0 & 66.5 & 50.2 & 50.3 \\
\hline Incr Delay（d2），s／veh & 33.6 & 45.9 & 0.1 & 323.1 & 131.1 & 81.8 & 104.8 & 216.7 & 372.2 & 174.6 & 1.8 & 1.9 \\
\hline Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln & 7.1 & 37.3 & 2.5 & 10.4 & 49.2 & 45.2 & 14.5 & 43.5 & 58.1 & 17.1 & 8.3 & 8.4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrrrrrrrrr} 
LnGrp Delay（d），S／veh & 100.5 & 88.4 & 16.7 & 394.6 & 177.3 & 119.4 & 170.8 & 273.2 & 425.2 & 241.1 & 52.0 & 52.2 \\
LnGrp LOS & F & F & B & F & F & F & F & F & F & F & D & D \\
\hline Approach Vol，veh／h & & 1956 & & & 2933 & & & 3063 & & 1026 \\
Approach Delay，s／veh & & 83.7 & & & 179.2 & & 339.9 & & 150.5 \\
Approach LOS & F & & & F & & & F & & F
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrrrrr} 
Timer－Assigned Phs & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
\hline Phs Duration \((G+Y+R c)\) ，s & 22.0 & 44.0 & 12.0 & 72.0 & 23.0 & 43.0 & 19.3 & 64.7 \\
Change Period（Y＋Rc），s & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.0 & 7.0 \\
Max Green Setting（Gmax），s & 17.0 & 37.0 & 7.0 & 65.0 & 18.0 & 36.0 & 15.0 & 57.0 \\
Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s & 19.0 & 39.0 & 9.0 & 67.0 & 20.0 & 20.4 & 14.3 & 59.7 \\
Green Ext Time（p＿C），s & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 2.5 & 0.0 & 0.0
\end{tabular}

\section*{Intersection Summary}

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 209.9
HCM 6th LOS

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis \(\qquad\)
Analyst: VJS
Agency/Co.: IH
Date Performed: Feb 2020
Analysis Time Period:
Freeway/Dir of Travel:
Weaving Location:
Analysis Year:
PM Peak
NJ 24 EB at CR 510
EB
Description: NJ \(24 / C R 510\) CD - Alt 4
Inputs \(\qquad\)
Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length
2040
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Segment Type & Freeway & \\
Weaving configuration & One-Sided & \\
Number of lanes, N & 3 & ln \\
Weaving segment length, LS & 600 & ft \\
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS & 65 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Minimum segment speed, SMIN & 15 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL & 2350 & \(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}\) \\
Terrain type & & \\
Grade & 0.00 & \\
Length & 0.00 & mi
\end{tabular}


Configuration Characteristics
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Number of maneuver lanes, NWL & 2 & ln \\
\hline Interchange density, ID & 1.0 & int/mi \\
\hline Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF & 1 & lc/pc \\
\hline Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR & 1 & lc/pc \\
\hline Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR & & lc/pc \\
\hline Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN & 1409 & lc/h \\
\hline Weaving lane changes, LCW & 1515 & lc/h \\
\hline Non-weaving vehicle index, INW & 222 & \\
\hline Non-weaving lane change, LCNW & 510 & \(\mathrm{lc} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
\hline Total lane changes, LCALL & 2025 & lc/h \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, W 0.590
```

Average weaving speed, SW
46.4
mi/h
Average non-weaving speed, SNW
mi/h

```
Weaving Segment Speed, Density, Level of Service and Capacity
\(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Weaving segment speed, S & 46.6 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Weaving segment density, D & 36.5 & \(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi}\) \\
Level of service, LOS & E & \\
Weaving segment v/c ratio & 0.857 & \\
Weaving segment flow rate, v & 4985 & \(\mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{h}\)
\end{tabular}
Weaving segment capacity, cW
veh/h

Limitations on Weaving Segments \(\qquad\)
If \(\bar{l} \overline{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{i} \overline{\mathrm{i}}\) reachē, see note.
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
& Minimum & Maximum & Actual
\end{tabular} Note

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft , weaving vehicles are assumed to make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment, under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.

HCS 2010: Freeway Weaving Release 6.65
Phone: Fax:
E-mail:
Operational Analysis \(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Analyst: & VJS \\
Agency/Co.: & IH \\
Date Performed: & Feb 2020 \\
Analysis Time Period: & PM Peak \\
Freeway/Dir of Travel: & NJ 24 EB at CR 510 \\
Weaving Location: & EB \\
Analysis Year: & 2040 \\
Description: & NJ \(24 / C R 510\) CD - Alt 4, Weave 2
\end{tabular}

Inputs \(\qquad\)
Segment Type
Weaving configuration
Number of lanes, N
Weaving segment length, LS
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS
Minimum segment speed, SMIN
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL
Terrain type
Grade
Length
NJ 24/CR 510 CD - Alt 4, Weave 2
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Segment Type & Freeway & \\
Weaving configuration & One-Sided & \\
Number of lanes, N & 3 & ln \\
Weaving segment length, LS & 900 & ft \\
Freeway free-flow speed, FFS & 65 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Minimum segment speed, SMIN & 15 & \(\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}\) \\
Freeway maximum capacity, cIFL & 2350 & \(\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}\) \\
Terrain type & & \\
Grade & 0.00 & \\
Length & 0.00 & mi
\end{tabular}


Configuration Characteristics
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Number of maneuver lanes, NWL & 2 & ln \\
Interchange density, ID & 1.0 & int/mi \\
Minimum RF lane changes, LCRF & 1 & lc/pc \\
Minimum FR lane changes, LCFR & 1 & lc/pc \\
Minimum RR lane changes, LCRR & & lc/pc \\
Minimum weaving lane changes, LCMIN & & \\
Weaving lane changes, LCW & 2187 & lc/h \\
Non-weaving vehicle index, INW & 343 & \\
Non-weaving lane change, LCNW & 696 & lc/h \\
Total lane changes, LCALL & 2883 & lc/h
\end{tabular}

Weaving and Non-Weaving Speeds
Weaving intensity factor, W 0.566
```

Average weaving speed, SW
46.9
mi/h
Average non-weaving speed, SNW


Limitations on Weaving Segments $\qquad$
If limit reached, see note.

|  | Minimum | Maximum | Actual | Note |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weaving length (ft) | 300 | 6105 | 900 | a, b |
| Density-based capacty, |  | Maximum | Analyzed |  |
| cIWL (pc/h/ln) | 2350 | 1952 | c |  |
| v/cratio |  |  | Maximum | Analyzed |

Notes:
a. In weaving segments shorter than 300 ft, weaving vehicles are assumed to
make only necessary lane changes.
b. Weaving segments longer than the calculated maximum length should be
treated as isolated merge and diverge areas using the procedures of
Chapter 13, "Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments."
c. The density-based capacity exceeds the capacity of a basic freeway segment,
under equivalent ideal conditions.
d. Volumes exceed the weaving segment capacity. The level of service is F.

## Appendix "K"

## Collision Diagrams




## Appendix "L"

## Environmental Screening and Constraint Map

# NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Bureau of Landscape Architecture and Environmental Solutions ENVIRONMENTAL AND LANDSCAPE SCREENING 

Revised September 22, 2011

| Request Date: | $5 / 6 / 2016$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Request made by: | Ed D'Arcy |  |  |
| Project Name: | Rt. 24, EB Ramp to CR 510 (Columbia Turnpike) |  |  |
| Project Description: | Concept Development Study to alleviate congestion at the intersection of <br> Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue, an intersection near the ramps from Rt. <br> 24. The study may recommend modifications to the Rt. 24 ramps. |  |  |
| County and <br> Municipality: | Florham Park Borough, Hanover, and Morris Townships, Morris County - <br> UPC No. 154330 M.P. 2.09 |  |  |
| Project Purpose |  |  | $\square$ Improve Vehicular/Driver Safety |
| Reduce Congestion | $\square$ Economic Development |  |  |
| $\square$ System Linkage | $\square$ Change to Current Design Standards |  |  |
| $\square$ Improve Bike/Ped. Capacity or Safety |  |  |  |
| $\square$ Other (Describe) |  |  |  |

## ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS/OPPORTUNITIES:

| Cultural Resources | Yes / No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Are there any 50+ year old structures in the project study area? | Y |
| Are there known buildings or structures on or eligible for the State and /or National <br> Register of Historic Places in the project study area? | N |
| Is there involvement with a historic bridge or culvert? | N |
| Is the project located in a known or potential Historic District? | N |
| Are there any undisturbed areas, old foundations or building rubble in the project study <br> area? | Y |
| Are there any known archaeological sites or potential underground cultural resources <br> within the project study area? | N |
| Enhancement Opportunities: | Comments: The Normandy Park Historic District Boundary Increase is located just outside of the <br> project area to the west. SHPO consultation will likely be needed due to scope of work and potential <br> archeological impacts. |


| Section 4(f) Properties | Yes / No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Are there any recreational facilities within the project study area? | Y |
| Is there publicly owned open space in the project study area? | Y |
| Is there a Wildlife Refuge or Wildlife Management Area in the project study area? | Y |
| Is there a school or school athletic fields in the project study area? | Y |
| Is there a community park or parkland within the project study area? | N |
| Is there a historic bridge or historic site in the project area? | N |
| Enhancement Opportunities: |  |
| Comments: Black Meadows is a wildlife preserve located on the eastern side Route 24. Farleigh <br> Dickinson University is located just south of the project. |  |


| Air/Noise | Yes / No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Are there any sensitive receptors (i.e. residences, schools, hospitals, and churches) <br> within 300 feet of the project? | Y |
| Will the project change the vertical or horizontal alignment of the roadway? | Y |
| Does the project provide for a significant increase in vehicle operating speeds of <br> roadway capacity? | Y |
| Is the project in a non-attainment area for Carbon Monoxide? | N |
| Is an intersection Carbon monoxide analysis required? | N |
| Is the project in a non-attainment area for PM2.5? | N |
| Is a PM2.5 hot-spot analysis required? | N Possibly |
| Is the project in a non-attainment area for PM10? | N |
| Is a PM10 hot-spot analysis required? |  |
| Mitigation Opportunities: | Comments: <br> - The project is in a PM 2.5 maintenance area. Traffic data detailing the Level-of-Service will be <br> needed to determine if a hot-spot analysis is needed. |
| •Due to the potential change in alteration of the highway alignment and the relocation and addition <br> of interchange lanes, and the addition of through traffic lanes, a noise study may be required. <br> • Air/Noise impacts will have to be reevaluated once a more detailed scope of work is available. |  |


| Ecology | Yes / No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Are there any wetlands, floodplains, sole source aquifer, stream crossings, <br> riparian zones, or wildlife habitat in the project study area? | Wetlands, SSA, <br> Wildlife Habitat |
| Is there any potential for rare, threatened or endangered species or their habitats <br> within the project study area or within a mile downstream of the project study <br> area (where streams are present)? | Y |
| Is there any potential or known vernal pool habitat within the project study area? | N |
| Is there a potential need for wildlife crossings in the project area (e.g., pipes, <br> small tunnels, fencing)? | Y |
| Are there any trout maintenance or trout production streams within the project <br> study area? | N |
| Are there any Category 1 waters in the project area? | N |
| Is the project located in a geologic formation(s) associated with acid producing <br> soils? | N |
| Are there any potential stormwater management mitigation areas in project area <br> or upstream of the project area? | Y |
| Do Stormwater Management facilities need to be created? If so, are there <br> potential locations within the project limits? | Unknown |
| Are there any Wild and Scenic Rivers in the project study area? | N |
| Does Essential Fish Habitat exist in the project study area? | N |
| Are there any other environmentally-sensitive areas that are possible project <br> design constraints? | N |
| Describe ecology in the project study area (e.g., heavily forested, urban, residential, etc.): The project <br> area is mostly forested with wetlands, with urban areas along the roadways. |  |

Comments:

- The Black Meadows Preserve is located within the project area on the southeastern side.
- There are wetlands scattered throughout the project area.
- The project is within the Buried Valley SSA.
- According to the Fish \& Wildlife IPaC tool, Indiana Bat, Northern Long-Eared Bat, and Bog Turtles have the potential to be found within the project area.
- Florham Park, Hanover Twp, and Morris Twp have maternity populations of both the Northern Long-Eared Bat and the Indiana Bat. Hanover Twp and Morris Twp have hibernation populations of the Indiana Bat. If tree clearing is proposed, it cannot occur from April 1 November 15 due to bat populations.
- Black Brook, a Freshwater Category 2 non-trout waterway, crosses Route 24, but does not reach the Park Ave, Columbia Turnpike intersection. If work near Black Brook is needed, a riparian zone of 150 ' may apply.
- According to NJDEP's Species Based Habitat GIS layer, Bald Eagle (State Endangered) may be present in the project area.
- Due to all of the causeways, there may be a need for wildlife crossing amenities.

| Potential environmental permits/approvals <br> and interagency coordination | Comments: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ | US Coast Guard |  |
| $\square$ | USACOE Section 10 |  |
| $\square$ | USACOE Section 404 |  |
| $\square$ | NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands |  |
| $\square$ | NJDEP Water Quality Certification |  |
| $\square$ | NJDEP Flood Hazard Area |  |
| $\square$ | NJDEP CAFRA |  |
| $\square$ | NJDEP Coastal Wetlands |  |
| $\square$ | NJDEP Waterfront Development |  |
| $\square$ | NJDEP Tidelands Conveyance |  |
| $\square$ | NJPDES Construction Activity <br> Stormwater GP |  |
| $\square$ | NJDEP Stormwater Management | Will likely be needed, due to disturbance. |
| $\square$ | PL 2001 Chapter 10 Reforestation |  |
| $\square$ | Pinelands Commission |  |
| $\square$ | D\&R Canal Commission |  |
| $\square$ | Meadowlands Commission |  |
| $\square$ | Essential Fish Habitat |  |
| $\square$ | Category One waters |  |
| $\square$ | USEPA Sole Source Aquifer |  |
| $\square$ | Highland Rules/Preservation Area |  |
| $\square$ | Delaware River Port Authority |  |
| $\square$ |  |  |

Comments:

- The majority of the project is within the Highlands Planning Area, Highlands Rules will have to be followed.
- If $1 / 4$ or more of impervious surface is added or if 1 acre or more of land is disturbed then stormwater management will be needed.
- Impacts to wetlands may trigger an individual permit where mitigation might be required.

| Landscape Architecture | Yes / No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Is there deforestation taking place in accordance with the No Net Loss Reforestation <br> Act (NNL P.L. 2001 Chapter 10 Reforestation)? | Y |
| Does existing vegetation need management (e.g., tree trimming, hazardous tree <br> removal, clearing, thinning)? | Y |
| Will planting need to be included (e.g., commitments, street trees, reforestation)? | Y |
| Are there Context Sensitive Solutions opportunities (e.g., streetscapes, screenings)? | N |
| Will vegetative Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Measures need to be included? | Y |
| Are there Aesthetic Enhancements that need to be addressed? | N |
| Are any structures proposed (e.g., bridge, retaining walls)? | Y |
| Do Stormwater Management facilities need to be created? | Possibly |
| Mitigation Opportunities: |  |
|  |  |


| Socioeconomics | Yes / No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Will the project affect farmland or community facilities? | Unknown |
| Based on the proposed improvements for this project, will there be possible <br> displacement of businesses or residences? | Y |
| Will the project affect access to community facilities, bus stop shelters, playgrounds or <br> parks or gardens? | Unknown |
| Can the project improve bike/ped facilities? | Y |
| Are there any observable safety (e.g. ADA compliant) issues or concerns in the project <br> study area? | Unknown |
| Does project have potential for socioeconomic impacts? If YES provide US Census <br> data in comments. | Unknown |
| Does project have potential for Environmental Justice involvement? If YES provide <br> US Census data in comments. | N |

Comments: There are 55 people within the project area. $14 \%$ of that population is considered to be a minority with $7 \%$ being Asian, $4 \%$ Hispanic, and $2 \%$ Black. $83 \%$ of the population has a household income of $\$ 75,000$ or higher. This does not appear to be an Environmental Justice community.

| Hazardous Waste | Yes / No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Are there any known or suspected hazardous waste sites (UST, landfills, known <br> NJDEP Case, ECRA Case), within the project study area? | Y |
| Are there active or abandoned industries, service stations or repair shops within the <br> project study area? | N |
| Is there evidence of potential contamination (monitoring wells, stained soils, etc.)? | Y |
| Are railroads or railyards located in the project study area? | N |

Enhancement Opportunities:
Comments: Since there are active NJDEP enforcement cases and historic fill within the project area, there is a potential for involvement with regulated material or contaminated sites. Once more specific project plans are available, then a reevaluation will be made to determine whether environmental investigation will be required.

## Environmental Screening Summary:

- The Normandy Park Historic District Boundary Increase is located just outside of the project area to the west. SHPO consultation will likely be needed due to scope of work and potential archeological impacts.
- The project is in a PM 2.5 maintenance area. Traffic data detailing the Level-of-Service will be needed to determine if a hot-spot analysis is needed.
- Due to the potential change in alteration of the highway alignment and the relocation and addition of interchange lanes, and the addition of through traffic lanes, a noise study may be required. Air/Noise impacts will have to be reevaluated once a more detailed scope of work is available.
- The Black Meadows Preserve is located within the project area on the southeastern side.
- There are wetlands scattered throughout the project area.
- According to the Fish \& Wildlife IPaC tool, Indiana Bat, Northern Long-Eared Bat, and Bog Turtles have the potential to be found within the project area.
- Due to bat presence, if tree clearing is proposed, it cannot occur from April 1 - November 15 due to bat populations.
- Black Brook, a Freshwater Category 2 non-trout waterway, crosses Route 24, but does not reach the Park Ave, Columbia Turnpike intersection. If work near Black Brook is needed, a riparian zone of 150' may apply.
- According to NJDEP's Species Based Habitat GIS layer, Bald Eagle (State Endangered) may be present in the project area.
- Due to all of the causeways, there may be a need for wildlife crossing amenities. The majority of the project is within the Highlands Planning Area, Highlands Rules will have to be followed.
- If $1 / 4$ or more of impervious surface is added or if 1 acre or more of land is disturbed then stormwater management will be needed.
- Impacts to wetlands may trigger an individual permit where mitigation might be required.
- Due to the presence of active NJDEP enforcement cases and historic fill, there is a potential for involvement with regulated material or contaminated sites. Once more specific project plans are available, then a reevaluation will be made to determine whether environmental investigation will be required.

Prepared \& Recommended By:


Route 24, EB Ramp to CR 510 (Columbia Turnpike) Hanover and Morris Townships, Morris County Environmental Constraints Map


Location: User-specified polygonal location
Ring (buffer): 0 -mile radius
Description: Route 24

| Summary |  | Census 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population |  | 55 |
| Population Density (per sq. mile) |  | 250 |
| Minority Population |  | 8 |
| \% Minority |  | 14\% |
| Households |  | 17 |
| Housing Units |  | 18 |
| Land Area (sq. miles) |  | 0.22 |
| \% Land Area |  | 99\% |
| Water Area (sq. miles) |  | 0.00 |
| \% Water Area |  | 1\% |
| Population by Race | Number | Percent |
| Total | 55 | ------- |
| Population Reporting One Race | 54 | 99\% |
| White | 49 | 89\% |
| Black | 1 | 2\% |
| American Indian | 0 | 0\% |
| Asian | 4 | 7\% |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | 0\% |
| Some Other Race | 0 | 0\% |
| Population Reporting Two or More Races | 1 | 1\% |
| Total Hispanic Population | 2 | 4\% |
| Total Non-Hispanic Population | 53 | 96\% |
| White Alone | 47 | 86\% |
| Black Alone | 1 | 2\% |
| American Indian Alone | 0 | 0\% |
| Non-Hispanic Asian Alone | 4 | 7\% |
| Pacific Islander Alone | 0 | 0\% |
| Other Race Alone | 0 | 0\% |
| Two or More Races Alone | 1 | 1\% |
| Population by Sex | Number | Percent |
| Male | 26 | 47\% |
| Female | 29 | 53\% |
| Population by Age | Number | Percent |
| Age 0-4 | 3 | 6\% |
| Age 0-17 | 13 | 23\% |
| Age 18+ | 42 | 77\% |
| Age 65+ | 12 | 23\% |
| Households by Tenure | Number | Percent |
| Total | 17 |  |
| Owner Occupied | 16 | 92\% |
| Renter Occupied | 1 | 8\% |

Data Note: Detail may not sum to totals due to rounding. Hispanic population can be of any race.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010 Summary File 1.

Location: User-specified polygonal location
Ring (buffer): 0-mile radius
Description: Route 24

| Summary | Census $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Population | 355 |
| Population Density (per sq. mile) | 2,727 |
| Minority Population | 36 |
| \% Minority | $10 \%$ |
| Households | 133 |
| Housing Units | 139 |
| Housing Units Built Before 1950 | 18 |
| Land Area (sq. miles) | 0.13 |
| \% Land Area | $100 \%$ |
| Water Area (sq. miles) | 0.00 |
| \% Water Area | $0 \%$ |


| Population by Race | Number | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 355 | ------ |
| Population Reporting One Race | 352 | $99 \%$ |
| White | 325 | $92 \%$ |
| Black | 3 | $1 \%$ |
| American Indian | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Asian | 21 | $6 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Some Other Race | 2 | $0 \%$ |
| Population Reporting Two or More Races | 3 | $1 \%$ |
| Total Hispanic Population | 8 | $2 \%$ |


| Population by Sex | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Male | 160 | $45 \%$ |
| Female | 195 | $55 \%$ |


| Population by Age | Number | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Age 0-4 | 25 | $7 \%$ |
| Age 0-17 | 70 | $20 \%$ |
| Age 18+ | 285 | $80 \%$ |
| Age $65+$ | 75 | $21 \%$ |


| Population 25+ by Educational Attainment | Number |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total | 264 |
| Less than 9th Grade | 8 |
| 9th - 12th Grade, No Diploma | 13 |
| High School Graduate | 42 |
| Some College, No Degree | 33 |
| Associate Degree | 9 |

[^3]Location: User-specified polygonal location
Ring (buffer): 0-mile radius
Description: Route 24

| Population Age 5+ Years by Ability to Speak English | Number | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 334 | ------- |
| Speak only English | 270 | 81\% |
| Non-English at Home | 64 | 19\% |
| Speak English "very well" | 44 | 13\% |
| Speak English "well" | 15 | 4\% |
| Speak English "not well" | 5 | 1\% |
| Speak English "not at all" | 0 | 0\% |
| Speak English "less than well" | 5 | 2\% |
|  |  |  |
| Households by Household Income in 1999 | Number | Percent |
| Household Income Base | 133 | ------- |
| < \$15,000 | 6 | 5\% |
| \$15,000-\$25,000 | 8 | 6\% |
| \$25,000-\$50,000 | 23 | 17\% |
| \$50,000-\$75,000 | 17 | 13\% |
| \$75,000 + | 79 | 60\% |
|  |  |  |
| Households by Tenure | Number | Percent |
| Total | 133 | ------- |
| Owner Occupied | 110 | 83\% |
| Renter Occupied | 23 | 17\% |
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## EJSCREEN ACS Summary Report

Location: User-specified polygonal location
Ring (buffer): 0-mile radius
Description: Route 24

|  | 2008-2012 <br> ACS Estimates | Percent | MOE ( $\pm$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population 25+ by Educational Attainment |  |  |  |
| Total | 43 | 100\% | 251 |
| Less than 9th Grade | 0 | 1\% | 24 |
| 9th - 12th Grade, No Diploma | 0 | 1\% | 27 |
| High School Graduate | 6 | 14\% | 116 |
| Some College, No Degree | 6 | 13\% | 138 |
| Associate Degree | 2 | 4\% | 109 |
| Bachelor's Degree or more | 30 | 71\% | 229 |
| Population Age 5+ Years by Ability to Speak English |  |  |  |
| Total | 55 | 100\% | 413 |
| Speak only English | 50 | 91\% | 398 |
| Non-English at Home ${ }^{1+2+3+4}$ | 5 | 9\% | 170 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Speak English "very well" | 3 | 5\% | 117 |
| ${ }^{2}$ Speak English "well" | 2 | 3\% | 71 |
| ${ }^{3}$ Speak English "not well" | 0 | 0\% | 27 |
| ${ }^{4}$ Speak English "not at all" | 0 | 0\% | 37 |
| ${ }^{3+4}$ Speak English "less than well" | 0 | 0\% | 44 |
| ${ }^{2+3+4}$ Speak English "less than very well" | 2 | 4\% | 83 |
| Linguistically Isolated Households* |  |  |  |
| Total | 0 | 100\% | 29 |
| Speak Spanish | 0 | 0\% | 20 |
| Speak Other Indo-European Languages | 0 | 73\% | 22 |
| Speak Asian-Pacific Island Languages | 0 | 27\% | 12 |
| Speak Other Languages | 0 | 0\% | 12 |
| Households by Household Income |  |  |  |
| Household Income Base | 19 | 100\% | 171 |
| < \$15,000 | 1 | 4\% | 29 |
| \$15,000-\$25,000 | 1 | 3\% | 89 |
| \$25,000-\$50,000 | 1 | 5\% | 92 |
| \$50,000-\$75,000 | 1 | 5\% | 103 |
| \$75,000 + | 16 | 83\% | 175 |
| Occupied Housing Units by Tenure |  |  |  |
| Total | 19 | 100\% | 171 |
| Owner Occupied | 18 | 95\% | 104 |
| Renter Occupied | 1 | 5\% | 156 |

Location: User-specified polygonal location
Ring (buffer): 0 -mile radius
Description: Route 24

|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 2008-2012 } \\ \text { ACS Estimates } \end{array}$ | Percent | MOE ( $\pm$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population by Language Spoken at Home ** |  |  |  |
| Total (persons age 5 and above) | 55 | 100\% | 413 |
| English | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Spanish | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| French | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| French Creole | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Italian | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Portuguese | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| German | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Yiddish | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other West Germanic | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Scandinavian | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Greek | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Russian | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Polish | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Serbo-Croatian | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other Slavic | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Armenian | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Persian | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Gujarathi | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Hindi | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Urdu | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other Indic | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other Indo-European | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Chinese | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Japanese | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Korean | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Mon-Khmer, Cambodian | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Hmong | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Thai | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Laotian | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Vietnamese | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other Asian | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Tagalog | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other Pacific Island | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Navajo | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other Native American | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Hungarian | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Arabic | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Hebrew | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| African | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Other and non-specified | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Total Non-English | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Data Note: Detail may not sum to totals due to rounding. Hispanic population can be of any race. N/A means not available.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS) 2008-2012.
**Population by Language Spoken at Home is available at the census tract summary level and up.

## EJSCREEN Report

 for the User Specified Area, NEW JERSEY, EPA Region 2Approximate Population: 59

## Route 24

| Selected Variables | State <br> Percentile |  | EPA Region <br> Percentile |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EJ Indexes |  | USA <br> Percentile |  |  |
| EJ Index for PM2.5 | 20 | 14 | 15 |  |
| EJ Index for Ozone | 20 | 14 | 15 |  |
| EJ Index for NATA Diesel PM* | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| EJ Index for NATA Air Toxics Cancer Risk* | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| EJ Index for NATA Respiratory Hazard Index* | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| EJ Index for NATA Neurological Hazard Index* | 1 | 2 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| EJ Index for Traffic Proximity and Volume | 16 | 18 | 0 |  |
| EJ Index for Lead Paint Indicator | 28 | 18 | 7 |  |
| EJ Index for Proximity to NPL sites | 48 | 40 | 8 |  |
| EJ Index for Proximity to RMP sites | 22 | 13 | 44 |  |
| EJ Index for Proximity to TSDFs | 1 | 2 | 14 |  |
| EJ Index for Proximity to Major Direct Dischargers |  | 1 |  |  |
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## EJSCREEN Report

for the User Specified Area, NEW JERSEY, EPA Region 2

## Approximate Population: 59

Route 24


## for the User Specified Area, NEW JERSEY, EPA Region 2

Approximate Population: 59
Route 24

| Selected Variables | Raw <br> Data | State <br> Avg. | \%ile in <br> State | EPA <br> Region Avg. | \%ile in <br> EPA <br> Region | USA <br> Avg. | \%ile in USA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Environmental Indicators |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Particulate Matter (PM 2.5 in $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 9.4 | 10 | 27 | 9.94 | 38 | 9.78 | 36 |
| Ozone (ppb) | 45.9 | 46.9 | 41 | 44.7 | 66 | 46.1 | 46 |
| NATA Diesel PM $\left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)^{*}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| NATA Cancer Risk (lifetime risk per million)* | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| NATA Respiratory Hazard Index* | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| NATA Neurological Hazard Index* | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Traffic Proximity and Volume (daily traffic count/distance to road) | 290 | 130 | 88 | 160 | 86 | 110 | 91 |
| Lead Paint Indicator (\% Pre-1960 Housing) | 0.39 | 0.43 | 45 | 0.53 | 33 | 0.3 | 66 |
| NPL Proximity (site count/km distance) | 0.1 | 0.28 | 28 | 0.19 | 47 | 0.096 | 76 |
| RMP Proximity (facility count/km distance) | 0.03 | 0.21 | 4 | 0.18 | 6 | 0.31 | 5 |
| TSDF Proximity (facility count/km distance) | 0.029 | 0.11 | 38 | 0.058 | 50 | 0.054 | 58 |
| Water Discharger Proximity (facility count/km distance) | 0.91 | 0.29 | 93 | 0.36 | 89 | 0.25 | 95 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demographic Indicators |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demographic Index | 9\% | 32\% | 11 | 35\% | 9 | 35\% | 6 |
| Minority Population | 10\% | 41\% | 17 | 41\% | 24 | 36\% | 26 |
| Low Income Population | 7\% | 23\% | 20 | 29\% | 13 | 34\% | 8 |
| Linguistically Isolated Population | 1\% | 7\% | 32 | 8\% | 35 | 5\% | 49 |
| Population With Less Than High School Education | 2\% | 12\% | 10 | 14\% | 9 | 14\% | 9 |
| Population Under 5 years of age | 6\% | 6\% | 59 | 6\% | 60 | 7\% | 54 |
| Population over 64 years of age | 25\% | 14\% | 92 | 14\% | 92 | 13\% | 92 |

* The National-scale Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) environmental indicators and EJ indexes, which include cancer risk, respiratory hazard, neurodevelopment hazard, and diesel particulate matter will be added into EJSCREEN during the first full public update after the soon-to-be-released 2011 dataset is made available. The National-Scale Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) is EPA's ongoing, comprehensive evaluation of air toxics in the United States. EPA developed the NATA to prioritize air toxics, emission sources, and locations of interest for further study. It is important to remember that NATA provides broad estimates of health risks over geographic areas of the country, not definitive risks to specific individuals or locations. More information on the NATA analysis can be found at: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/natamain/index.html.

For additional information, see: www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice
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## Appendix " $\mathbf{M}$ "

## Alternatives, Right of Way Impacts, Environmental Constraints







## Appendix " N "

## Public Communications / Utility Communications

Route 24, Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue Interchange Improvements Morris Township, Borough of Florham Park and Hanover Township, Morris County

> Public Information Center (PIC)

## Introduction

A virtual Public Information Center (PIC) was held for the Route 24, Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue Interchange Improvements project from November 30, 2020 to December 14, 2020 to allow the public to view the Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) and if desired, to provide comments. Due to the declared COVID-19 Public Health Emergency and State of Emergency, and in order to maintain recommended social distancing practices, it was determined that the PIC would be conducted in a virtual format.

Information was posted on the New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) website to provide notice to the public about the virtual PIC for the project.

The virtual PIC included a project handout, narrated video presentation, and feedback survey. The project handout, a copy of which is shown in Appendix A, provided a summary of the proposed improvements and anticipated design schedule. The handout also provided an individual to contact in the NJDOT's Office of Community Relations for further information or to provide comments. The narrated video presentation provided a visual and audible description of the proposed improvements. A PDF copy of the presentation is shown in Appendix B. After viewing the handout and video, visitors to the PIC were encouraged to participate in a survey, a copy of which is shown in Appendix C, to provide their comments and / or concerns.

Information regarding the virtual PIC was provided to municipal and county officials. The project handout was sent via US Mail to residences, businesses, and utility owners located within 250 feet of the project limits. The mailing list is shown in Appendix D.

The virtual PIC was advertised on the Florham Park Police Department and Office of Emergency Management Facebook page and in several news outlets. Copies of these notices and articles are shown in Appendix E. The readers were encouraged to view the virtual PIC presentation and participate in the survey after viewing the presentation.

## PIC Survey Responses

During the two weeks that the virtual PIC was active on the website, there were 3,764 visitors to the website and NJDOT had received 122 survey responses. Eleven additional responses were received via email. A tabulation of the responses received are shown in Appendix F. Of the 133 total responses
received, 81 were in support of the project, 40 did not support the project and 12 did not indicate a preference. Resolutions of support for the project have not yet been received from the municipalities. At the conclusion of this Concept Development Phase, Morris County will manage the project and be responsible for Preliminary and Final Design.

A summary of Frequently Asked Questions and NJDOT's Responses were posted to the web page on December 18, 2020 and are as follows:

## 1. Can improvements be made to the Route $\mathbf{2 4}$ Mainline?

The project Purpose and Need is to provide relief from congestion and reduce the number of vehicle crashes at the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue. The scope of this project does not address improvements to weaving or traffic flow on Route 24. Guide signing will be changed to reroute Route 24 motorists to the new proposed ramp. Exit numbers will not change.
2. Why not build a ramp to the business complexes via Campus Drive, NY Jets training facility and locations further south where the cars are heading anyway?
Per the NJDOT Roadway Design Manual the minimum spacing for interchanges should be at least 1 mile between urban crossroads. Campus Drive is 0.3 miles and the Jets training facility is 0.8 miles from the interchange at Columbia Turnpike. If Campus Drive was converted to a ramp, vehicular access would have to be denied to the office complex from the ramp.

## 3. Can the existing ramp from Columbia Turnpike Eastbound to Route $\mathbf{2 4}$ Eastbound remain?

In order to provide relief from congestion and reduce delays at the Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue intersection, the existing ramp from Columbia Turnpike Eastbound to Route 24 Eastbound will be closed and traffic will be directed to the new proposed ramp via two yield controlled right turn lanes from Columbia Turnpike Eastbound to Park Avenue Southbound. Two left turn lanes will also be provided from Park Avenue Southbound to the new proposed ramp.
4. The design eliminates the turn left from our neighborhood (Delaware and Prescott), onto Park Avenue. Why not build the new ramp at the existing Prescott Road intersection?
In the original Preliminary Preferred Alternative, the proposed ramp between Park Avenue and Route 24 Eastbound was aligned opposite Prescott Road at a new signalized intersection. Because of a local approval for the construction of the Marriot Hotel, the Preliminary Preferred Alternative was revised and the proposed ramp was relocated.

## 5. How will the new curbed island on Columbia Turnpike Westbound affect traffic?

The curbed island will be provided on Columbia Turnpike Westbound to relieve congestion and reduce the number of vehicle crashes at the intersection with Park Avenue. Motorists on Route 24 Eastbound will be rerouted to the next exit and use the new proposed ramp to reach Park Avenue. To be clear, traffic exiting Route 24 Westbound and traffic coming from Florham Park on Columbia Turnpike Westbound will be able to use the left turn lanes, through lanes or right turn lane at Park Avenue.
6. When were traffic counts taken? Did COVID affect traffic counts?

The traffic counts at the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue were taken in October 2019 prior to COVID. These volumes were then projected to 2020 using a growth factor for the area as a matter of standard practice.
7. How will traffic be improved if a new signalized intersection will be added for the new ramp?

As indicated in the presentation, the existing traffic delays at the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue can be as high as 8 minutes. The traffic analysis performed for this study show that rerouting the Route 24 Eastbound traffic to the new proposed ramp along with the additional intersection upgrades and timing modifications will reduce these delays by 3 to 6 minutes.

## Appendix A

www.dewberry.com

# Virtual Public Information Center 

November 30, 2020 through December 14, 2020<br>Route 24, Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue Interchange Improvements Morris Township, Borough of Florham Park and Hanover Township<br>Morris County, New Jersey

The New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT), committed to developing transportation improvements that best balance transportation needs, the environment, community concerns and costs, will hold a Virtual Public Information Center (PIC) to provide local residents and businesses with information on the Route 24, Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue Interchange Improvements. You are encouraged to actively participate by providing comments at the end of the presentation by mail or e-mail.

## The Presentation

Due to the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency, the Public Information Center will be conducted virtually at the following website:

## https://www.dewberry.com/njdot-rt24-columbiatpk-parkave-interchange

Please view the presentation at a time that is convenient for you between November 30, 2020 and December 14, 2020. The purpose of the presentation is to provide information about the proposed improvements at the Route 24, Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue Interchange. After the presentation, you will have an opportunity to submit comments to the NJDOT. Property owners with rental units are advised that tenants are also invited and encouraged to participate.

## Background

Traffic exiting Route 24 Eastbound for Columbia Turnpike Westbound is forced to weave across heavy traffic on Columbia Turnpike Westbound to make a left turn onto Park Avenue Southbound. Weaving is causing accidents, delays at the Columbia Turnpike/Park Avenue signalized intersection and back-ups onto Route 24 during the morning peak hours.

## The Proposed Project

NJDOT determined that a new ramp will be constructed to connect Route 24 Eastbound to and from Park Avenue at a new signalized T-intersection located south of the Columbia Turnpike/Park Avenue intersection. This new two-way ramp will connect to the existing ramps to and from Route 24

Eastbound and Columbia Turnpike Eastbound. The existing ramps will be modified.

New signing will direct Route 24 Eastbound drivers bound for Park Avenue Southbound to stay on the highway and take the next exit (Columbia Turnpike Eastbound) to access the new ramp to Park Avenue. This will eliminate weaving on Columbia Turnpike Westbound and reduce accidents and delays at the Columbia Turnpike/Park Avenue intersection.

A physical separator such as a curbed island will be constructed on Columbia Turnpike Westbound to prevent exiting traffic from Route 24 Eastbound from weaving across traffic to the left. Drivers will have the option of staying on Columbia Turnpike or turning right onto Park Avenue Northbound.

The existing ramp from Columbia Turnpike Eastbound to Route 24 Eastbound will be closed and signing will direct drivers to use the new ramp connection on Park Avenue. To accommodate the increase in traffic from Columbia Turnpike Eastbound to Park Avenue Southbound, two right turn lanes will be provided at the Columbia Turnpike/Park Avenue intersection.

## Anticipated Schedule

- Concept Development Phase complete: Winter 2021
- Preliminary Engineering Phase begins: Fall 2021


## For further information, please contact:

Anthony Sytko, Regional Coordinator<br>New Jersey Department of Transportation Office of Community Relations<br>PO Box 600, Trenton, NJ 08625-0600<br>Phone: 609-963-1992<br>E-mail: Anthony.Sytko@dot.nj.gov

## Appendix B

www.dewberry.com

## Route 24, Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue Interchange Improvements

Virtual Public Information Center
November 30, 2020







Route 24, Columbia Tpk./Park Ave.| November 30, 2020

## Project Schedule



Current Phase
By NJDOT

Phase
By County

Phase
By County

## Feedback

## Take the survey and submit comments at the following website: <br> https://www.dewberry.com/nidot-rt24-columbiatpk-parkaveinterchange

Questions can be submitted via email to NJDOT at: Anthony.Sytko@dot.ni.gov

## Appendix C

www.dewberry.com

## NJDOT Route 24, Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue Interchange <br> Public Information Center Survey

## 1. Contact Information (Optional)

By providing contact information, you will be added to the mailing list for Route 24, Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue Interchange

Name


Address $\square$
Email Address $\square$
Phone Number $\square$
2. To help us better understand your interest in the project, please indicate your affiliation:

ResidentBusiness

Municipal/Government
Utility
Other:


## 3. Do you live or work in the project area?

Yes - please indicate where in the comment field below.

Comments:

4. Are you supportive of the project as it is shown in the presentation?

Yes

No

Comments:

5. If you have any questions regarding the project, please provide them below.

Q1: $\square$
Q2:
Q3:


Q4:
Q5:

6. Please provide any other comments below.


## NJDOT Route 24, Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue Interchange <br> THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

If you have any remaining questions or comments regarding this project, please submit them by email to Anthony.Sytko@dot.nj.gov

## Appendix D

www.dewberry.com

| Sr.No | Owner Name | Mailing Address | Street Address | Block | Lot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | FORTE, JOHN J. JR \& MARY BETH | 7 ACADEMY RD, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 35 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 1101 | 2 |
| 2 | CHIAROLANZIO, DAVID \& DANIELLE | 37 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 37 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 1101 | 3 |
| 3 | DE CARO, CARMINE J | 41 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 41 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 1101 | 4 |
| 4 | AMBROSIANO, THEODORE | 45 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 45 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 1101 | 5 |
| 5 | SANGILLO, STEVEN | 195 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 47 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 1101 | 6 |
| 6 | AMALGAMATED \& CONSOLIDATED LLC | 25-27 DICKERSON ST, DOVER, NJ 07801 | 49 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 1101 | 7 |
| 7 | ALVEY, DAVID | 17 LAKE TRAIL WEST, HARDING, NJ 07960 | 57 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 1101 | 8 |
| 8 | PISCIOTTO, JAMES \& JACQUELINE S | 14 CORN HILL DR, MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 61 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 1101 | 9 |
| 9 | ALVEY, DAVID | 17 LAKE TRAIL WEST, HARDING, NJ 07960 | 65 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 1101 | 10 |
| 10 | DECARO, UMBERTO | 69 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 69 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 1101 | 11 |
| 11 | PICONE, PAUL C \& TONI M | 211 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 211 PARK AVE, MADISON, NJ 07940 | 1101 | 12 |
| 12 | GORZELNIK, LAWRENE M | 14 DELAWARE RD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 14 DELAWARE RD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 1101 | 13 |
| 13 | BUNETA, ANDRO \& JENNIFER | 12 DELAWARE RD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 12 DELAWARE RD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 1101 | 14 |
| 14 | ALTMAN, SCOTT \& ENRICHETTA | 10 DELAWARE RD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 10 DELAWARE RD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 1101 | 15 |
| 15 | MC HUGH, JAMES R \& SUSAN B | 8 DELAWARE RD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 8 DELAWARE RD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 1101 | 16 |
| 16 | RICCIARDELLI, STEVEN \& MARLO | 6 DELAWARE RD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 6 DELAWARE RD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 1101 | 17 |
| 17 | BIALOS, STEVEN/NUNEZ, SCORPIO | 2 DELAWARE RD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 2 DELAWARE RD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 1101 | 18 |
| 18 | JAMES H DOWDY III | 15 DELAWARE RD MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | PARK AVE \& DELAWARE | 1105 | 2 |
| 19 | MILLMORE, ANNE O. (TRUSTEE) | 215 PARK AVE MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | PARK AVE | 1105 | 3 |
| 20 | ADVANCE AT PARK\%SLK GLOBAL SOLUTION | 2727 LBJ FREEWAY STE 806, DALLAS, TX 75234 | 220 PARK AVE FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 1201 | 1 |
| 21 | ADVANCE AT PARK\%SLK GLOBAL SOLUTION | 2727 LBJ FREEWAY STE 806, DALLAS, TX 75234 | 200 PARK AVE FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 1201 | 2 |
| 22 | VILLA AT FLORHAM PARK INC | 3 MANHATTAN DR BURLINGTON, NJ 08016 | 190 PARK AVE FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 1201 | 3 |
| 23 | WOODFIELD ESTATES @ FLORHAM PARK | 39 MAIN ST CHATHAM, NJ 07932 | 188 PARK AVE FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 1201 | 4 |
| 24 | KBSII 100-200 CAMPUS DRIVE LLC | 100 CAMPUS DR,1F-\%T LYNCH FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 200 CAMPUS DR FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 1201 | 5 |
| 25 | KBSII 300-600 CAMPUS DRIVE LLC | 100 CAMPUS DR,1F-\%T LYNCH FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 300 CAMPUS DR FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 1201 | 6 |
| 26 | KBSII 100-200 CAMPUS DRIVE LLC | 100 CAMPUS DR,1F-\%T LYNCH FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 100 CAMPUS DR FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 1201 | 7 |
| 27 | PARK AVENUE FOUNDATION INC | 184 PARK AVE FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 184 PARK AVE FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 1201 | 8 |
| 28 | TEXAS EASTERN TRANSMISSION CORP | P.O.BOX 2629, ADDISON, TEXAS 75001 | 34 COLUMBIA RD | 4801 | 6,7.8 |
| 29 | LSREF3 AH CHICAGO LLC\% RYAN, LLC | 600 FIFTH AVE, 9TH FLOOR, NEW YORK, NY 10020 | 194 PARK AVE FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 4802 | 1 |
| 30 | CEDAR KNOLLS ONE LLC | 80 S JEFFERSON RD, \#202, WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 190 PARK AVE FLORHAM PARK, NJ 07932 | 4802 | 2 |
| 31 | RAVINE DEVELOPMENT CO LLC | P.O. BOX 298, SPRINGFIELD, NJ 07081 | 10 PARK AVE | 4902 | 1 |
| 32 | COLUMBIA EXECUTIVE PLAZA ASSOC. | 820 MORRIS TPK.SUITE 301, HORT HILLS, N.J. 07078 | COLUMBIA ROAD, OFF | 4902 | 2 |
| 33 | SOUTHEAST MORRIS CTY MUN UTIL AUTH | 19 SADDLE RD, CEDAR KNOLLS, NJ 07927 | 29 COLUMBIA RD | 4903 | 1 |
| 34 | HONEYWELL,INC., ATT: RAY MERCHANT | 115 TABOR RD. MORRIS PLAINS, NJ 07950 | 101 COLUMBIA RD | 9101 | 4 |
| 35 | BOLCAR, STEPHEN \& SALLY A | 88 NO JEFFERSON RD WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 88 NO JEFFERSON RD WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9201 | 1 |
| 36 | ANTONIELLO, JOSEPH R/CAROL | 29 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 29 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9201 | 2 |
| 37 | MARINO, ANNA F | 111 NO JEFFERSON RD WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9 LILLIAN PL WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9201 | 3 |
| 38 | LETIZIA, RONALD JR/BETH ANN | 25 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 25 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9201 | 4 |
| 39 | BAKA, JOHN A/CAROL M/ET ALS | 19 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 19 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9201 | 5 |
| 40 | MORETTI,FRANK R. JR. \& PATRICIA | 15 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 15 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9201 | 6 |
| 41 | WANG, ALICE M | 11 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 11 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9201 | 7 |
| 42 | MIHALKO, MICHAEL \& ANDREA | 7 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 7 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9201 | 8 |
| 43 | BARCELLONA, GAETANO | 1101 APPLETON WAY WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 78 NO JEFFERSON RD | 9201 | 9 |
| 44 | DOYLE, DAVID \& DANIELLE | 72 NO JEFFERSON RD, WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 72 NO JEFFERSON RD, WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9201 | 10 |
| 45 | PURDUE, MICHAEL/DENISE/ASHLEY | 68 NO JEFFERSON RD, WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 68 NO JEFFERSON RD, WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9201 | 11 |
| 46 | MILLMORE, ANNE O TRUSTEE | 215 PARK AVE, MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 215 PARK AVE, MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 9201 | 12 |
| 47 | LAKE, ROLAND \& ELEANOR | 3 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 3 NYE AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9201 | 15 |
| 48 | GANCARZ, ADAM/ELIZBIETA | 183 PARSIPPANY RD WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 183 PARSIPPANY RD WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9202 | 1 |
| 49 | HEUVERKAMP, DIRK \& MAFALDA | 179 PARSIPPANY RD WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 179 PARSIPPANY RD WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9202 | 2 |
| 50 | ORFANAKOS, GEORGE T \& MARIA | 175 PARSIPPANY RD WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 175 PARSIPPANY RD WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9202 | 3 |
| 51 | BRUNNER, FRED C THIRD | 9 KITCHELL PL WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 163 PARSIPPANY RD WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9202 | 4 |
| 52 | GRAVES, WILLIAM \& ALICE | 5 WOODLAND AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 10 WOODLAND AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9202 | 5 |
| 53 | JCP\&L ATT:FIRSTENERGY SERVICE CO | JCP\&L ATT:FIRSTENERGY SERVICE CO PO BOX 4747 OAKBROOK, IL 60522 | 24 WOODLAND AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9202 | 6 |
| 54 | BOURGEOIS, DONNYELL | 34 WOODLAND AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 34 WOODLAND AVE WHIPPANY, NJ 07981 | 9202 | 7 |
| 55 | GRAVEMAN, RICHARD FRED \& SUSAN H | 15 PARK AVE, CONVENT, NJ 07960 | 15 PARK AVE, CONVENT, NJ 07960 | 9502 | 6 |
| 56 | JP PICONE III TRUST \& JP PICONE III | 11 PARK AVE, MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 11 PARK AVE, MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 9502 | 5 |
| 57 | MERCER, PAUL A \& JOY M | 5010 THOMAS BERRY WAY, CHAPEL HILL, NC 27516 | 9 PARK AVE, MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 9502 | 4 |
| 58 | JOSEPH, HAROLD N \& SYLITA | 592 NW 135 TER, PLANTATION, FL 33325 | 5 PARK AVE, MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 9502 | 3 |
| 59 | BROCKWELL, SHANE \& DEGREZIA, DALENA | 118 COLUMBIA RD, MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 118 COLUMBIA RD, MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 9502 | 2 |
| 60 | BELL ATLANTIC \%DUFF \& PHELPS | PO BOX 2749, ADDISON,TX 75001 | 3 PARK AVE/COLUMBIA RD | 9502 | 1 |
| 61 | OPPENHEIMER, JOHN \& NALLET, CORINNE | 112 COLUMBIA RD, MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 112 COLUMBIA RD, MORRISTOWN, NJ 07960 | 9502 | 7 |
| 62 | PEREZ, PACIFICO B \& EVELYN C | 114 COLUMBIA RD, CONVENT, NJ 07960 | 114 COLUMBIA RD, CONVENT, NJ 07960 | 9502 | 8 |
| 63 | DEEPU, ARIFUR \& RAHMAN, ZAKIA | 2 WYNDMOOR DR CONVENT, NJ 07960 | 2 WYNDMOOR DR CONVENT, NJ 07960 | 9502 | 9 |
| 64 | KELLY, JENNIFER WIGFIELD | 4 WYNDMOOR DR, CONVENT, NJ 07960 | 4 WYNDMOOR DR, CONVENT, NJ 07960 | 9502 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 | Steve W. Williams, <br> Administrator | Borough of Chatham 54 Fairmount Avenue Chatham, NJ 07928 |  |  | NP |
| 66 | Brian K. Gibbons, $\quad$ Police of | Borough of Chatham 54 Fairmount Avenue Chatham, NJ 07928 |  |  | NP |
| 67 | Raymond M. Codey, Adminstrator | Borough of Madison Hartley Dodge Memorial Building 50 Kings Road, Madison, NJ 07940 |  |  | NP |
| 68 | Darren P. Dachisen Sr. $\quad$ Police | Borough of Madison Hartley Dodge Memorial Building 50 Kings Road, Madison, NJ 07940 |  |  | NP |
| 69 | Timothy Quinn Administrator | Morris Township 50 Woodland Avenue, P.O. Box 7603 Convent Station, NJ 07961 |  |  | NP |
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## Route 24, Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue Interchange Improvements

 Virtual PIC Online Advertisements
## Morristown

https://morristowngreen.com/2020/12/03/dot-proposing-changes-to-columbia-turnpike-park-avenue-interchange-public-comments-through-dec-14/

MorrlstownGreen.com
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News- Sthook Sports Videos- CONTRBBUTE

DOT proposing changes to Columbia
Turnpike/Park Avenue interchange; public comments through Dec. 14


By Kevin Coughlin - Dezember 3,2020

## Tapinto

https://www.tapinto.net/articles/proposed-improvements-to-rt-24-on-and-off-access-in-florham-park


Florham Park PD Facebook Page
https://www.facebook.com/pg/FlorhamparkPD/posts/


## NJDOT

https://www.state.nj.us/transportation/community/meetings/

| Active/Upcoming Public Meetings |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 'NA'NA' |  |
| Date: | From: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 at 02:26:00 PM <br> To: Friday, December 11, 2020 at 02:26:00 PM |
| Topic: | Rt 36 Thompson Ave |
| Meeting | Public Information Center - Information (pdf) |
| Type: | Click for PIC Web Site - Web Site |
| Location: |  |
| Topic: |  |
| Date: | From: Monday, November 30, 2020 at 03:21:00 PM <br> To: Monday, December 14, 2020 at 03:21:00 PM |
| Topic: | Rt. 24/Columbia Turnpike Interchange |
| Meeting | Public Information Center - Information (pdf) |
| Type: | Click for PIC Web Site - Web Site |
| Location: | Morris Twp, Florham Park, Hanover Township, Morris County |
| Topic: | 25th Legislative District: Sen. Anthony Bucco, Asm. Brian Bergen, Asw. Aura Dunn26th Legislative District: Sen. Joseph Pennacchio, Asm. Jay Webber, Asw. BettyLou DeCroce27th Legislative District: Sen. Richard Codey, Asm. John McKeon, Asw. Mila Jasey |

## Florham Park Eagle

https://www.newjerseyhills.com/florham park eagle/news/video-ramp-being-considered-to-ease-congestion-at-columbia-turnpike-intersection/article 4a61fbc6-6aa2-5250-bf7b-7d8b062642ec.html
(need a login to view the entire article but it appears that this leads to the virtual PIC)

## Florham Park Eagle <br>  <br> 



く
max
VIDEO: Ramp being considered to ease congestion a Turnpike intersection

Decs.2020 00

The state Department of Transportation (DOT) is considering a new ramp off Route 24 that would connect with Park Avenue further
south of the Park Avenue-Columbia Turnpike intersection to ease traffic congestion in Morris Township.
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The following was discussed at the above referenced meeting:
Following brief introductions by Anthony Sytko and a description of the meetings purpose by Ed D'Arcy, John Korunow proceeded to describe the changes that have occurred since the previous Local Officials Meeting in May of 2017. John explained that the Preliminary Preferred Alternative is essentially the same with the exception of a shift to the south on Park Avenue by 350'. The Parcel originally set for the ramp has been sold to a developer to build a hotel. The new location has two added benefits over the original location. First the new signal will now be a greater distance from the signal at Columbia and Park and the ramp will be constructed over a parking lot which reduces the environmental impact by reducing the impervious area required for the project.

John also stated that due to the time that has passed, new crash data and traffic counts where obtained to confirm that the Preliminary Preferred Alternative is still valid.

## The meeting was then opened up for questions:

Jim Slate (Morris Twp.) asked what impact the revised Alternative 3 had on the level of service at the intersections. John Korunow (IH Engineering) said the level of service stayed the same and the only real change is the ramp shifting over 350'. There are still 900 vehicles being taken out of the intersection, which will reduce crashes and congestion. Jim asked what the cost change is with this alternative. John said the construction cost is about the same, but there are fewer right-of-way acquisitions and a reduction in impervious surface could reduce the size of the retention basin. Jim asked how the lost parking spots will be made up. John said that will have to be evaluated and discussed with the businesses in Preliminary Engineering.

Mike Sgaramella (Florham Park) asked if the land in the complex would be condemned. Chris Vitz (Morris County) said that it would go through the standard right-of-way process. Ed D'Arcy (NJDOT) explained NJDOT is only handling this Concept Development Phase, and that Morris County will take over for design and construction, and it would only be condemned if an agreement cannot be negotiated. Chris added that the County works with property owners, and condemnation is a last resort.

Mike then asked if this is a surface ramp or an elevated ramp. John said there is a wall along the side, but it is a surface ramp.

Chris asked what the next steps are. Anthony Sytko (NJDOT) said there will be a Public Information Center (PIC) soon, and it will be virtual. Ed added after the PIC is done, the Draft Concept Development Report will be revised, and then the project will be turned over to the County in early 2021.

Jim Slate mentioned he liked portions of the old plan, and preferred that the ramp line up with Prescott Road. He asked if there was any chance things could change. Jim Burnet added that the County could take ownership of Campus Drive and use that to create an interchange that will work for eastbound and westbound. Chris said the County will not take over Campus Drive, as there are impacts to wetlands and the detention basin. In addition, it is too close to the Columbia Turnpike EB ramp to Route 24 EB creating a weave conflict. Jim Slate said he'd like to see the hotel taken into consideration as well. Chris said once it becomes a County project, they can discuss funding and then determinations will be made. John Korunow added that using Campus Drive increases the cost of the project and Ed added that NJDOT prohibits access off a ramp.

Jim Slate then suggested the Triboro Road ramp, and asked if that was a possible option. Chris said that is a separate project, and it will never be built.

Steve Williams (Chatham) asked if the info center will be this year. Anthony said it will be in October or November. Steve then asked what the next steps are, and the timeline. Chris said assuming the Draft CD Report is sent to the County in early 2021, Preliminary Engineering could then begin late 2021 or early 2022 if funding for the project is provided by NJTPA. He said construction is still 7 years away.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 AM.
If the writer does not receive any comments on the minutes by (October 16, 2020), it will be understood that the content of this memo is acceptable to all attendees.

Wednesday, August 23, 2017 - Rt. 24 EB ramp to CR 510 (Columbia Turnpike) meeting, Municipal Building, Florham Park

| Name | Organization | Phone \# | Email address |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anthony Sytko | NJDOT - Gov't \& Comm. Relations | 609-530-2110 | Anthony.sytko@dot.nj.gov |
| Steve Williams | Chatham - Administrator | 973-701-6807 | swilliams@chathamborough.org |
| Michael Sgaramella | Florham Park - Engineer | 973-410-5473 | msgaramella@fpboro.net |
| Dave Leo | Hanover - Engineering | 973-428-2489 | dleo@hanovertownship.com |
| Joseph Orlando | Florham Park PD | 973-410-5440 | 545@fppd.net |
| Mark Taylor | Florham Park - Mayor | 973-410-5302 | mtaylor@fpboro.net |
| Aliaa Majeed | NJDOT - Project Mgt. |  | Aliaa.majeed@dot.nj.gov |
| Ed D'Arcy | NJDOT - Project Mgt. | 609-530-3631 | Edward.darcy@dot.nj.gov |
| Jesse Kaar | Morris Twp. FD | 973-326-7462 | jkaar@morristwp.com |
| Joe Cortright | Whippany FD | 973-703-0285 | jcortright@whippanyfire.com |
| Christopher Vitz | Morris Co. - Engineer | 973-285-6758 | cvitz@co.morris.nj.us |
| Danielle Ferland | Morris Co. - Asst. Bridge Engineer | 973-829-8622 | dferland@co.morris.nj.us |
| Robert Vogel | Madison - Engineer | 973-593-3060 | vogelr@rosenet.org |
| Chief Robert Treiber | Florham Park PD | 973-377-2200 | 532@fppd.net |
| Bryan Pilipie | Hanover PD | 973-428-2512 | bpilipie@hanoverpolice.com |
| Lt. Ed Conrads | Morris Twp. PD | 973-326-7454 | econrads@mtpd1422.com |
| Mark Osterhoudt | Morris Twp. PD | 973-326-7436 | mosterhoudt@mtpd1422.com |
| John Korunow | IH Engineers | 609-734-8400 | jkorunow@ihengineers.com |
| Brian Stankus | IH Engineers | 609-734-8400 | bstankus@ihengineers.com |
| Peter Mancuso | Morris Twp. Committee | 973-704-1937 | mancuso@att.net |
| Jim Slate | Morris Twp. | 973-326-7443 | jslate@morristwp.com |

After introductions, Ed D'Arcy (NJDOT) explained that although this is a county project, NJDOT has agreed to do the concept development phase, at the county's request, due to the proximity to a state ramp. The project will be turned over to the county once we finish the CD phase.

John Korunow (IH Engineers) then presented the first alternative. He said that initially they considered ramps off Park Ave. but that didn't work because if there was a backup, it would bring cars onto the interchange. Instead, vehicles will come off Rt. 24 to a new intersection, and that will take the volume off Columbia \& Park. Part of this will remove the ramp from Rt. 24 SB to Columbia. This alternative requires a lot of ROW acquisition, and will cost approximately $\$ 21$ million in total.

Brian Stankus (IH Engineers) provided the traffic engineering breakdown. He said that approximately $90 \%$ of the traffic during the AM rush hour is making the left from Columbia onto Park - roughly 1,600 vehicles per hour. The backup meters traffic coming off the ramp as well. All that traffic would be diverted to the new signal intersection, and would still leave approximately 600 vehicles/hr making the left. In addition, the traffic in the evening rush hour making the right from Park to Columbia is also massive, and the new signal will alleviate much of that traffic as well.

There was a discussion about the Honeywell facility, and whether that anticipated traffic was factored into the projections, which it was. John noted they also did not want to put the ramp directly over gas transmission lines. Brian concluded that this alternative was not an overall fail, but did include some $F$ movements. Mayor Taylor (Florham Park) said that safety for drivers is the top priority.

John then presented Alternative 2, which includes roundabouts. This eliminates the 2 A exit, and all traffic would come onto 2 B . There are additional walls needed for the ramps, and more basins will be needed because of the increase impervious surface. This project will total approximately $\$ 15$ million.

Brian explained this alternative is one of the two better ones for the Columbia/Park interchange. It still takes traffic off the intersection, but it does create a weaving section on Rt. 24 EB. He noted that most roundabouts work with low volume, but this is higher volume, and that could create an issue with traffic backing up onto the ramp during the AM peak. Representatives from the Florham Park Police Department expressed concerns about those potential backups causing accidents.

There was a discussion about accidents, and where cars would go in the event of a lane closure due to the circle. John explained that the lanes were of sufficient width that, should one lane be closed, cars would still be able to move. In addition, there would be a wide enough shoulder for most vehicles to get around.

John then presented Alternative 3. This is less expensive and requires less ROW acquisition than the first two; it would cost approximately $\$ 12.5$ million total. The barrier would prevent movement from the ramp to the left turn lane, and new signage would direct drivers to Morristown. However, the ramp from Columbia onto Rt. 24 EB would be eliminated. Mayor Taylor asked if this would help the projected 2020 traffic numbers; Brian said this creates similar numbers to Alternative 2. Brian also noted this causes a 600 foot weaving section on Rt. 24 EB, which would be an issue. Lt. Ed Conrads (Morris Twp. Police Department) said this would force more drivers further down to take Exit 1A at Whippany Rd.

Joe Cortright (Whippany Fire Department) asked if the exit by the hotel would be acquired, because he was concerned about safety access to the Honeywell property. He suggested creating a fire hydrant on the Florham Park side (northeast corner) of the new intersection, because the only hydrant currently there is across the road, and in the event of a fire there, the department would have to close down all of Park Ave. to bring the hose across the road. John said that would be factored in once Concept Development was finished and they moved into Final Design.

Finally, Alternative 4 was presented. This proposes to move the traffic down to Campus Drive. It addresses the safety issues, but does not eliminate traffic out of the Columbia/Park intersection, and does nothing to remove traffic during the evening peak. In addition, this proposal creates multiple driveways on the ramp, which is not allowed under the guidelines. This would require eliminating the trailways that were just put in. Lastly, it creates an F weaving pattern as well.

There was a discussion about the jurisdictional issues. Representatives from Morris County inquired why county funds were being used to pay for a project that would benefit the state ramps. Ed explained that although there is a political aspect to it, it's a county intersection that happens to be near a state ramp, and thus it's ultimately a county project.

There was a discussion about expanding the scope to look at regional issues on Rt. 24, but Ed said this project was limited in scope - this was just about the Columbia/Park intersection and not all of Rt. 24. Robert Vogel (Madison) said a list of pros and cons was needed, and in his opinion the best recommendation is Alternative 1. John said that project costs the most and doesn't create much improvement. Ed recommends Alternative 3, since it improves the safety and is the cheapest, which makes it the most efficient.

Bryan Pilipie (Hanover Police Department) inquired about traffic coming from Morristown that wants to go onto Rt. 24 EB with Alternative 3. Brian answered that they would move through the Columbia/Park intersection and make the left at the new signal. Jesse Kaar (Morris Township Fire Department) responded that would move backups to the new intersection instead. John said it would alleviate most of the issues - there would still be F movements, but there would be fewer of them.

Ed said that he hoped to advance and finalize concept development by the end of the year and present to Morris County in early 2018 to choose the PPA.

Bryan asked if the new signal would impact the timing of signals further down Park Ave. Ed said they would have to coordinate the timing, since ordinarily signals are not placed that closely together. Brian added that there would not be a lot of movement eastbound at the new signal, but it would be sufficient to warrant its own phase.

Steve Williams (Chatham) asked if there was a discussion or examination of looking at Rt. 24 near Rt. 287. Drivers get off early and create problems in that area. Ed mentioned there could be a problem statement submitted about that area. Steve then asked about other issues on Rt. 24 in Chatham. Ed responded that ITS was looking to optimize the signals and signage on Rt. 124, including at its intersection with Rt. 24, but that the purpose of this meeting was to discuss Columbia/Park.

Ed Conrads inquired if there could be a generator switch installed at Columbia/Park to allow the police department to hook up a generator in the event of a power outage, which would save time and money in police manpower at the intersection. Ed D'Arcy responded that it would be passed along to Traffic Engineering, since it's a NJDOT light. Anthony Sytko (NJDOT) added that he would get Lt. Conrads a contact person to investigate that.

## MEETING ADJOURNED

## John Korunow

To:
Subject:
Attachments:

John Korunow
FW: Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange and Intersection Alternatives.
510-623 count summary.xls

From: Brian M. Stankus [mailto: bstankus@ihengineers.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2017 6:05 PM
To: 'Vitz, Chris'; 'J ohn Korunow'; 'Edward D'Arcy'
Cc: 'Dellagiacoma, Debra'; 'Majeed, Aliaa'
Subject: RE: Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange and Intersection Alternatives.
Chris -

Attached is a copy of the peak hour intersection counts IH conducted in April 2016 at Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue.

You noted: "Under the "Advantages" paragraph bullet "3." Notes a third receiving lane would be constructed south of Columbia Turnpike on Park Avenue. That is not reflected on the graphic." We propose to revise the text to eliminate the reference to the third southbound lane (so it matches the graphic). Since no more than two lanes at a time enter southbound Park Avenue at the signal there is not really a need for a third southbound lane here - the third lane could potentially increase the available storage between the two signals, but the lane drop beyond the proposed new signal could add to delays especially during the weekday morning peak hour.

I will send the sketches showing the redistributed Year 2022 peak hour volumes for Alternatives 1 and 3 in a separate email. At this point these diagrams are the rough working pencil sketches but they will show you what we analyzed.

Thanks and please contact me with any further questions.

Brian M. Stankus, P.E., PTOE
Project M anager

103 C ollege R oad East, First Floor
Princeton, NJ 08540
phone (609) 734-8400
direct (609) 524-6407
fax (609) 734-8405
bstankus@ihengineers.com
www.ihengineers.com
"F irst choice of our clients for over 15 years."

From: Vitz, Chris
Sent: Tuesday, September 05, 2017 3:27 PM
To: 'John Korunow' [ikorunow@ihengineers.com](mailto:ikorunow@ihengineers.com); 'Brian M. Stankus' [ostankus@ihengineers.com](mailto:ostankus@ihengineers.com); 'Edward D'Arcy' [edward.darcy@dot.state.nj.us](mailto:edward.darcy@dot.state.nj.us)

Cc: Dellagiacoma, Debra [ddellagiacoma@co.morris.nj.us](mailto:ddellagiacoma@co.morris.nj.us); 'Majeed, Aliaa' <Aliaa.M ajeed@dot.nj.gov>
Subject: RE: Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange and Intersection Alternatives.
John,
Thank you. I have to present the alternatives at the Freeholder work session on Sept $13^{\text {th }}$. So if the additional answers from Brian are sent before Friday, that would be great.

Christopher J. Vitz, P.E.
Director of Public Works \& County Engineer
County of Morris Department of Public Works
PO Box 900
Morristown, NJ 07963-0900
973-285-6758

From: John Korunow [mailto:jkorunow@ihengineers.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 05, 2017 11:08 AM
To: Vitz, Chris [CVitz@co.morris.nj.us](mailto:CVitz@co.morris.nj.us); 'Brian M. Stankus' <ostankus@ ihengineers.com>; 'Edward D'Arcy' [edward.darcy@dot.state.nj.us](mailto:edward.darcy@dot.state.nj.us)
Cc: Dellagiacoma, Debra [ddellagiacoma@co.morris.nj.us](mailto:ddellagiacoma@co.morris.nj.us); 'Majeed, Aliaa' <Aliaa.M ajeed@dot.nj.gov>
Subject: RE: Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange and Intersection Alternatives.
See Below

From: Vitz, Chris [mailto: CVitz@co.morris.nj.us]
Sent: Friday, September 01, 2017 4:12 PM
To: 'jkorunow@ihengineers.com'; 'Brian M. Stankus'; Edward D'Arcy
Cc: Dellagiacoma, Debra
Subject: Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange and Intersection Alternatives.
John, Brian, Ed,
I want to thank you again for the presentation and work performed on the Route 24 / Columbia Turnpike / Park Avenue interchange and intersection.

I have had some time to digest the materials provided and have a few questions;

1) Was any research done on a direct connection from Route 24 EB to Park Avenue Southbound? I know this has been suggested before at the county level, but I am not sure if your group, or NJDOT Value Engineering looked into that alternative. Some type of answer on that would allow me to address that specific issue with the Freeholder Board. Thank you. - NJDOT Value Solutions looked at this alternative (see attached). This alternative dumps the relocated traffic right back into the intersection at Columbia Turnpike. This will require changing the signal timing to give more to Park Avenue. This alternative may help with the weave on Columbia Turnpike but it does nothing for the delays at the intersection. They are still a very bad "F".
2) Alternative 1
a. There is no justification given as to why the WB Columbia Turnpike to EB Route 24 Ramp is being realigned and reconstructed. We are not touching this particular ramp. It is remaining as is. However the first paragraph suggests that half the remaining Columbia WB left turns would use this alternative to get to the flyover ramp. Why not just allow those WB vehicles to continue to make the left at Park Avenue? The WB vehicles are allowed to go either way. We are suggesting that when they discover that there is another way that reduces their delay that they may take the flyover ramp as an alternate.

How was the percentage of vehicles proposed to use that approach determined? There was no formula for the $50 \%$. It is an assumption based on engineering judgement. It could be more or it could be less. There is no way to know until the construction is complete and the realignment is in use.

I need to defer to Brian Stankus on the rest of these questions. He is out of the office today, back tomorrow. I will also discuss the "bullet 3 " issue with him.
b. Under the "Advantages" paragraph bullet " 3 ." Notes a third receiving lane would be constructed south of Columbia Turnpike on Park Avenue. That is not reflected on the graphic.
3) Alternative 3
a. Under the "Advantages" paragraph bullet "3." Notes a third receiving lane would be constructed south of Columbia Turnpike on Park Avenue. That is not reflected on the graphic.
4) If possible, can the traffic counts be provided for the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue? As well as any other traffic counts taken in the area? It would be helpful for us to have those for any future development applications.
5) If possible, could you provide the proposed traffic volumes on simplified versions of the maps for Alternatives 1 and 3 ?

I would like to have these answers and documents to better inform the County Freeholder Board. I have been asked to present your findings at an upcoming Freeholder Board Work Session. I have copied in Debra Dellagiacoma, our M orris County Traffic Engineer on this message.

Thank you.
Sincerely,

Christopher J. Vitz, P.E.
Director of Public Works \& County Engineer
County of Morris Department of Public Works
PO Box 900
Morristown, NJ 07963-0900
973-285-6758


| 7 | Sewer (Florham Park Borough) | Florham Park Borough Sewer Utility | Mr. Ted Lee | Plant Manager | 111 Ridgedale Avenue, Florham Park, NJ 07932 | Office: 973-377-1330 |  | 27-Oct-16 | 16-Nov-16 |  | NO | Company Engineer to be Contacted: Howard Matteson -CDM Smith- Senior PE, 110 Fieldcrest Avenue, \#8, 6th Floor, Edison, NJ 08837, 732-225-7000, mattesonHS@cdmsmith.com. UTILITY Agreement: Carl Ganger; Borough of Florham Park, Director-DCS, 111 Ridgedale Avenue, Florham Park, NJ, 973-410-5330, cganger@fpboro.net. Preliminary Engineering funding - not specified |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | Water (Florham Park Borough) | Florham Park Borough Water Utility | Mr. Alex Zipeto | Water Superintendent | 111 Ridgedale Avenue, Florham Park, NJ 07932 | Office: 973-410-5316 | azipeto@fpboro.net | 27-Oct-16 |  |  |  | 1. Called on $01 / 23 / 2017$, left voice message. Mr. Zipeto returned phone call and requested Letter \#1 to be re-send by email. E-mail sent on 01/23/2017. |
| 9 | Sewer (Hanover Township) | Hanover Sewerage Authority | Michael C. Wynne, P.E. | Executive Director | PO Box 320 1000 Route 10 Whippany NJ 07981 | Office: 973-428-2477 Fax: 973-515-3774 | mwynne@hanovertownship.com | 27-Oct-16 |  |  |  | 1. Called on 01/23/2017, left voice message. |
| 10 | Water <br> (Hanover <br> Township) | The Southeast Morris County Municipal Utility Authority (SMCMUA) | Paul Kozakiewicz | Superintendent | 19 Saddle Road Cedar Knolls, NJ 07927 | Office: 973-326-6865 | pkozakiewicz@smcmua.org | 27-Oct-16 | 02-Dec-16 | YES |  | 1. We got questionnaire from Paul, indicating that SMCMUA has a utility within the limits of the project, but we didn't get the map indicating the exact location. In Paul's email says that there is new person (Mr. Manley) will be assigned for this work. Called on 01/23/2017, but he had a day off, I will call on 01/24/2017. |
| 11 | Sewer (Morris Township) | Morris Township Sewer | Mr. James Slate | Township Engineer | $\begin{gathered} 50 \text { Woodland Ave } \\ \text { PO Box } 7603 \\ \text { Convent Station, NJ } 07961 \text { - } \\ 7603 \end{gathered}$ | Office: $973-326-7440$ | Jslate@morristwp.com | 27-Oct-16 | 23-Jun-17 | YES |  | 1. Called on 01/23/2017, left voice message. <br> 2. We got questionnaire on June 23, 2017. Preliminary Engineering funding $\$ 00.00$ |
| 12 | Water (Morris Township) | The Southeast Morris County Municipal Utility Authority (SMCMUA) | Paul Kozakiewicz | Superintendent | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \text { Saddle Road } \\ & \text { Cedar Knolls, NJ } 07927 \end{aligned}$ | Office: 973-326-6865 | pkozakiewicz@smcmua.org | 27-Oct-16 |  |  |  | 1. We got questionnaire from Paul, indicating that SMCMUA has a utility within the limits of the project, but we didn't get the map indicating the exact location. In Paul's email says that there is new person (Mr. Manley) will be assigned for this work. Called on 01/23/2017, but he had a day off, I will call on 01/24/2017. |
| 13 | Gas | Algonquin Gas Transmission Co | Mr. Andy Meyer | Superintendent | Morristown Airport (MMU) 45 Airport Rd, Morristown, NJ 07960 | Office: 973-644-2640 | armeyer@spectraenergy.com | 23-Jan-17 |  |  |  | 1. Sent e-mail with Letter \#1 on 01/23/2017 |
| 14 | Gas | Texas Eastern Gas |  |  |  | Office: 713-627-5400 |  | 23-Jan-17 |  |  |  | 1. Called on 01/23/2017, left voice message to engineering department of central office in Texas. Also found the local Morristown office 1 Columbia Rd., Morristown, NJ 07960 (973)5391933, nobody picks the phone answer machine. |

UPC \# 154330
October 28, 2016

Mr. Baxter Turley
Advanced Engineer
Jersey Central Power \& Light of New Jersey (NORTH)
300 Madison Avenue
Morristown NJ 07962
Phone: 732-212-4262

Re:<br>NJ Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange<br>Concept Development<br>Interchange Improvements<br>Borough of Florham Park, Townships of Morris and Hanover<br>Morris County<br>UPC Code: 154330<br>ELECTRIC UTILITY

Project Designer:<br>IH Engineers, P.C.<br>103 College Road East, $1^{\text {st }} \mathrm{Fl}$.<br>Princeton, NJ 08540<br>ATTN: John Korunow, P.E.<br>Phone: (609) 734-8400<br>Fax: (609) 734-8405<br>Email: jkorunow@ihengineers.com

Dear Mr. Turley:
The New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) has contracted IH Engineers, P.C. (IH) for Concept Development (CD) for Interchange Improvements of NJ Route 24, Park Avenue and Columbia Turnpike Interchange. The project involves alternative analysis for the relocation of interchange ramps. This will involve relocating traffic from the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue to Park Avenue approximately 1000 feet east of the intersection.

This letter will serve to established an official contact with Jersey Central Power \& Light of New Jersey (NORTH) - Electric and verify if you do have any facility in the project affected area. Please find enclosed project Location Map and Photos of existing condition of the project area, to give you a better understanding of proposed project. If your facility exists within the project area, please estimate and provide the additional amount of Preliminary Engineering (PE) expenses you may request to pay for your effort in assisting NJDOT to investigate and verify the actual information and to develop accommodation schemes of all your facilities affected by the project.

Please complete the following questionnaire and return it to the Designer's Engineer by November 25 ${ }^{\text {th }}, \mathbf{2 0 1 6}$. If you prefer to respond by FAX or E-mail the numbers are in the caption above.
(X) We DO HAVE existing facilities within the project limits.
( $\quad$ We DO NOT HAVE existing facilities within the project limits.
(..) We HAVE PROPOSED facilities planned within the project limits.
(X) The following companies are tenants on/in our facilities within the project limits:

Verizon
Cablevision

## (X) The Company Engineer to be contacted is:

| Name <br> Company <br> Title | Harvey M. Lockley <br> Address CentralPower \& Light |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Engineering Services Supervisor. |
|  | 101. Crawford's Corner Road |
| Bld. 5th. Fl. Suite 1-511 |  |
| Tel: | $\frac{\text { Holmdel, NJ. } 07733}{(732) 212-4262}$ |
| Fax: | $\frac{(330) 245-5635}{\text { Email: }}$ |
|  |  |

(X) The UTILITY AGREEMENT shall be sent to the following person:
(X) Same as above or fill in below:

(X) The amount of Preliminary Engineering funding needed will be $\$ 20,000.00$ (This amount is only an estimate)
(X)

We would like the NJDOT to arrange for the following work to be done for our facilities should it be necessary for them to be relocated or modified.
$\qquad$ ) Design/Engineering
( ) Construction - Some or All?
) Neither - the Company will perform (or arrange to have performed) all needed work.) Not certain at this time.

End of questionnaire.
If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.

(Interchange Improvements)
UPC \# 154330

January 23, 2017

Mr. Andy Meyer<br>Algonquin Gas Transmission Co<br>Morristown Airport (MMU)<br>45 Airport Rd,<br>Morristown, NJ 07960<br>Phone: 973-664-2640

Re:<br>NJ Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange<br>Concept Development<br>Interchange Improvements<br>Borough of Florham Park, Townships of Morris and Hanover<br>Morris County<br>UPC Code: 154330<br>GAS UTILITY

Project Designer:<br>IH Engineers, P.C.<br>103 College Road East, $1^{\text {st }} \mathrm{Fl}$.<br>Princeton, NJ 08540<br>ATTN: John Korunow, P.E. Phone: (609) 734-8400<br>Fax: (609) 734-8405<br>Email: jkorunow@ihengineers.com

Dear Mr. Meyer:
The New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) has contracted IH Engineers, P.C. (IH) for Concept Development (CD) for Interchange Improvements of NJ Route 24, Park Avenue and Columbia Turnpike Interchange. The project involves alternative analysis for the relocation of interchange ramps. This will involve relocating traffic from the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue to Park Avenue approximately 1000 feet east of the intersection.

This letter will serve to established an official contact with Algonquin Gas Transmission Co - Gas and verify if you do have any facility in the project affected area. Please find enclosed project Location Map and Photos of existing condition of the project area, to give you a better understanding of proposed project. If your facility exists within the project area, please estimate and provide the additional amount of Preliminary Engineering (PE) expenses you may request to pay for your effort in assisting NJDOT to investigate and verify the actual information and to develop accommodation schemes of all your facilities affected by the project.

Please complete the following questionnaire and return it to the Designer's Engineer by February 23 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$, 2017. If you prefer to respond by FAX or E-mail the numbers are in the caption above.
$\qquad$ ) We DO HAVE existing facilities within the project limits.
$\qquad$ ) We DO NOT HAVE existing facilities within the project limits.
$\qquad$ ) We HAVE PROPOSED facilities planned within the project limits.
$\qquad$ ) The following companies are tenants on/in our facilities within the project limits:
$\qquad$ ) The Company Engineer to be contacted is:

Name
Company
Title
Address
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Tel:
Fax:
Email: $\qquad$
( ) The UTILITY AGREEMENT shall be sent to the following person:
( $\qquad$ Same as above or fill in below:

Name
Company
Title
Address

Tel:
Fax:
Email:
( $\quad$ The amount of Preliminary Engineering funding needed will be $\$$ (This amount is only an estimate)
$\qquad$ We would like the NJDOT to arrange for the following work to be done for our facilities should it be necessary for them to be relocated or modified.
( Design/Engineering
( Construction - Some or All?
(—) Neither - the Company will perform (or arrange to have performed) all needed work.
( Not certain at this time.

End of questionnaire.
If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.


103 College Road East, $1^{\text {sl }}$ Floor Princeton, NJ 08540
T: 609-734-8400 F: 609-734-8405
www.hengineers.com
Also in: Hackensack and Staten Island
Re: NJDOT Utility Letter \#1
NJ Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange
(Interchange Improvements)
UPC \# 154330

October 28, 2016

Mr. John Wyckoff
Director - Engineering
NJ Natural Gas
1415 Wyckoff Road
PO Box 1464
Wall, NJ 07719
Phone: 732-938-7864

## Re:

NJ Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange

## Concept Development

Interchange Improvements
Borough of Florham Park, Townships of Morris and Hanover
Morris County
UPC Code: 154330
GAS UTILITY

## RECEIVED <br> กCT 312016 <br> MAK - ENGINEERING

Dear Mr. Wyckoff:
The New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) has contracted IH Engineers, P.C. (IH) for Concept Development (CD) for Interchange Improvements of NJ Route 24, Park Avenue and Columbia Turnpike Interchange. The project involves alternative analysis for the relocation of interchange ramps. This will involve relocating traffic from the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue to Park Avenue approximately 1000 feet east of the intersection.

This letter will serve to established an official contact with NJ Natural Gas - Gas and verify if you do have any facility in the project affected area. Please find enclosed project Location Map and Photos of existing condition of the project area, to give you a better understanding of proposed project. If your facility exists within the project area, please estimate and provide the additional amount of Preliminary Engineering (PE) expenses you may request to pay for your effort in assisting NJDOT to investigate and verify the actual information and to develop accommodation schemes of all your facilities affected by the project.

Please complete the following questionnaire and return it to the Designer's Engineer by November $25^{\text {th }}, 2016$. If you prefer to respond by FAX or E-mail the numbers are in the caption above.
(X) We DO HAVE existing facilities within the project limits.
( ) We DO NOT HAVE existing facilities within the project limits.
( We HAVE PROPOSED facilities planned within the project limits.
$\qquad$ ) The following companies are tenants on/in our facilities within the project limits:

Re: NJDOT Utility Letter \#1 NJ Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange (Interchange Improvements) UPC \# 154330
(X) The Company Engineer to be contacted is:

| Name | Kyle Rauth |
| :--- | :--- |
| Company | NEW JERSEY NATURAL GAS |
| Title | Project Engineer |
| Address | 1415 Wyckoff Rd |
|  | PO Box 1464 |
| Tel: | Wall, NJ 07719 |
| Fax: | T: 732-919-8016 |
| Email: | F: 732-919-7854 |
|  | Krauth@njng.com |

(X ) The UTILITY AGREEMENT shall be sent to the following person:
$\qquad$ Same as above or fill in below:

Name
John B. Wyckoff, P.E. NEW JERSEY NATURAL GAS
Title Director - Engineering
Company
Address 1415 Wyckoff Rd
PO Box 1464
Wall, NJ 07719
Tel: $\quad$ T: 732-938-7864
Email: F: 732-919-7854
JBWyckoff@NJNG.com
(ـ) The amount of Preliminary Engineering funding needed will be \$10,000.00 (This amount is only an estimate)
$\qquad$ ) We would like the NJDOT to arrange for the following work to be done for our facilities should it be necessary for them to be relocated or modified.
(__) Design/Engineering ) Construction - Some or All?
) Neither - the Company will perform (or arrange to have performed) all needed work. ) Not certain at this time.

## End of questionnaire.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.
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103 College Road East, $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ Floor Princeton, NJ 08540
T: 609-734-8400 F: 609-734-8405
www ihengineers.com
Aso in: Hackensack and Staten Istand
Re: NJDOT Utility Letter \#1
(Interchange Improvements)
UPC \# 154330

October 28, 2016

## Mr. Ted Lee

Plant Manager
Florham Park Borough Sewer Utility
111 Ridgedale Avenue,
Florham Park, NJ 07932
Phone: 973-377-1330

## Re:

NJ Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange
Concept Development
Interchange Improvements
Borough of Florham Park, Townships of Morris and Hanover
Morris County
UPC Code: 154330
SEWER UTLLTY

## Project Designer:

IH Engineers, P.C. 103 College Road East, $1^{\text {st }}$ Fl.
Princeton, NJ 08540
ATTN: John Korunow, P.E.
Phone: (609) 734-8400
Fax: (609) 734-8405
Email: jkorunow@ihengineers.com

Dear Mr. Lee:
The New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) has contracted IH Engineers, P.C. (IH) for Concept Development (CD) for Interchange Improvements of NJ Route 24, Park Avenue and Columbia Turnpike Interchange. The project involves alternative analysis for the relocation of interchange ramps. This will involve relocating traffic from the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue to Park Avenue approximately 1000 feet east of the intersection.

This letter will serve to established an official contact with Florham Park Borough Sewer Utility - Sewer and verify if you do have any facility in the project affected area. Please find enclosed project Location Map and Photos of existing condition of the project area, to give you a better understanding of proposed project. If your facility exists within the project area, please estimate and provide the additional amount of Preliminary Engineering (PE) expenses you may request to pay for your effort in assisting NJDOT to investigate and verify the actual information and to develop accommodation schemes of all your facilities affected by the project.

Please complete the following questionnaire and return it to the Designer's Engineer by November $25^{\text {th }}, 2016$. If you prefer to respond by FAX or E-mail the numbers are in the caption above.
( ) We DO HAVE existing facilities within the project limits.
(*) We DO NOT HAVE existing faclities within the project limits.
$\qquad$ ) We HAVE PROPOSED facilities planned within the project limits.
( ) The following companies are tenants on/in our facilities within the project limits:

Re: NJDOT Utility Letter \#1
NJ Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange
(Interchange Improvements)
UPC \# 154330
$(\vee)$ The Company Engineer to be contacted is:

| Name | Howard matteson |
| :---: | :---: |
| Company | CDM Smith |
| Title | Senior PE |
| Address | 110 Fielderest Ave $\$ 8$ bIF Floor |
|  | Edison, N5 08837 |
| Tel: | (732) $225-7000$ |
| Fax: |  |
| Email: | mattesonHSecdmsmoth |

$(\checkmark)$ The UTILITY AGREEMENT shall be sent to the following person:
( $\vee)$ Same as above or fill in below:

| Name | Carl Cancer |
| :--- | :--- |
| Company | Boreurh ef Florhen Park |
| Title | Address |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Tel: $\quad(973) 410-5330$
Fax: $\quad(973) 410-5490$
Email: cgenger efpbroinet
( ) The amount of Preliminary Engineering funding needed will be \$ (This amount is only an estimate)
( ${ }^{\text {( ) We would like the NJDOT to arrange for the following work to be done for our facilities should it be }}$ necessary for them to be relocated or modified.
( ) Design/Engineering
( ) Construction - Some or All?
(—) Neither - the Company will perform (or arrange to have performed) all needed work.
(
Not certain at this time.

End of questionnaire.
If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.





JAMES R. SLATE, P.E. TOWNSHIP ENGINEER
(973) 326-7440

John Korunow, PE
IH Engineers, PC
103 College Road East, $1^{\text {st }}$ Floor
Princeton, NJ 08540

# TOWNSHIP OF MORRIS 

Re: Concept Development- Interchange Improvements<br>Park Avenue, Florham Park<br>Township of Morris Sanitary Sewer System

## Dear Mr. Korunow:

Pursuant to your recent request for information concerning our sanitary sewer system in your project limits,
Enclosed please find the completed questionnaire you have submitted to our office. Unfortunately, we do not have any plans, either design or as-builts of this sanitary sewer system in our archive files. Since you are preparing concept plans for the revised interchange ramp for Route 24 , we do not, at this time, know whether any modifications will be required of this system in your project limits.

While we understand the scope of this project is to reduce the impacts of Route 24 traffic exiting onto Columbia Road and impacting the Park Avenue/ Columbia Road intersection, the concept to move the impact to the Park Avenue intersection with the old Honeywell intersection may not address the traffic impacts unless additional ramps/exits are placed along the Route 24 corridor to address the new development along the corridor. During the various meetings held by the State, County of Morris and stakeholders along the Park Avenue corridor, it was requested that the State DOT look into installing ramps/ exits at the rear of various office complexes in the Rockerfeller Development tract and tying the ramps/ exits into the boulevard roadways and commons access roads between the various office buildings. By installing exits into the points of destination for these cars, the Park Avenue/ Columbia Road intersection would handle the other traffic coming west along Columbia Road and east along Park Avenue.

Our office would be interested in meeting with your group to discuss our concerns, even before a concept is designed for this new ramp. If you have any questions or require any additional information please give our office a call or email my office at JSlate@morristwp.com.


103 College Road East, $1^{\text {st }}$ Floor Princeton, NJ 08540
T: 609-734-8400 F: 609-734-8405 www.ihengineers.com Also in: Hackensack and Staten Island

Re: NJDOT Utility Letter \#1

## Mr. James Slate

Township Engineer
Morris Township Sewer
50 Woodland Ave
PO Box 7603
Convent Station, NJ 07961-7603
Phone: 973-326-7440

Re:<br>NJ Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange<br>Concept Development<br>Interchange Improvements<br>Borough of Florham Park, Townships of Morris and Hanover<br>Morris County<br>UPC Code: 154330<br>SEWER UTILITY

## Project Designer:

IH Engineers, P.C. 103 College Road East, $1^{\text {st }} \mathrm{Fl}$.
Princeton, NJ 08540
ATTN: John Korunow, P.E. Phone: (609) 734-8400
Fax: (609) 734-8405
Email: jkorunow@ihengineers.com

Dear Mr. Slate:
The New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) has contracted IH Engineers, P.C. (IH) for Concept Development (CD) for Interchange Improvements of NJ Route 24, Park Avenue and Columbia Turnpike Interchange. The project involves alternative analysis for the relocation of interchange ramps. This will involve relocating traffic from the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue to Park Avenue approximately 1000 feet east of the intersection.

This letter will serve to established an official contact with Morris Township Sewer Hanover - Sewer and verify if you do have any facility in the project affected area. Please find enclosed project Location Map and Photos of existing condition of the project area, to give you a better understanding of proposed project. If your facility exists within the project area, please estimate and provide the additional amount of Preliminary Engineering (PE) expenses you may request to pay for your effort in assisting NJDOT to investigate and verify the actual information and to develop accommodation schemes of all your facilities affected by the project.

Please complete the following questionnaire and return it to the Designer's Engineer by November $25^{\text {th }}, 2016$. If you prefer to respond by FAX or E-mail the numbers are in the caption above.


We DO HAVE existing facilities within the project limits.
$(\square)$
We DO NOT HAVE existing facilities within the project limits.
$\qquad$ We HAVE PROPOSED facilities planned within the project limits.
$\qquad$ The following companies are tenants on/in our facilities within the project limits:
$\qquad$ ) The Company Engineer to be contacted is:

Name Sames Slate Company

TOWNSHIP OF MORRIS
Title TownSHIP ENGIMEEF
Address
50 klooslañ DVE
MORRISTOWN, NT 07960
Tel: 973-326-7440
Fax: 973-605-8363
Email: VSLATEEMORRISTWP.COM
( ) The UTILITY AGREEMENT shall be sent to the following person:
(X) Same as above or fill in below:

Name

## Company

$\qquad$
Title
Address

Tel:
Fax:
Email:
( ) The amount of Preliminary Engineering funding needed will be $\$$ (This amount is only an estimate)
$\qquad$ ) We would like the NJDOT to arrange for the following work to be done for our facilities should it be necessary for them to be relocated or modified.
( Design/Engineering
( ) Construction - Some or All?
(_) Neither - the Company will perform (or arrange to have performed) all needed work.
(X) Not certain at this time.

End of questionnaire.
If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.


Re: NJDOT Utility Letter \#1

UPC \# 154330
October 28, 2016

Mr. Frank Antisell
Manager
Verizon
6000 Hadley Road
South Plainfield, NJ 07080
Phone: 908-412-6160

Re:<br>NJ Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange<br>Concept Development<br>Interchange Improvements<br>Borough of Florham Park, Townships of Morris and Hanover<br>Morris County<br>UPC Code: 154330<br>TELEPHONE UTILITY

Project Designer:<br>IH Engineers, P.C.<br>103 College Road East, $1^{\text {st }}$ Fl.<br>Princeton, NJ 08540<br>ATTN: John Korunow, P.E.<br>Phone: (609) 734-8400<br>Fax: (609) 734-8405<br>Email: jkorunow@ihengineers.com

Dear Mr. Antisell:

The New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) has contracted IH Engineers, P.C. (IH) for Concept Development (CD) for Interchange Improvements of NJ Route 24, Park Avenue and Columbia Turnpike Interchange. The project involves alternative analysis for the relocation of interchange ramps. This will involve relocating traffic from the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue to Park Avenue approximately 1000 feet east of the intersection.

This letter will serve to established an official contact with Verizon - Telephone and verify if you do have any facility in the project affected area. Please find enclosed project Location Map and Photos of existing condition of the project area, to give you a better understanding of proposed project. If your facility exists within the project area, please estimate and provide the additional amount of Preliminary Engineering ( PE ) expenses you may request to pay for your effort in assisting NJDOT to investigate and verify the actual information and to develop accommodation schemes of all your facilities affected by the project.

Please complete the following questionnaire and return it to the Designer's Engineer by November 25 ${ }^{\text {th }}$, 2016. If you prefer to respond by FAX or E-mail the numbers are in the caption above.


We DO HAVE existing facilities within the project limits.
$\qquad$ We DO NOT HAVE existing facilities within the project limits.
$\qquad$ ) We HAVE PROPOSED facilities planned within the project limits.
$\qquad$ ) The following companies are tenants on/in our facilities within the project limits:

(X) The Company Engineer to be contacted is:
 The UTILITY AGREEMENT shall be sent to the following person:
$\qquad$ Same as above or fill in below:


## ( $X$ ) The amount of Preliminary Engineering funding needed will be $\$ \$ 20,000$

 (This amount is only an estimate)$\qquad$ ) We would like the NJDOT to arrange for the following work to be done for our facilities should it be necessary for them to be relocated or modified.
( Design/Engineering
( ) Construction - Some or All?
X ) Neither - the Company will perform (or arrange to have performed) all needed work. ) Not certain at this time.

End of questionnaire.
If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.


103 College Road East, $1^{\text {st }}$ Floor Princeton, NJ 08540
T: 609-734-8400 F: 609-734-8405
www.hengineers.com
Also in: Hackensack and Staten Island
Re: NJDOT Utility Letter \#1
NJ Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange
(Interchange Improvements)
UPC \# 154330

October 28, 2016

## Mr. Paul Kozakiewicz

Superintendent
The Southeast Morris County Municipal Utility Authority
(SMCMUA)
19 Saddle Road
Cedar Knolls, NJ 07927
Phone: 973-326-6865

## Re:

NJ Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange
Concept Development
Interchange Improvements
Borough of Florham Park, Townships of Morris and Hanover
Morris County
UPC Code: 154330
WATER UTILITY

## Project Designer:

IH Engineers, P.C.
103 College Road East, $1^{\text {st }}$ Fl.
Princeton, NJ 08540
ATTN: John Korunow, P.E.
Phone: (609) 734-8400
Fax: (609) 734-8405
Email: jkorunow@ihengineers.com

## Dear Mr. Kozakiewicz:

The New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) has contracted IH Engineers, P.C. (IH) for Concept Development (CD) for Interchange Improvements of NJ Route 24, Park Avenue and Columbia Turnpike Interchange. The project involves alternative analysis for the relocation of interchange ramps. This will involve relocating traffic from the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue to Park Avenue approximately 1000 feet east of the intersection.

This letter will serve to established an official contact with The Southeast Morris County Municipal Utility Authority (SMCMUA) - Water and verify if you do have any facility in the project affected area. Please find enclosed project Location Map and Photos of existing condition of the project area, to give you a better understanding of proposed project. If your facility exists within the project area, please estimate and provide the additional amount of Preliminary Engineering (PE) expenses you may request to pay for your effort in assisting NJDOT to investigate and verify the actual information and to develop accommodation schemes of all your facilities affected by the project.

Please complete the following questionnaire and return it to the Designer's Engineer by November $\mathbf{2 5}^{\text {th }}, \mathbf{2 0 1 6}$. If you prefer to respond by FAX or E-mail the numbers are in the caption above.
(4) We DO HAVE existing facilities within the project limits.
$(\quad$ We DO NOT HAVE existing facilities within the project limits.
(_) We HAVE PROPOSED facilities planned within the project limits.

## (_) The following companies are tenants on/in our facilities within the project limits:

(4) The Company Engineer to be contacted is:


(X)The UTILITY AGREEMENT shall be sent to the following person:
$\qquad$ ) Same as above or fill in below:

Name Laura Cummings PE
Company Southeast Morris County MUA
Title Executive Director/Chief Engineer
Address

Tel:
$(973) 326-6866$
Fax: $\quad$ (973) 326-7233
Email: lcummings@smcmua.org
( ) The amount of Preliminary Engineering funding needed will be \$ $\qquad$ (This amount is only an estimate)
(X) We would like the NJDOT to arrange for the following work to be done for our facilities should it be necessary for them to be relocated or modified.
$(x)$ Design/Engineering
( $\backslash$ ) Construction - Some or All? $\qquad$
) Neither - the Company will perform (or arrange to have performed) all needed work.
( $\quad$ Not certain at this time.
End of questionnaire.
If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.


Y:INJDOT\GEC 2013 Term Agreement iTO 30 Rte 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchangel05 Utility Letter \#1\Letter \#1 - Water= The 2 of 2
Southeast Morris County Municipal Utility Authority.docx

## Appendix " 0 "

## Design Communications Report (DCR) \& STIP

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Quality Management

## Design Communications Report

PROJECT NAME: Route 24 EB Ramp to CR 510 (Columbia Turnpike)
UPC\#: 154330

DESIGNER: IH Engineers, PC
DESIGNER PROJECT MANAGER: John W. Korunow, Jr., PE

NJDOT PROJECT MANAGER: Edward D'Arcy

## Design Communications Report Approval

Final Design and Construction Phases

| PROJECT NAME: | UPC\#: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Route 24 EB Ramp to CR 510 (Columbia | 154330 |
| CONSULTING FIRM: | DESIGNER PROJECT MANAGER: |
| IH Engineers, PC | John W. Korunow, JR., PE |
| NJDOT PROJECT MANAGER: | NJDOT EXECUTIVE REGIONAL |
| Edward D'Arcy | MANAGER: Atul Shah |

Design Communications Report (DCR) Entry No.(s) 1-4
Pursuant to the Interactive Communications Procedure and the Interactive Communications Procedure of the New Jersey Department of Transportation (the Department), the Department's Project Manager has approved the DCR identified above, (approved by Entry No.(s)) subject to the certification below of the Designer.
This approval by the Department's Project Manager is not a certification by the Department that the above project has been designed in accordance with all applicable State and Federal design standards and requirements or that comments and decisions made during Interactive Communications with the Department on design elements and features of the project to this point have been incorporated or satisfactorily resolved and the Contract Documents have been revised accordingly, and the Department is fully relying in this regard upon the certification below by the Designer.
Furthermore, the Project Manager, by signing below on behalf of the Department, has not waived the Designer's obligation proyide contract documents that are constructible and free from errors and/or


[^7]NJDOT In-House Design Team Leader

## Design Communications Report Entry Form

## Project Name: Route 24 EB Ramp to CR 510 (Columbia Turnpike)

| Design <br> Activity <br> No. 2000 | April 27, 2016 | DCR Entry No. 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Concept Development Initiated - <br> Kick Off Meeting |  |  |
| Edward D'Arcy, Value Solutions SME, John Korunow |  |  |
| A Kick Off Meeting was held with the NJDOT PM, Value Solutions and the Designer to <br> discuss the Route 24 Interchange and Columbia Turnpike - Smart Solution Study - Smart <br> Solutions Workshop. During the workshop, several alternatives were developed centered <br> on improving the safety of the traffic exiting from Route 24 EB to Columbia Turnpike WB <br> and improving the LOS at the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue (650' <br> west of Route 24 EB ramp. Currently traffic exiting Route 24 weaves across multiple <br> through lanes to make the left at Park Avenue. This safety issue is compounded by the <br> high volumes on Columbia Turnpike and a very poor LOS. |  |  |
| Of the many Value Solutions Alternatives, two were selected to be advanced to Concept <br> Development. These alternatives are: |  |  |
| - Alternate 1 - Overpass from the Route 24 EB Ramp/Columbia Turnpike WB to Park |  |  |
| - Avenue and Park Avenue to Route 24 EB. |  |  |
| Alternate 2 - Modern Roundabout Hybrid Alternative. |  |  |
| In addition to Alternatives 1 \& 2, IH will look into developing a third alternative. |  |  |


| Design <br> Activity <br> No. 2430 | May 18, 2017 | DCR Entry No. 2 <br> Core Group Meeting |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Who (NJDOT Project Manager/ SME /Stakeholder /Designer) |  |  |
| Design Element issue |  |  |
| Decision and reasoning |  |  |


| Design Activity No. | (Approved date by NJDOT Project Manager) | DCR Entry No. <br> Hydraulics \& Hydrology |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Edward D'Arcy, SME's, John Korunow |  |  |
| The meeting was set to review the results of the analysis of the two Value Solution Alternatives: <br> - Alternate 1 - Overpass from the Route 24 EB Ramp/Columbia Turnpike WB to Park Avenue and Park Avenue to Route 24 EB. <br> - Alternate 2 - Modern Roundabout Hybrid Alternative. |  |  |

## Project Name: Route 24 EB Ramp to CR 510 (Columbia Turnpike)

separation between Route 24 EB Ramp traffic and Columbia Turnpike traffic. Route 24 EB Ramp traffic will no longer be able to turn left at Park Avenue eliminating a dangerous weave. However, an alternate ramp will be provided directly to Park Avenue much like Alternative 1 without the overpass.

The analysis showed that Alternative 3, while not great, provided the best LOS for the least cost and the least impacts to ROW.

During this meeting Value Solutions offered an additional alternative. This alternative proposes to utilize Campus Drive to the east as a new half interchange with Route 24 EB. Currently Campus Drive is a cul-de-sac that provides access to six large office complexes. IH was tasked with determining if the Campus Drive Alternative was feasible.

| Design <br> Activity <br> No. 2440 | August 23, 2017 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Edward D'Arcy \& Aliaa Majeed - NJDOT Project Management, Anthony Sitko - NJDOT OCCR, <br> John Korunow \& Brian Stankus - IH Engineers, Officials and Emergency Services from Florham <br> Park, Chatham, Morris, Madison and Whippany, and Morris County Engineering. |  |
| The purpose of the meeting was to present all 4 alternatives to the Officials of the <br> adjoining communities and Morris County. Alternatives 1-3 were described in detail as <br> they were for the Core Group Meeting and Alternate 3 was presented as the possible <br> preferred alternative. |  |
| Alternate 4 was also presented; however, details were not developed further than an <br> image on an aerial plan. Many of the officials seemed to like the idea of moving the traffic <br> away from the intersection of Park and Columbia Turnpike. |  |
| It was decided to analyze Alternate 4 to determine if it is worthwhile to pursue or not. |  |


| Design <br> Activity <br> No. 2440 | September 25, 2020 | DCR Entry No. 4 <br> Hold Local Officials Briefing |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Edward D'Arcy \& Alexander Maevsky - NJDOT Project Management, Anthony Sytko - <br> NJDOT OCCR, John Korunow - IH Engineers, John Coffey - Dewberry, Officials and <br> Emergency Services from Florham Park, Chatham, Morris, Madison, Hanover and Morris <br> County Engineering. |  |  |
| The purpose of the meeting was to present a new Alternative - 3 (revised). This <br> alternative was developed as the property which was to be purchased for alternative 3 is <br> no longer available. The property owner was granted a permit to build the new hotel The <br> Officials of the adjoining communities and Morris County were presented an Alternative 3 <br> (Revised) to be the possible preferred alternative. |  |  |

Develop recommendations that would improve the traffic flow between the ramp and the intersection along with providing improvements to the operation of the intersection that could be investigated further. The Route 24 EB ramp merges with Columbia Turnpike WB approximately 650 feet east of the signalized intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue. At this intersection there is a heavy AM left turn movement on the Columbia Turnpike WB approach that currently utilizes a double left-turn lane.
COUNTY: Morris
MUNICIPALITY: Morris Twp, Hanover Twp
MILEPOSTS: 2.09
STRUCTURE NO.: NA
LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT: 27, 25
SPONSOR: Morris County
ASSET MANAGEMENT CATEGORY: Congestion Relief: Highway Operational Improvements

| MPO | Phase | Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NJTPA | CD | 2016 |

Route 26, Cox Road to Nassau Street

Federal Resurfacing/Rehab project.
COUNTY: Middlesex
MUNICIPALITY: North Brunswick Twp
MILEPOSTS: 1.64-2.54
STRUCTURE NO.: N/A
LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT: 17 SPONSOR: NJDOT
ASSET MANAGEMENT CATEGORY: Road Assets: Highway Resurfacing

| MPO | Phase | Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NJTPA | CD | 2016 |

## Appendix "P"

## Resolutions of Support

## John Korunow

From:
Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:

Vitz, Chris [CVitz@co.morris.nj.us](mailto:CVitz@co.morris.nj.us)
Wednesday, December 13, 2017 2:31 PM
'John Korunow'
Dellagiacoma, Debra; Edward D'Arcy; M ajeed, Aliaa; Brian M. Stankus
RE: Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange and Intersection Alternatives.

John,

The County supports Alternative 3 as the most viable option for improvements to that area.

Do you need anything additional?

Christopher J. Vitz, P.E.
Director of Public Works \& County Engineer
County of Morris Department of Public Works
PO Box 900
Morristown, NJ 07963-0900
973-285-6758

From: John Korunow [mailto:jkorunow@ihengineers.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2017 1:04 PM
To: Vitz, Chris [CVitz@co.morris.nj.us](mailto:CVitz@co.morris.nj.us)
Cc: Dellagiacoma, Debra [ddellagiacoma@co.morris.nj.us](mailto:ddellagiacoma@co.morris.nj.us); Edward D'Arcy [edward.darcy@dot.state.nj.us](mailto:edward.darcy@dot.state.nj.us); Majeed,
Aliaa <Aliaa.M ajeed@dot.nj.gov>; Brian M. Stankus <bstankus@ ihengineers.com>
Subject: Re: Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange and Intersection Alternatives.
Chris. Do you have a final decision on the PPA? We need documentation from you to finalize the CD Report
John
Sent from my iPhone
On Nov 8, 2017, at 3:50 PM, Vitz, Chris <CVitz@ co.morris.nj.us>wrote:
John,
Thank you for providing this additional information. Will this be included in the final report? Do you have a date as to when the report will be completed?

As an aside we did meet with officials from Hanover, Florham Park, M orris Township, M adison and Chatham Borough and explained why Alternative 3 was the best option to progress. They all seemed to sign on to the project as we pressed to keep the focus on this intersection alone, not other requested improvements outside the borders of this project.

We have also spoken with the NJTPA and are working with them to get this project into the TIP.

From: John Korunow [mailto:jkorunow @ihengineers.com]
Sent: M onday, November 06, 2017 2:37 PM
To: Vitz, Chris [CVitz@co.morris.nj.us](mailto:CVitz@co.morris.nj.us); Dellagiacoma, Debra [ddellagiacoma@co.morris.nj.us](mailto:ddellagiacoma@co.morris.nj.us)
Cc: 'Edward D'Arcy' [edward.darcy@dot.state.nj.us](mailto:edward.darcy@dot.state.nj.us); 'M ajeed, Aliaa' <Aliaa.M ajeed@dot.nj.gov>; 'Brian M. Stankus' <bstankus@ ihengineers.com>

Subject: RE: Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange and Intersection Alternatives.
Hi Chris, we have completed our Evaluation of the Campus Drive Alternative. The Cost is substantially more than Alternative 3 for the following reasons.

- A good portion of the ramps to and from Route 24 will be in wetlands. This material is not suitable and will need to be excavated and hauled away. The new material will need to be porous and will therefore cost more than your typical borrow material.
- The Campus Drive roadway will need to be replaced with a more substantial pavement box since it will be handling significantly more traffic including trucks.
- The Total Cost for Design and Construction is $\$ 10.6$ million
- The cost does not include ROW for the ramps and the new roundabout or for wetland mitigation and a storm water basin.
See attached
Regards
John W. Korunow Jr., PE, CME
Transportation D epartment M anager
and O perations M anager
<image001.jpg>
103 C ollege R oad East, First Floor
Princeton, NJ 08540
(P) 609-734-8400 Ext. 6404
(F) 609-734-8405
jkorunow @ihengineers.com
www.ihengineers.com
"F irst choice of our clients for over 15 years"

From: Vitz, Chris [mailto:CVitz@co.morris.nj.us]
Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 2:35 PM
To: 'Edward D'Arcy'; 'Brian M. Stankus'; 'J ohn Korunow'
Cc: Dellagiacoma, Debra; 'Majeed, Aliaa'
Subject: RE: Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange and Intersection Alternatives.
Ed,
I presented the various alternatives at the Freeholder Work Session this morning. While they agree that Alternative 3 is a viable option the overall feeling is it will take many years to implement. We have already contacted the NJTPA about funding.

However the Freeholder Board also asked for additional detail on Alternative 4, the extension of Campus Drive. I did not anticipate this response from the board. I have several questions I need to investigate. They are;

1) If Campus Drive were a County roadway and new ramps to were to be constructed to Route 24 would or could the jurisdiction change between County / State occur at the point of the cul-de-sac? Would that eliminate the State's concern of having private driveway access to a state highway ramp?
2) Did the NJDOT or your consultant investigate the size or cost of any property acquisitions with this alternative?
3) Did the NJDOT or your consultant come up with an estimated cost for this alternative?
4) If there is a specific reason(s) this Alternative cannot move forward, please let me know.

The Freeholder Board understands it may take 5-10 years to implement Alternate 3 with State or Federal funding through NJTPA at $\$ 12$ million. So they are asking if both could be done. If Alternative 4 could be implemented more quickly and at a substantially lower cost it would show local businesses that we are being proactive in attempting to address traffic problems in the area, stemming the possible loss of those tenants. This Alternative could work as a stop gap until the larger project is completed and remain in place to allow an additional connection to Route 24.

Thank you for taking the time to review my questions and any responses you may provide.
Christopher J. Vitz, P.E.
Director of Public Works \& County Engineer County of Morris Department of Public Works
PO Box 900
Morristown, NJ 07963-0900
973-285-6758

## Appendix " Q "

NJDOT Communications _ Value Engineering Study

## John Korunow

| From: | D'Arcy, Edward [edward.darcy@dot.nj.gov](mailto:edward.darcy@dot.nj.gov) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, May 18, 2017 4:51 PM |
| To: | John Korunow |
| Cc: | Majeed, Aliaa |
| Subject: | FW: Rt.24 EB Ramp to CR 510 (Columbia Turnpike)- Scope Team M eeting-Project Fact |
|  | Sheet |
| Attachments: | Rt 24 VE 1.pdf |

John,
For your use to evaluate the suggestion from the Scope Team M eeting. Thanks.

From: Kondash, Thomas
Sent: Thursday, M ay 18, 2017 3:23 PM
To: M ajeed, Aliaa <Aliaa.M ajeed@dot.nj.gov>; D'Arcy, Edward [edward.darcy@dot.nj.gov](mailto:edward.darcy@dot.nj.gov)
Cc: Alsharaa, M anar $\langle M$ anar.Alsharaa@ dot.nj.gov>; Ahmadi, Hedaeatull [Hedaeatull.Ahmadi@dot.nj.gov](mailto:Hedaeatull.Ahmadi@dot.nj.gov); Patibandha, Hetal [Hetal.Patibandha@dot.nj.gov](mailto:Hetal.Patibandha@dot.nj.gov); Abitz, Robert [robert.abitz@dot.nj.gov](mailto:robert.abitz@dot.nj.gov); Hauske, M ark
[mark.hauske@dot.nj.gov](mailto:mark.hauske@dot.nj.gov); Vijayakumar, Amutha [Amutha.Vijayakumar@dot.nj.gov](mailto:Amutha.Vijayakumar@dot.nj.gov); Vo, Binh [binh.vo@dot.nj.gov](mailto:binh.vo@dot.nj.gov);
Howard, Warren [Warren.Howard@dot.nj.gov](mailto:Warren.Howard@dot.nj.gov)
Subject: RE: Rt. 24 EB Ramp to CR 510 (Columbia Turnpike)- Scope Team M eeting-Project Fact Sheet

Ed and Aliaa,

As presented today by the VE "team" (past and present members).
Thomas J. Kondash, Jr.
Project M anager
Claims-Risk Analysis \& Value Engineering
(609) 530-4947

From: M ajeed, Aliaa
Sent: Tuesday, M ay 09, 2017 2:46 PM
To: Virgilio, Al; Abitz, Robert; Howard, Warren; Balluch, Al; Cheney, Amber; Burns, Vincent; M aniar, Nipa; Kondash, Thomas; Gresavage, Susan; Khalid Shaikh; Alsharaa, M anar; Hirt, Deborah
Cc: D'Arcy, Edward
Subject: RE: Rt. 24 EB Ramp to CR 510 (Columbia Turnpike)- Scope Team M eeting-Project Fact Sheet

Good afternoon All,

Please find the attached files (Project Fact Sheet \& Alternatives) for Rt. 24 EB Ramp to 510 (Columbia Turnpike) - Scope Team M eeting by $5 / 18 / 2017$ at 1:30 pm in conference Room $3 B, 3^{\text {rd }}$ Floor.

Thanks!!

Aliaa M ajeed
Assistant Project M anager
Division of Project M anagement
Phone (609-530-3713)

From: M ajeed, Aliaa
Sent: M onday, M ay 01, 2017 2:05 PM
To: Virgilio, Al; Abitz, Robert; Howard, Warren; Balluch, Al; Cheney, Amber; Hartle, Paul; Burns, Vincent; M aniar, Nipa; Kondash, Thomas; Gresavage, Susan; '
Cc: D'Arcy, Edward
Subject: Rt. 24 EB Ramp to CR 510 (Columbia turnpike)- Scope Team M eeting

Dear All,
Good afternoon!

Scope Team M eeting is scheduled on 05-18-2017 at 1:30 PM in Conference Room 3B, E \& O Building headquarter. Looking forward to your participation. Also, an agenda for project will be sent to you in near future.

Thanks,
Aliaa M ajeed
Assistant Project M anager
Division of Project M anagement
Phone (609-530-3713)


Kishor Shah

From:
John Korunow [jkorunow@ihengineers.com](mailto:jkorunow@ihengineers.com)
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 2:16 PM
To:
Subject:
Attachments:

## 'Kishor Shah'

FW: Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange and Intersection Alternatives. Estimate_Alternative4.xls; Alternative 4.docx; campus_drive_Optimized.pdf

From: John Korunow [mailto:jkorunow@ihengineers.com]
Sent: Monday, November 06, 2017 2:37 PM
To: 'Vitz, Chris'; 'Dellagiacoma, Debra'
Cc: 'Edward D'Arcy'; 'Majeed, Aliaa'; 'Brian M. Stankus'
Subject: RE: Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange and Intersection Alternatives.
Hi Chris, we have completed our Evaluation of the Campus Drive Alternative. The Cost is substantially more than Alternative 3 for the following reasons.

- A good portion of the ramps to and from Route 24 will be in wetlands. This material is not suitable and will need to be excavated and hauled away. The new material will need to be porous and will therefore cost more than your typical borrow material.
- The Campus Drive roadway will need to be replaced with a more substantial pavement box since it will be handling significantly more traffic including trucks.
- The Total Cost for Design and Construction is $\$ 10.6$ million
- The cost does not include ROW for the ramps and the new roundabout or for wetland mitigation and a storm water basin.
See attached
Regards
John W. K orunow Jr., PE, CM E
Transportation D epartment $M$ anager
and Operations $M$ anager

103 C ollege R oad East, First Floor
Princeton, NJ 08540
(P) 609-734-8400 Ext. 6404
(F) 609-734-8405
jkorunow @ihengineers.com
www.ihengineers.com
"F irst choice of our clients for over 15 years"

From: Vitz, Chris [mailto:CVitz@co.morris.nj.us]
Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 2:35 PM
To: 'Edward D'Arcy'; 'Brian M. Stankus'; 'J ohn Korunow'

Cc: Dellagiacoma, Debra; 'Majeed, Aliaa'
Subject: RE: Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange and Intersection Alternatives.
Ed,
I presented the various alternatives at the Freeholder Work Session this morning. While they agree that Alternative 3 is a viable option the overall feeling is it will take many years to implement. We have already contacted the NJTPA about funding.

However the Freeholder Board also asked for additional detail on Alternative 4, the extension of Campus Drive. I did not anticipate this response from the board. I have several questions I need to investigate. They are;

1) If Campus Drive were a County roadway and new ramps to were to be constructed to Route 24 would or could the jurisdiction change between County / State occur at the point of the cul-de-sac? Would that eliminate the State's concern of having private driveway access to a state highway ramp?
2) Did the NJDOT or your consultant investigate the size or cost of any property acquisitions with this alternative?
3) Did the NJDOT or your consultant come up with an estimated cost for this alternative?
4) If there is a specific reason(s) this Alternative cannot move forward, please let me know.

The Freeholder Board understands it may take 5-10 years to implement Alternate 3 with State or Federal funding through NJTPA at $\$ 12$ million. So they are asking if both could be done. If Alternative 4 could be implemented more quickly and at a substantially lower cost it would show local businesses that we are being proactive in attempting to address traffic problems in the area, stemming the possible loss of those tenants. This Alternative could work as a stop gap until the larger project is completed and remain in place to allow an additional connection to Route 24.

Thank you for taking the time to review my questions and any responses you may provide.

## Christopher J. Vitz, P.E.

Director of Public Works \& County Engineer
County of Morris Department of Public Works
PO Box 900
Morristown, NJ 07963-0900
973-285-6758


103 College Road East, 1st Floor, Princeton, NJ 08540 (609) 734-8400, (609) 734-8405 (fax)

Project No.: Project Desc.: Page No. Calculated By: Checked By:

Route 24 \& Columbia Turnpike

ALTERNATIVE 4


| BEAM GUIDE RAIL | LF | $3,100.00$ | $\$$ | 35 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $9 " \times 16 "$ CONCRETE VERTICAL CURB | LF | $10,440.00$ | $\$$ | 25 |
| CANTILEVER SIGN STRUCTURE | UNIT | 1.00 | $\$$ | 90,000 |


| TOPSOIL AND SEEDING (MAIN LINE) | MILE | 0.80 | \$ | 112,815 | \$ | 90,252 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PLANTING (MAINLINE) | MILE | 0.80 | \$ | 64,500 | \$ | 51,600 |
| TOPSOIL, SEEDING, PLANTING (FINGER RAMP) | MILE | 0.35 | \$ | 12,500 | \$ | 4,375 |
| TOPSOIL, SEEDING, PLANTING (ACCESS ROAD) | FT | 1,800.00 | \$ | 8 | \$ | 14,220 |


| FIELD OFFICE | MILE | 1.40 | \$ | 44,260 | \$ | 61,964 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MATERIALS FIELD LABORATORY | MILE | 1.40 | \$ | 28,970 | \$ | 40,558 |
| EROSION CONTROL DURING CONSTRUCTION | MILE | 1.40 | \$ | 64,375 | \$ | 90,125 |

PROJECT SUBTOTAL= \$ 6,116,159

| LIGHTING, TRAFFIC STRIPES, SIGNS AND DELINEATORS | LS | 3\% OF PROJ. SUBTOTAL | \$ | 183,485 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAINTANANCE OF TRAFFIC | LS | 3\% OF PROJ. SUBTOTAL | \$ | 183,485 |
| TRAINING | LS | 1\% OF PROJ. SUBTOTAL | \$ | 61,162 |
| MOBILIZATION | LS | 9\% OF PROJ. SUBTOTAL | \$ | 550,454 |
| PROGRESS SCHEDULE | LS |  | \$ | 6,000 |
| CLEARING SITE | LS |  | \$ | 45,000 |
| CONSTRUCTION LAYOUT | LS |  | \$ | 42,000 |
| PROJECT TOTAL= |  |  | \$ | 7,187,744 |
| CONTINGENCIES \& ESCALATION (YEAR 2021, 1.1) |  | CONSTR. ESTIMATE FOR CD= | \$ | 7,906,519 |
| CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AMOUNT (16.2\% OF CONSTRUCTION COST)= \$ |  |  |  | 1,280,856 |
| CONTING. FOR CONSTR. CHANGE ORDER ( $\$ 25,000+4 \%$ OVER \$ 500 K ) |  | CHANGE ORDER CONTING.= | \$ | 321,261 |


| UTILITIES RELOCATIONS BY COMPANIES/OWNERS (2\% OF CC) |  |  |  | \$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

UTILITY RELOCATION COST FOR CD ESTIMATE \$ 158,130

SUMMARY

|  | CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE FOR CD | $\$$ | $\mathbf{7 , 9 0 6 , 5 1 9}$ |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | DESIGN ENGINEERING | $\$$ | $\mathbf{9 4 8 , 7 8 2}$ |
|  | CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING (CE) | $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 8 0 , 8 5 6}$ |
| CONTINGENCIES | $\$$ | $\mathbf{3 2 1 , 2 6 1}$ |  |
| UTILITIES:RELOCATIONS BY COMPANIES | $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 5 8 , 1 3 0}$ |  |

## Alternative 4:

This alternative involves a new "half-interchange" on the Route 24 east of the Columbia Turnpike interchange, with on and off ramps to the EB roadway to Campus Drive. Campus Drive intersects Park Avenue (CR 623) at a point roughly $3 / 4$ mile south of Columbia Turnpike.

## Advantages:

- Provides an alternative for the traffic exiting Route 24 EB destined for Park Avenue SB which may reduce the weaving conflict on Columbia Turnpike.
- Reduces congestion at the Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue intersection.


## Disadvantages:

- Creates a new weaving movement on Route 24 EB between the existing and proposed ramps that will operate at LOS ' $F$ '.
- Campus Drive serves as an access roadway for several large office building. Not only was a trail built for Office employees to use for exercise during the lunch period, but many people use the roadway itself to walk. The trail and any walking that happens on Campus drive will no longer be possible.
- ROW will be required for the new ramps and roundabout. The majority of the ROW is in wetlands therefore additional ROW will be required for mitigation or additional funds allocated to purchase wetlands from a mitigation bank.
- The new ramps and roundabout will increase the impervious surface above the threshold for Storm Water Management Rules and this alternative will impact the existing drainage basins. Additional ROW will be required for a new basin.
- The new development will be within in Flood Hazard Area/Airport Hazard Area.
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## NJDOT - MORRIS COUNTY

## Route 24 Interchange and Columbia Turnpike - Smart Solution Study

## I. BACKGROUND:

The Value Engineering/Smart Solutions Unit was requested to investigate and recommend improvements for the area between the Route 24 EB ramp to Columbia Turnpike and the signalized intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue in Morris and Hannover Townships, Morris County. Our goal was to develop some recommendations that would improve the traffic flow between the ramp and the intersection along with provide some improvement to the operation of the intersection that could be investigated further.

The Route 24 EB ramp merges with Columbia Turnpike approximately 650 feet east of the signalized intersection and there is a heavy movement from this ramp to the double leftturn lane at the intersection. In our previous review of this area, Columbia Turnpike was striped as two through lanes but it has since been restriped as a dedicated through lane and a left turn lane. This intersection is currently near capacity with several movements failing and over capacity during the AM peak hours.

The 2007 and 2027 traffic volumes used in our review came from the Florham Park 2027 Transportation Needs Assessment Study conducted by Greenman Pedersen, Inc. for the Borough of Florham Park in 2007. The distribution of the Route 24 ramp traffic at the intersection had to be estimated using information from the 2010 Traffic Impact Study for the General Development Plan for the Honeywell Site conducted by Langan Engineering. This study included a new bypass road that relocated the left turns from this Route 24 EB ramp to a new intersection on Park Avenue south of Columbia. Based upon our analysis it was estimated that approximately $3 / 4$ of the AM ramp volume and $1 / 2$ of the PM ramp volume is making a left at the intersection. Also, left turn volumes coming from this ramp accounted for $1 / 3$ and $1 / 4$ of the lefts being made at Park Avenue during the AM \& PM peak hours, respectively.

## II. BRAINSTORMING IDEAS

Based upon our field trip to the location, along with our brainstorming efforts in the office and the recommendation from the Transportation Needs Study, we were able to come up with several solutions that would improve the weaving problem between the Route 24 ramp and Park Avenue. Unfortunately, most of these improvements would not solve the congestion problems at the intersection in the future. We have summarized our brainstorming ideas below.

## 1. Create a Signalized T-Intersection with the Route 24 EB ramp to Columbia Turnpike WB (Figure 1)

This concept would widen the ramp to accommodate two lanes at the new intersection and by installing the signal here; it would meter the WB traffic to the Park Avenue signal and eliminate the conflict created by the ramp traffic weaving over to make a left at the signal. Since this section of Columbia Turnpike is divided,
the proposed signal would only affect Columbia WB traffic and the EB traffic would continue to be free flow.

Advantages:

- Eliminates the weaving conflict between the ramp and Columbia Turnpike traffic.
- No Right-of-Way would be required.
- Allows for the storage length of the left turn lanes to be extended if necessary.

Disadvantages:

- Potentially could have the ramp traffic back up onto Route 24.
- Does not solve the congestion problem at the Columbia and Park intersection and there would still be approximately 2,000 vehicles turning left in the AM peak hour at Park Avenue in the future.


## 2. Create a new ramp from Route 24 EB to Park Avenue (Figure 2)

This concept would construct a new ramp from Route 24 EB to Park Avenue to allow vehicles destined to Park Avenue, a direct connection - eliminating the need to weave over two lanes to make a left from Columbia Turnpike.

## Advantages:

- Eliminates the weaving conflict between the Route 24 ramp and Columbia Turnpike traffic.
- Provide some congestion relief at the intersection for a short period of time.

Disadvantages:

- Will require one property to be acquired along with some frontage from several other properties.
- Does not solve the congestion problem at the Columbia and Park intersection and there would still be approximately 1,400 vehicles turning left at Park Avenue in the future.
- Design waivers may be needed for a partial interchange and interchange spacing.
- Environmental issues.

3. Create an overpass over Columbia Turnpike for the Route 24 EB ramp and connecting to Park Avenue south of Columbia (Figure 3)

This concept would still allow traffic to exit onto Columbia Turnpike but it would create a direct connection to Park Avenue south of Columbia Turnpike.

Advantages:

- Eliminates the weaving conflict between the ramp and Columbia Turnpike traffic.

Disadvantages:

- Does not solve the congestion problem at the Columbia and Park intersection and there would still be approximately 1,400 vehicles turning left at Park Avenue in the future.
- Will require Right-of-Way for ramp extension.
- Will add another signal on Park Avenue approximately 600 feet south of the Columbia signal.
- Potential Wetlands (stream) impacts.


## 4. Create a two-lane modern roundabout at the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue (Figure 4)

This concept would eliminate the signal at this intersection and replace it with a 2lane modern roundabout to improve the operation of the intersection and remove the need for the ramp traffic to weave over to make the left.

Advantages;

- Minimum Right-of-Way would be required.
- Signal would be eliminated.
- Safer due to low angle, low speed crashes.
- Less conflicting moves.
- No maintenance required.

Disadvantages;

- Public acceptance
- Projected traffic volumes may exceed the capacity of the roundabout.


## 5. Create a triple left turn lane on Columbia Turnpike WB and separate the left turns originating from the ramp from Columbia Turnpike lefts (Figure 5)

This concept would split the Columbia Turnpike traffic into two separate lanes in advance of the merge from the Route 24 EB ramp; one for left turning moves only and one for thru and right turns prior to the Route 24 ramp. These lanes would be separated by an island and it would extend to the intersection (similar to Route 1 and Quakerbridge Road). The lane with the left turns would eventually widen to two
lanes. When the Route 24 ramp merged it would have its own lane and any lefts would only have to weave with the thru/right turning traffic on Columbia. At the intersection there would be a third left turn lane along with separate thru and right turn lanes.

Advantages:

- Additional capacity for left turn moves.
- Ramp traffic wishing to make a left at Park Avenue will only have to weave with the Columbia Turnpike thru and right turning traffic.


## Disadvantages:

- This unorthodox configuration would have to be approved by Traffic Engineering.
- Will require Right-of-Way for widening.
- Unfamiliar traffic pattern for motorists.


## 6. Create an overpass for Park Avenue to go over Columbia Turnpike with a far side ramp from Columbia Turnpike WB to Park Avenue SB (Figure 6)

This concept would grade separate Park Avenue over Columbia Turnpike and a far side two-way connector road would be built from Columbia Turnpike to Park Avenue. The road from Columbia WB to Park SB would have to be a double lane, free flow ramp because of the approximate 2,000 vehicles that would have been making a left to Park Avenue SB. The connector road would address the left turns that would have been made from the remaining three legs and be signalized at both ends. There may be a potential weave problem along Columbia Turnpike between the Route 24 ramp and the new connector road. If this weave is a problem perhaps a new ramp from Route 24 EB to Park Avenue also be added.

Advantages:

- Eliminates the long-term congestion problem at the Columbia and Park intersection.
- Improves traffic flow in the area.

Disadvantages:

- Will require extensive Right-of-Way.
- May be cost prohibitive.
- Environmental issues.

7. Eliminate ramp from Rt. 24 EB to Columbia Turnpike WB and eliminate ramp from Columbia Turnpike EB to Rt. 24 EB and create new intersection on Columbia Turnpike (Figure 7)

This concept would eliminate ramp from Rt. 24 EB to Columbia Turnpike WB and ramp from Columbia Turnpike EB to Rt. 24 EB and create new intersection on Columbia Turnpike to accommodate the moves that were removed.

Advantages:

- Eliminate the weave on Columbia Turnpike.
- Increase the stacking distance.

Disadvantages:

- Will not accommodate the left turns from Columbia Turnpike to Park Avenue in 2027 built year.
- Additional traffic signal on Columbia Turnpike.


## 8. Create an SPUI (Single Point Urban Interchange) or Diverging Diamond Interchange at Park Avenue and Columbia Turnpike Intersection (Figure 8)

This concept would grade separate Park Avenue over Columbia Turnpike using Single Point Urban Interchange or Diverging Diamond Interchange.

Advantages:

- Eliminates the congestion problem at the Columbia and Park intersection.
- Improves traffic flow in the area.

Disadvantages:

- High Right-of-Way impacts.
- Will be expensive to construct.

9. Create a new Ramp/Overpass from Columbia WB to Park Avenue along with a new Ramp from Route 24EB to Park Avenue (Figure 9)

This concept is combination of two previous ideas (\#2 and \#3) with a slight modification that combines the lefts from Columbia Turnpike WB with the Columbia Turnpike WB traffic destined to Route 24 EB. The end result will address those extremely high lefts ( 1900 vehicles/hr in 2027) at Park Avenue. The ramp from Figure \#2 should take about $1 / 3$ of the lefts and the ramp from Columbia turnpike (overpass) will take the remaining $2 / 3$. The only issue is the proximity of 2 traffic signals which will have to be evaluated further.

## Advantages;

- Eliminates the congestion problem at the Columbia and Park intersection.
- Improves traffic flow in the area.

Disadvantages;

- High Right-of-Way impacts.
- Will be expensive to construct.
- Additional traffic signal on Park Avenue.


## 10. Create a new Ramp from Route 24 EB Columbia WB to Park Avenue (Figure 10)

This concept will create a new ramp connecting directly to Park Avenue and remove this volume from the Columbia Turnpike \& Park Avenue intersection. This idea has an extremely high environmental impacts, so it would be an opportunity for partnering with Morris County. Morris County would be responsible for the location and the cost of this ramp including all DEP permits, and NJDOT would be responsible Rt. 24 widening. This concept would serve as cost sharing project, and let the local township to take some ownership of the traffic problems that were created from urban sprawling.

## Advantages;

- Improves the congestion problem at the Columbia and Park intersection.
- Improves traffic flow in the area.
- Cost sharing opportunity
- Might provide acceptable LOS without structures


## Disadvantages;

- Extremely high environmental impact.
- High Right-of-Way impacts.
- Additional traffic signal on Park Avenue.


## III. Summary of Findings:

There were several ideas that would help improve the weaving problem between the Ramp 24 SB ramp and Park Avenue but they did not address the main issue which was the congestion and failing movements at the signalize intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue. Given the anticipated growth this intersection will require significant improvements and any improvements made to relieve the Route 24 weave problem will be insignificant. In order to accommodate the 2027 traffic growth, grade separation option will be needed at this intersection, and possibly a combination with other ideas.

Furthermore, this intersection is located within the local municipality jurisdiction, and funding for this project should be the responsibility of the local township and the new/proposed development. This is a perfect example of urban sprawling, and NJDOT should not fund this type of projects. At the very least, cost sharing should be pursued further.

The Office of Value Engineering recommends that the problem statement should be submitted to the Department and go through the normal process.

## IV. Action Taken:

A first meeting was held on April 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ with NJDOT Upper Management, and the directive was low cost, minimal ROW take option should be pursued. One low cost solution discussed was to combine idea \#1 and idea \#5 - hence, Alternative \#11A and \#11B emerged. The second meeting was held on May $2^{\text {nd }}$ to discuss these concepts.

## a) Create a Double Left Turn Lanes on Columbia Turnpike WB with One Shared Left/Through Lane and One Through Lane and Signalize T-Intersection with the Route 24 EB ramp to Columbia Turnpike WB (Figure 11A)

This concept is a combination of idea \#1 (new two lane ramp with metering traffic signal on Columbia Turnpike WB) and idea \#5 (triple left turn lanes from Columbia Turnpike WB at the intersection). After further evaluation, a double left turn lanes and a shared left/through lane and another through lane and a right lane was evaluated. Also, there will be a 15 ' ROW take along Park Avenue to accommodate the additional left turn lane. The estimated construction cost for this concept is \$1.6 Million.

## Advantages:

- Additional capacity for left turn moves on Columbia Turnpike to Park Ave.
- Eliminates the weaving conflict between the ramp and Columbia Turnpike traffic.
- Allows for the storage length of the left turn lanes to be extended if necessary.

Disadvantages:

- The shared left/through lane turned into a left turn lane only and reduced the capacity of the through move.
- Unfamiliar traffic pattern for motorists.
- Minor Right-of-Way would be required.

The traffic analysis indicate a double left and a shared through lane at Columbia Turnpike and Park Ave. triggers a split phase for Columbia (less green time, more
yellow and red). The resulting backups in the AM peak cut off the existing and proposed ramp system of Route 24 from entering Columbia Turnpike. Analysis also showed that 3 out of the 4 approaches are still failing (LOS F) in 2027. Hence, this concept was dismissed.

## b) Create a Triple Left Turn Lanes on Columbia Turnpike WB with Two Through Lanes and Signalize T-Intersection with the Route 24 EB ramp to Columbia Turnpike WB (Figure 11B)

This concept is a variation of concept \#11A except that it has triple left turn lanes and two through lanes and a right lane on Columbia Turnpike. Therefore, in addition to the 15 ' ROW take along Park Avenue to accommodate the additional left turn lane, there will be 15 ' ROW take along Columbia Turnpike (MetLife frontage, and residential frontage past Park Avenue) to accommodate the additional through lane. The estimated construction cost for this concept is \$3.5 Million.

## Advantages:

- One full additional left turn lane for left turn moves on Columbia Turnpike to Park Ave.
- Eliminates the weaving conflict between the ramp and Columbia Turnpike traffic.
- Allows for the storage length of the left turn lanes to be extended if necessary.

Disadvantages:

- Unfamiliar traffic pattern for motorists.
- High Right-of-Way would be required.

The traffic analysis the approach delay at Columbia Turnpike WB at Park Ave. is reduced significantly as compared to the existing condition and Concept \#11A in the year 2027 due to the additional left turn lane, but three out of the 4 approaches are still failing (LOS F). Since the cost is high and the benefit is low, this concept was dismissed.

Since both alternatives (11A and 11B) were dismissed, the office of Value Engineering and Traffic Engineering will further evaluate the following:

- Adaptive signal is recommended at Columbia Turnpike \& Park Avenue intersection with any concepts.
- Revisit brainstorming idea \#2 which is constructing a new ramp from Route 24 EB to Park Avenue to allow vehicles destined to Park Avenue, a direct connection eliminating the need to weave over two lanes to make a left from Columbia Turnpike. Hence, Alternatives \#12A and \#12B were emerged as a short term solution.
- Revisit brainstorming idea \#10 and further evaluated for long term solution.

A third meeting was held on May $22^{\text {nd }}$ with NJDOT Upper Management to discuss Alternatives \#12A \& \#12B, and Idea \#10.

## c) Create a new ramp from Route 24 EB to Park Avenue with no widening in Park Avenue (Figure 12A)

This concept is a variation of brainstorming idea \#2 except that the exit ramp from Route 24 EB will be held close to Route 24 to minimize ROW impacts, and will have the stop control at the end of the ramp. The existing ramp from Route 24 EB to Columbia Turnpike EB will be removed since both exit ramps from Route 24 are too close, and would create confusion to motoring public. No construction estimate is available.

Advantages and disadvantages are described under the brainstorming idea \#2. The analysis showed that the Alternative 12A will operate safer, but will not alleviate the congestion.
d) Create a new ramp from Route 24 EB to Park Avenue with widening in Park Avenue (Figure 12B)

This concept is a variation of Alternative 12 A except that there will be 15 ' widening along Park Avenue from the end of the exit ramp, carrying it through Columbia turnpike for a three through lanes, then taper back to two lanes. No construction estimate is available, but it may cost upward of 5 Million.

Advantages and disadvantages are described under the brainstorming idea \#2. The analysis showed that the Alternative 12B will alleviate the congestion for the approximately first 5 years then it will deteriorate as the traffic volumes increases.

## e) Create a new Ramp from Route 24 EB Columbia WB to Park Ave. (Figure 10)

Advantages and disadvantages are described under the brainstorming idea \#10. No construction estimate is available, but preliminary findings showed the following potential fatal flaws:
$>$ There are no place to construct the ramp to tie to Park Avenue since the vicinity area is fully developed. Also, there are numerous utility poles and wetland that would need to be addressed.
$>$ The new traffic signal at the terminus of the proposed ramp may not operate properly due to the proximity of the adjacent traffic signal.
$>$ There will be an incomplete interchange at this location, and FHWA will not participate.

The analysis showed that it will alleviate the congestion for the approximately first 5 years then it will deteriorate as the traffic volumes increases. The total overall delay at Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue would be very similar to Alternative 12B.

Based on the results of these studies, the office of Value Engineering finds that the traffic congestion issue at Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue is not due to the ramps off Route 24, but rather due to the local business development in the vicinity of Jets training facility off Park Avenue that drew high number of traffic to this location. The Department will analyze the cost benefit of these improvements, however, the analysis showed that any of these improvements will have a short term improvement that lasts approximately 5 years.

Next meeting is scheduled on $6 / 3 / 14$ at 9 AM


Figure \#1 - Create a Signalize T-Intersection with the Route 24 EB ramp to Columbia Turnpike WB




Figure 4 - Create a two-lane roundabout at the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue.




Figure 7 - Eliminate Ramp from Rt. 24 EB to Columbia Turnpike WB and Eliminate Ramp from Columbia Turnpike WB to Rt. 24 EB and create New Intersection on Columbia Turnpike


Figure 8 - Create an SPUI (Single Point Urban Interchange) or Diverging Diamond Interchange at Park Avenue and Columbia Turnpike Intersection


Figure 9 - Create an Overpass from Columbia Turnpike WB and Connecting to Park Avenue and Combined with Figure 2 which is Create a New Ramp from Route 24 EB to Park Ave.


Figure 10 - Create a new exit ramp from Route 24 EB and Connecting to Park Avenue





Figure 12B - New Ramp from Rt. 24 EB to Park Ave. (with Widening)



|  | No Build | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternative 5 | Alternative 6 | Alternative 7 | Alternative 8 | Alternative 9 | Alternative 10 | Alternative 11A | Alternative 11B | Alternative 12A | Alternative 12B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description |  | Create a Signalize TIntersection with the Route 24 EB ramp to Columbia Turnpike WB | Create a new ramp from Route 24 EB to Park Avenue | Create an overpass over Columbia Turnpike for the Route 24 EB ramp and connecting to Park Avenue south of Columbia | Create a two lane modern roundabout at the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue | Create a triple left turn lane on Columbia Turnpike WB and separate the left turns originating from the ramp from Columbia Turnpike lefts | Create an overpass for Park Avenue to go over Columbia Turnpike with a far side ramp from Columbia Turnpike WB to Park Avenue SB | Eliminate ramp from Rt. 24 EB to Columbia Turnpike WB and eliminate ramp from Columbia Turnpike EB to Rt. 24 EB and create new intersection on Columbia turnpike | Create an SPUI (Single Point Urban Interchange) or Diverging Diamond Interchange at Park Avenue and Columbia Turnpike Intersection | Create a new Ramp/Overpass from Columbia WB to Park Avenue along with a new Ramp from Route 24 EB to Park Avenue | Create a new Ramp from Route 24 EB Columbia WB to Park Avenue | Create a Triple Left Turn Lanes on Columbia Turnpike WB with One Shared Leff/Through Lane and Signalize TIntersection with the Route 24 EB ramp to Columbia Turnpike WB | Create a Triple Exclusive Left Turn Lanes on Columbia Turnpike WB and Two Through Lanes and Signalize T-Intersection with the Route 24 EB ramp to Columbia Turnpike WB | New Ramp from Rt. 24 EB to Park Ave. (No Widening) | New Ramp from Rt. 24 EB to Park Ave. (With Widening) |
| Eliminate Weave on Columbia Turnpike | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Address 2007 Left Turns on Columbia Tpk WB at Park | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Address 2027 Left Turns on Columbia Tpk WB at Park | No | No | No | No | No | No | Possible | No | Possible | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Grade Separated (Bridge) | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
| Utility Impacts | None | None | Medium | Medium | Minor | Low-Medium | High | Minor | Major | Major | High | Medium | High | Low | High |
| ROW Impacts | None | Minor | Medium - Requires acquistion of few residential homes | High | Minor | Minor | High | Minor | High | Very High | Very High | Medium | High | Low | High |
| Access Impacts | None | None | Minor | Minor | Medium | Minor | Medium-High | Minor | High | Medium-High | Medium-High | Medium | High | Low | High |
| Environmental Impacts | None | Minor | Medium | High | Minor | Low-Medium | High | Minor | High | Very High | Extremely High | Low | High | Medium | High |
| Construction Cost | None | \$ | \$ | \$ $\$$ | \$ | \$ | \$\$\$ | \$ | \$ \$ \$ \$ | \$\$\$ | \$\$\$\$ | $1.6 \mathrm{M} \pm$ | $3.5 \mathrm{M} \pm$ | $\sim 3 \mathrm{M}$ ? | $\sim 5 \mathrm{M}$ ? |
| Traffic Operations | None | No | Imrprove for 2007 <br> Fail in 2027 | Improve Moderately | Imrprove for 2007 <br> Fail in 2027 | Imrprove for 2007 <br> Fail in 2027 | Improve Moderately | No | Improve Moderately | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Imrprove for } 2007 \\ & \text { Fail in } 2027 \end{aligned}$ | Imrprove for 2007 <br> Fail in 2027 | Imrprove for 2007 <br> Fail in 2027 | Imrprove for 2007 <br> Fail in 2027 | Imrprove for 2007 <br> Fail in 2027 | Imrprove for 2007 <br> Fail in 2027 |
| Likehood of Acceptance | Not to Morris County | Fair - Just a bandaid fix | Fair | Not Likely | Not Likely; Public do not like roundabouts | Possible | Not Likely | Not Likely | Not Likely | Possible | Not Likely - Needs Partnering with Morris County | Possible | Possible | Possible | Possible |
| Likehood of Construction | Most Likely | Possible | Possible | Not likely | Not Likely | Possible | Not Likely | Not Likely | Not Likely | Possible | Not Likely - DEP | Possible | Possible | Possible | Possible |
| Value/\$ | N/A | High | Medium | Low | High | High | Medium | Medium | Low | Low | Low | High | Medium | High | Medium |

Kishor Shah

From:
Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:
Attachments:

Brian M. Stankus [bstankus@ihengineers.com](mailto:bstankus@ihengineers.com)
Friday, October 21, 2016 2:07 PM
nlinnik@ihengineers.com
kshah@ihengineers.com
FW: Rt.24, EB Ramp to CR 510
CR 510 and Park Ave.pdf; CR 510 from Park Av to Rt 24.pdf

M aybe I never uploaded it to the server, but I really thought I had at least given you hard copies.
I am running out the door - maybe we can discuss details on M onday. Have a good weekend.
--B

From: Gary Patterson [mailto:gpatterson@ihengineers.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 11:00 AM
To: bstankus@ihengineers.com
Cc: jkorunow @ihengineers.com
Subject: FW: Rt.24, EB Ramp to CR 510
Brian,
FYI. We should probably ask him to copy you on all correspondence...

From: Shah, Dashrath [mailto:Dashrath.Shah@dot.nj.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 9:32 AM
To: jkorunow@ihengineers.com; Gary Patterson
Cc: D'Arcy, Edward
Subject: FW: Rt.24, EB Ramp to CR 510
FYI
Dashrath Shah
Principal Engineer-Team D
Division of Project M anagement
NJDOT
(609)530-3713

From: LiSanti, Daniel
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 8:43 AM
To: Shah, Dashrath
Cc: Azam, Sophia; Boucher, Amon
Subject: Rt.24, EB Ramp to CR 510
Hello Dashrath:
The Bureau of Transportation Data and Safety has received your Safety M anagement System Information request dated May 3, 2016. In response to your Safety M anagement System ranking request for Route 24, EB Ramp to CR 510, Hanover and M orris Townships, M orris County, we have determined the following:

- Route 24, MP 2.09, EB Ramp to CR 510 is within limits of Route 24, M P 0.2 to 2.20 , roadway segment which is ranked \#69 on our preliminary 2015 NJDOT Corridor Segment List (2011-2013 crash data). This list has not been approved to date but we expect final approval soon. We do not expect the ranking to change significantly. Upon final approval, we will provide you with the final ranking.

In response to your Safety M anagement System ranking request for CR 510 (Columbia Avenue), Park Avenue to Route 24, M P 14.23 to 14.60, and the signalized intersection of Columbia Avenue and Park Avenue, M P 14.23, Hanover and Morris Townships, Morris County, we are unable to provide a ranking. Our Safety Management System provides rankings for locations under the state's jurisdiction, this location, per SLD, appears to be under the jurisdiction of the county. The MPO's, in this case NJTPA, have list which include county and local roads. This location may be ranked on one of NJTPA's list. For your use, a crash check was performed for both Columbia Avenue, Park Avenue to Route 24, and at the signalized intersection of Columbia Avenue and Park Avenue for the years 2011-2013, see attached files.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.
Thanks
Daniel LiSanti, PE
Project M anager
Transportation Data \& Safety
New Jersey Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 600

Trenton, NJ 08625-0600
Office Phone: (609) 530-4692
Daniel.LiSanti@dot.nj.gov

From: Azam, Sophia
Sent: Tuesday, May 03, 2016 10:40 AM
To: LiSanti, Daniel
Subject: FW: Rt.24, EB Ramp to CR 510
Please assign. Thanks
From: Shah, Dashrath
Sent: Tuesday, M ay 03, 2016 10:39 AM
To: Bertucci, Philip; Chan, Kiong; Levinton, Ira; Barretts, Chris; Lewis, Jim; Hawkinson, Bruce; Azam, Sophia; Longworth, John; Jamerson, John; Abraham, Antoun; Roessner, Chrissa; Appesh, Nart; M aniar, Nipa; Amin, Padmanabha; Dube, Richard; Pinto, Frank
Cc: D'Arcy, Edward
Subject: Rt.24, EB Ramp to CR 510
Hi everybody,
Find attached the shotgun memo for the above subject project.
Each unit is requested to provide the input/information relevant to this project.
Thanks

Dashrath Shah
Principal Engineer-Team D
Division of Project M anagement

NJDOT
(609)530-3713

## Appendix " R "

## Cost Estimates

103 College Road East, 1st Floor, Princeton, NJ 08540 (609) 734-8400, (609) 734-8405 (fax)

## ALTERNATIVE 1

| ITEM DESCRIPTION | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Amount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| STRIPPING (4"-6" DEPTH) | ACRE | 3.70 | $\$$ | 4,050 |
| ROADWAY EXC. UNCLASSIFIED | CY | $27,350.00$ | $\$$ | 40 |

EARTHWORK TOTAL= \$ 1,108,985

| 2 INCH HMA SURFACE COURSE \& 8 INCH BASE COARSE | LF | $9,450.00$ | $\$$ | 80 | $\$$ | 756,000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 INCH HMA SURFACE COURSE \& 2 INCH BASE COARSE | LF | $2,670.00$ | $\$$ | 16 | $\$$ | 42,720 |

PAVEMENT TOTAL= \$ 798,720

| BRIDGE STRUCTURE | SF | $8,250.00$ | $\$$ | 225 | $\$$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | STRUCTURE TOTAL= \$ 1,856,250


| URBAN AREA | MILE | 0.25 | $\$ 544,280$ | $\$$ | 136,070 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| RAMPS | LF | $7,200.00$ | $\$$ | 55 | $\$$ | DRAINAGE TOTAL= \$ 532,070


| BEAM GUIDE RAIL | LF | 975.00 | $\$$ | 46 | $\$$ | 44,850 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $9 " X 16 "$ CONCRETE VERTICAL CURB | LF | $1,050.00$ | $\$$ | 35 | $\$$ | 36,750 |
| RETAINING WALL | SF | $38,000.00$ | $\$$ | 110 | $\$$ | $4,180,000$ |
| BLOCK CURB | LF | 350.00 | $\$$ | 30 | $\$$ | 10,500 |
| TANGENT GUIDE RAIL TERMINAL | UNIT | 2.00 | $\$$ | 2,650 | $\$$ | 5,300 |

INCIDENTAL ITEMS TOTAL= \$ 4,277,400

| TOP SOIL AND SEEDING | MILE | 1.30 | $\$ 112,815$ | $\$$ | 146,660 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| PLANTING | MILE | 1.30 | $\$ 64,500$ | $\$$ | 83,850 |


| FIELD OFFICE | MILE | 1.30 | $\$ 44,260$ | $\$$ | 57,538 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MATERIALS FIELD LABORATORY | MILE | 1.30 | $\$ 28,970$ | $\$$ | 37,661 |
| EROSION CONTROL DURING CONSTRUCTION | MILE | 1.30 | $\$ 64,375$ | $\$$ | 83,688 |

GENERAL ITEMS TOTAL= \$ 178,887

| TRAFFIC SIGNAL | LS | 1.00 | $\$ 200,000$ | $\$$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

PROJECT SUBTOTAL= $\$ \mathbf{9 , 1 8 2 , 8 2 1}$

| LIGHTING, TRAFFIC STRIPES, SIGNS AND DELINEATORS | LS | $3 \%$ OF PROJ. SUBTOTAL | $\$$ | 275,485 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| MAINTANANCE OF TRAFFIC | LS | $1.5 \%$ OF PROJ. SUBTOTAL | $\$$ | 137,742 |
| TRAINING | LS | $1 \%$ OF PROJ. SUBTOTAL | $\$$ | 91,828 |
| MOBILIZATION | LS | $10 \%$ OF PROJ. SUBTOTAL | $\$$ | 918,282 |
| PROGRESS SCHEDULE | LS | 1.00 |  | $\$$ |
| CLEARING SITE | LS | 1.00 |  | $\$, 000$ |
| CONSTRUCTION LAYOUT | LS | 1.00 |  | 115,000 |

PROJECT TOTAL= \$ 10,816,158

CONTINGENCIES \& ESCALATION (YEAR 2021, 1.1)
CONSTR. ESTIMATE FOR CD= \$ 11,897,774

CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AMOUNT (9.5\% OF CONSTRUCTION COST)= \$ 1,130,289
CONTING. FOR CONSTR. CHANGE ORDER $(\$ 205,000+3 \%$ OVER $\$ 5 \mathrm{M}) \quad$ CHANGE ORDER CONTING. $=\mathbf{\$ 4 1 1 , 9 3 3}$

| UTILITIES RELOCATIONS BY COMPANIES/OWNERS (9\% OF CC) |  |  |  | $\$ 1,070,800$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

SUMMARY

| CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE FOR CD | $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 , 8 9 7 , 7 7 4}$ |
| ---: | :---: | ---: |
| CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING (CE) | $\mathbf{1}, 130, \mathbf{2 8 9}$ |
| CONTINGENCIES | $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 , 9 3 3}$ |
| UTILITIES:RELOCATIONS BY COMPANIES | $\mathbf{4 1 1 , 0 7 0 , 8 0 0}$ |
| TOTAL ESTIMATE: | $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 , 5 1 0 , 7 9 6}$ |






103 College Road East, 1st Floor, Princeton, NJ 08540 (609) 734-8400, (609) 734-8405 (fax)
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Route 24 \& Columbia Turnpike

ALTERNATIVE 4


| BEAM GUIDE RAIL | LF | $3,100.00$ | $\$$ | 35 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $9 " \times 16 "$ CONCRETE VERTICAL CURB | LF | $10,440.00$ | $\$$ | 25 |
| CANTILEVER SIGN STRUCTURE | UNIT | 1.00 | $\$$ | 90,000 |


| TOPSOIL AND SEEDING (MAIN LINE) | MILE | 0.80 | \$ | 112,815 | \$ | 90,252 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PLANTING (MAINLINE) | MILE | 0.80 | \$ | 64,500 | \$ | 51,600 |
| TOPSOIL, SEEDING, PLANTING (FINGER RAMP) | MILE | 0.35 | \$ | 12,500 | \$ | 4,375 |
| TOPSOIL, SEEDING, PLANTING (ACCESS ROAD) | FT | 1,800.00 | \$ | 8 | \$ | 14,220 |


| FIELD OFFICE | MILE | 1.40 | \$ | 44,260 | \$ | 61,964 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MATERIALS FIELD LABORATORY | MILE | 1.40 | \$ | 28,970 | \$ | 40,558 |
| EROSION CONTROL DURING CONSTRUCTION | MILE | 1.40 | \$ | 64,375 | \$ | 90,125 |

PROJECT SUBTOTAL= \$ 6,116,159

| LIGHTING, TRAFFIC STRIPES, SIGNS AND DELINEATORS | LS | 3\% OF PROJ. SUBTOTAL | \$ | 183,485 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAINTANANCE OF TRAFFIC | LS | 3\% OF PROJ. SUBTOTAL | \$ | 183,485 |
| TRAINING | LS | 1\% OF PROJ. SUBTOTAL | \$ | 61,162 |
| MOBILIZATION | LS | 9\% OF PROJ. SUBTOTAL | \$ | 550,454 |
| PROGRESS SCHEDULE | LS |  | \$ | 6,000 |
| CLEARING SITE | LS |  | \$ | 45,000 |
| CONSTRUCTION LAYOUT | LS |  | \$ | 42,000 |
| PROJECT TOTAL= |  |  | \$ | 7,187,744 |
| CONTINGENCIES \& ESCALATION (YEAR 2021, 1.1) |  | CONSTR. ESTIMATE FOR CD= | \$ | 7,906,519 |
| CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AMOUNT (16.2\% OF CONSTRUCTION COST)= \$ |  |  |  | 1,280,856 |
| CONTING. FOR CONSTR. CHANGE ORDER ( $\$ 25,000+4 \%$ OVER \$ 500 K ) |  | CHANGE ORDER CONTING.= | \$ | 321,261 |


| UTILITIES RELOCATIONS BY COMPANIES/OWNERS (2\% OF CC) |  | \$ | 158,130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | UTILITY RELOCATION COST FOR CD ESTIMATE | \$ | 158,130 |
|  | SUMMARY |  |  |
|  | CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE FOR CD | \$ | 7,906,519 |
|  | DESIGN ENGINEERING | \$ | 948,782 |
|  | CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING (CE) | \$ | 1,280,856 |
|  | CONTINGENCIES | \$ | 321,261 |
|  | UTILITIES:RELOCATIONS BY COMPANIES | \$ | 158,130 |
|  | TOTAL ESTIMATE: | \$ | 10,615,548 |


| ROW COST |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alternative 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Block | Lot | Area | Land Value | Purchase | Cost |
| 1 | 9101 | 4 | 16.800 | \$8,421,000 | 0.321 | \$160,901 |
| 2 | 9201 | 12 | 2.700 | \$260,800 | 0.010 | \$966 |
| 3 | 1201 | 1 | 16.722 | \$2,172,200 | Access | \$0 |
| 4 | 1201 | 1 | 16.722 | \$2,172,200 | 0.093 | \$12,081 |
| 5 | 1201 | 1 | 16.722 | \$2,172,200 | 0.524 | \$68,068 |
| 6 | 4802 | 1 | 8.490 | \$4,970,000 | 2.273 | \$1,330,602 |
| 7 | 4802 | 2 | 3.500 | \$760,000 | 3.300 | \$716,571 |
| 8 | 4902 | 1 | 8.690 | \$2,247,500 | 1.311 | \$339,065 |
| 9 | 4802 | 2 | 3.500 | \$760,000 | 1.081 | \$234,731 |
| 10 | 4903 | 1 | 0.451 | \$146,600 | 0.451 | \$146,600 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 9.364 | \$3,009,585 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alternative 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Block | Lot | Area | Land Value | Purchase | Cost |
| 1 | 9101 | 4 | 16.800 | \$8,421,000 | 0.316 | \$158,395 |
| 2 | 9201 | 12 | 2.700 | \$260,800 | 0.012 | \$1,159 |
| 3 | 1201 | 1 | 16.722 | \$2,172,200 | Access | \$0 |
| 4 | 1201 | 1 | 16.722 | \$2,172,200 | 0.094 | \$12,211 |
| 5 | 1201 | 1 | 16.722 | \$2,172,200 | 0.295 | \$38,321 |
| 6 | 4802 | 1 | 8.490 | \$4,970,000 | 2.126 | \$1,244,549 |
| 7 | 4802 | 2 | 3.500 | \$1,240,300 | 3.500 | \$1,240,300 |
| 8 | 4902 | 1 | 8.690 | \$2,247,500 | 1.272 | \$328,978 |
| 9 | 4902 | 2 | 1.080 | \$377,600 | 1.080 | \$377,600 |
| 10 | 4903 | 1 | 0.451 | \$146,600 | 0.451 | \$146,600 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 9.146 | \$3,548,113 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alternative 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Block | Lot | Area | Land Value | Purchase | Cost |
| 1 | 9101 | 4 | 16.800 | \$8,421,000 | 0.321 | \$160,901 |
| 2 | 9201 | 12 | 2.700 | \$260,800 | 0.010 | \$966 |
| 3 | 9502 | 1 | 0.662 | \$219,200 | 0.100 | \$33,112 |
| 4 | 9502 | 2 | 1.084 | \$232,500 | 0.038 | \$8,150 |
| 5 | 9502 | 3 | 1.757 | \$244,200 | 0.036 | \$5,004 |
| 6 | 1201 | 1 | 16.722 | \$2,172,200 | Access | \$0 |
| 7 | 1201 | 1 | 16.722 | \$2,172,200 | 0.093 | \$12,081 |
| 8 | 1201 | 1 | 16.722 | \$2,172,200 | 0.456 | \$59,235 |
| 9 | 4802 | 1 | 8.490 | \$4,970,000 | 0.269 | \$157,471 |
| 10 | 4802 | 1 | 8.490 | \$4,970,000 | 1.882 | \$1,101,713 |
| 11 | 4802 | 2 | 3.500 | \$1,240,300 | 3.500 | \$1,240,300 |
| 12 | 4902 | 1 | 8.690 | \$2,247,500 | 0.391 | \$101,125 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 7.096 | \$2,880,057 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Alternative 3 (Revised) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Block | Lot | Area | Land Value | Purchase | Cost |
| 1 | 9101 | 4 | 16.800 | $\$ 8,421,000$ | 0.200 | $\$ 100,150$ |
| 2 | 9201 | 12 | 2.700 | $\$ 260,800$ | 0.028 | $\$ 2,666$ |
| 3 | 9502 | 1 | 0.662 | $\$ 219,200$ | 0.054 | $\$ 17,947$ |
| 4 | 9502 | 2 | 1.084 | $\$ 232,500$ | 0.049 | $\$ 10,402$ |
| 5 | 9502 | 3 | 1.757 | $\$ 244,200$ | 0.032 | $\$ 4,420$ |
| 6 | 1201 | 1 | 16.722 | $\$ 2,172,200$ | 3.870 | $\$ 502,664$ |
| 7 | 4802 | 1 | 8.490 | $\$ 4,970,000$ | 0.259 | $\$ 151,734$ |
| 8 | 4802 | 1 | 8.490 | $\$ 4,970,000$ | 1.882 | $\$ 1,101,713$ |
| 9 | 4802 | 2 | 3.500 | $\$ 1,240,300$ | 0.056 | $\$ 19,845$ |
| 10 | 4902 | 1 | 8.690 | $\$ 2,247,500$ | 0.435 | $\$ 112,504$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.864 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 2,024,044$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix " S "

## Alternatives Matrix

CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT REPORT
Improvements at Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange
Morris Township and Hannover Township, Morris County, New Jersey

## Alternatives Matrix

| Alternatives | Description | $\begin{gathered} \text { Meets } \\ \text { Purpose and } \\ \text { Need } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Construction Cost * | ROW <br> Acquisition Required | Benefits | Disadvantages |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| "No-Build" | No work will be completed to extend the useful life of the structure. | No | \$0.00 | 0 |  |  |
| Alternative 1 | An overpass will be constructed over Columbia Turnpike diverting traffic from the Route 24 EB ramp to Columbia Turnpike WB to a new signalized intersection on Park Avenue approximately 600 ' south of the Columbia Turnpike intersection. The existing ramp from Route 24 EB to Columbia Turnpike WB will be closed. A new ramp connecting the new signalized intersection at Park Avenue NB to the Ramp leading to Route 24 EB will also be constructed. | No | \$14,510,796 | $\begin{gathered} 10 \text { Parcels } \\ 9.565 \\ (\$ 3,009,585) \end{gathered}$ | - Eliminates the weaving conflict between the Route 24 EB ramp (Exit 2A) and Columbia Turnpike WB traffic. <br> - Reduces congestion at the Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue intersection, including the WB Columbia Turnpike left turn onto Park Avenue SB. | - There will be three moves on Columbia Turnpike WB very close to each other namely the Exit to Route 24 EB, the Exit to Park Avenue via the flyover ramp and at the intersection of Park Avenue NB, which may create confusion to motorist. <br> - Right-of-way will be required. <br> - Environmental issues will be created. <br> - Will be costly due to the new structure, land acquisition and environmental issues. <br> - Will add another signal on Park Avenue approximately 600 feet south of the Columbia Turnpike signal. <br> - Based on NJDEP Website, the widening on Park Avenue SB involves groundwater contamination, critical environmental and historic sites, and the highland planning area. All the constraints will need investigation, permits and necessary measures to satisfy the permit conditions which will increase time and cost. <br> - At the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue, multiple movements will continue to operate at LOS ' $F$ ' during both peak hours. |
| Alternative 2 | A new two lane modern roundabout will be constructed to the south of Columbia Turnpike connecting Columbia Turnpike EB, Park Avenue and Route 24 EB. The ramp from Route 24 EB to Columbia WB will be removed and the ramp from Columbia Turnpike WB to Route 24 EB will be pushed further north to provide greater weave distance to the ramp from Route 24 EB to Columbia Turnpike EB. The existing ramps to and from Columbia Turnpike EB will be relocated to the proposed roundabout. Finally a new traffic signal will be provided at the new ramp intersection at Park Avenue. | No | \$13,888,330 | $\begin{gathered} 10 \text { Parcels } \\ 9.146 \\ (\$ 3,548,113) \end{gathered}$ | - Eliminates the weaving conflict between the Route 24 EB ramp (Exit 2A) and Columbia Turnpike WB traffic. <br> - Reduces congestion at the Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue intersection, including the WB Columbia Turnpike left turn onto Park Avenue SB. <br> - Modern roundabouts typically will provide safe operation with low crash severity. | - Public acceptance. <br> - During the morning peak hour, the WB roundabout approach will operate at LOS 'F'. Weaving movement on Route 24 EB between ramps will also operate at LOS ' $F$ '. <br> - Right-of-way will be required. <br> - Environmental issues will be created. <br> - Will be costly due to land acquisition and environmental issues. <br> - Will add another signal on Park Avenue approximately 600 feet south of the Columbia signal. <br> - Based on NJDEP Website, the widening on Park Avenue SB has groundwater contamination, critical environmental and historic sites, and the highland planning area. All the constraints will need investigation, permits and necessary measures to satisfy the permit conditions which will increase time and cost. <br> - At the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue, multiple movements will continue to operate at LOS ' $F$ ' during both peak hours. |
| Alternative 3 | A barrier or island will be constructed on Columbia Turnpike WB to the east of the entering traffic from Route 24 EB Ramp to prevent these vehicles from weaving over to the left onto Park Avenue SB. The ramps to and from Columbia Turnpike EB and Route 24 EB will be modified to bring traffic to Park Avenue at a new signalized intersection. The modifications will accommodate the vehicles that can no longer turn left at Park Avenue from Columbia Turnpike WB. The ramp from Columbia Turnpike EB to Route 24 EB will be closed and traffic diverted to the new ramp connection at Park Avenue. | No | \$6,298,404 | $\begin{gathered} 12 \text { Parcels } \\ 7.096 \\ (\$ 2,880,057) \end{gathered}$ | - Eliminates the weaving conflict between the Route 24 EB ramp (Exit 2A) and Columbia Turnpike WB traffic. <br> - Reduces congestion at the Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue intersection, including the WB Columbia Turnpike left turn onto Park Avenue SB | - Weaving movement on Route 24 EB between ramps will operate at LOS ' $F$ ' during the morning peak hour. <br> - Right-of-way will be required. <br> - Environmental issues will be created. <br> - Will be costly due to land acquisition and environmental issues. <br> - Will add another signal on Park Avenue approximately 600 feet south of the Columbia signal. <br> - Based on NJDEP Website, the widening on Park Avenue SB has groundwater contamination, critical environmental and historic sites, and the highland planning area. All the constraints will need investigation, permits and necessary measures to satisfy the permit conditions which will increase time and cost. <br> - At the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue, multiple movements will continue to operate at LOS ' $F$ ' during both peak hours. |


| Alternative 3Rev (PPA) | This alternative was developed as the property which was to be purchased for alternative 3 is no longer available. The property owner was granted a permit to build the new hotel. A barrier or island will be constructed on Columbia Turnpike WB to the east of the entering traffic from Route 24 EB Ramp to prevent these vehicles from weaving over to the left onto Park Avenue SB. The ramps to and from Columbia Turnpike EB and Route 24 EB will be modified to bring traffic to Park Avenue at a new signalized intersection. The modifications will accommodate the vehicles that can no longer turn left at Park Avenue from Columbia Turnpike WB. The ramp from Columbia Turnpike EB to Route 24 EB will be closed and traffic diverted to the new ramp connection at Park Avenue. | No | \$5,735,581 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10Parcels } \\ 6.864 \\ (\$ 2,024,044) \end{gathered}$ | - Eliminates the weaving conflict between the Route 24 EB ramp (Exit 2A) and Columbia Turnpike WB traffic. <br> - Reduces congestion at the Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue intersection, including the WB Columbia Turnpike left turn onto Park Avenue SB. <br> - The new ramp will be constructed over an existing parking lot reducing the quantity of new impervious surface. <br> - The new ramp will be an additional $350^{\prime}$ further south of the intersection with Columbia Turnpike than Alternative 3 providing less conflict with the two signalized intersections. | - Weaving movement on Route 24 EB between ramps will operate at LOS ' $F$ ' during the morning peak hour. <br> - Right-of-way will be required. <br> - Will add another signal on Park Avenue approximately 950 ' south of the Columbia signal. <br> - At the intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue, multiple movements will continue to operate at LOS ' $F$ ' during both peak hours. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alternative 4 | This alternative involves a new "halfinterchange" on the Route 24 east of the Columbia Turnpike interchange, with on and off ramps to the EB roadway to Campus Drive. Campus Drive intersects Park Avenue (CR 623) at a point roughly $3 / 4$ mile south of Columbia Turnpike | No | \$7,076,213 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { Parcel } \\ 5.630 \\ (\$ 1,234,603) \end{gathered}$ | - Provides an alternative for the traffic exiting Route 24 EB destined for Park Avenue SB which may reduce the weaving conflict on Columbia Turnpike. <br> - Reduces congestion at the Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue intersection. | - Creates a new weaving movement on Route 24 EB between the existing and proposed ramps that will operate at LOS ' $F$ '. <br> - Campus Drive serves as an access roadway for several large office buildings with multiple access driveways. Access is not allowed on ramps as per the Access Management Code. <br> - Right-of-way will be required. If the driveways are revoked for the office buildings they will become land locked and therefore a problem for the Department. <br> - Environmental issues will be created including impacting an existing drainage basins and wetland. <br> - Will be costly due to land acquisition and environmental issues. <br> - The new development will be within in Flood Hazard Area/Airport Hazard Area. |

Construction cost includes design, utility relocation and construction. ROW and Access costs are not included in the Construction Cost.

## Appendix "T"

Risk Register


## Appendix "U"

## Quantitative Risk Analysis Report <br> (Not Applicable)

## Appendix "V"

## Utility Risk Assessment Plan <br> (Not Applicable)

## Appendix "W"

## Complete Streets Checklist

## NJDOT Complete Streets Checklist

## Background

The New Jersey Department of Transportation's Complete Streets Policy promotes a "comprehensive, integrated, connected multi-modal network by providing connections to bicycling and walking trip generators such as employment, education, residential, recreational and public facilities, as well as retail and transit centers." The policy calls for the establishment of a checklist to address pedestrian, bicyclist and transit accommodations "with the presumption that they shall be included in each project unless supporting documentation against inclusion is provided and found to be justifiable."

## Complete Streets Checklist

The following checklist is an accompaniment to NJDOT's Complete Streets Policy and has been developed to assist Project Managers and designers develop proposed alternatives in adherence to the policy. Being in compliance with the policy means that Project Managers and designers plan for, design, and construct all transportation projects to provide appropriate accommodation for bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users on New Jersey's roadways, in addition to those provided for motorists. It includes people of all ages and abilities. The checklist applies to all NJDOT projects that undergo the Capital Project Delivery (CPD) Process and is intended for use on projects during the earliest stages of the Concept Development or Preliminary Engineering Phase so that any pedestrian or bicycle considerations are included in the project budget. The Project Manager is responsible for completing the checklist and must work with the Designer to ensure that the checklist has been completed prior to advancement of a project to Final Design.

## Using the Complete Streets Checklist

The Complete Streets Checklist is a tool to be used by Project Managers and designers throughout Concept Development and Preliminary Engineering to ensure that all developed alternatives reflect compliance with the Policy. When completing the checklist, a brief description is required for each "Item to be Addressed" as a means to document that the item has been considered and can include supporting documentation.

## NJDOT Complete Streets Checklist

## CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT CHECKLIST

## Instructions：

For each box checked，please provide a brief description for how the item is addressed，not addressed or not applicable and include documentation to support your answer．

| Item to be Addressed | Checklist Consideration | YES | NO | N／A | Required Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Bicycle， <br> Pedestrian and <br> Transit <br> Accommodations | Are there accommodations for bicyclists，pedestrians（including ADA compliance）and transit users included on or crossing the current facility？ <br> Examples include（but are not limited to）： <br> Sidewalks，public seating，bike racks，and transit shelters | $\square$ | 区 | $\square$ | Sidewalk exists on North－East corner of the intersection． <br> There are no facilities like public seating， bike racks and transit shelters on Park Avenue and Columbia Turnpike． |
| Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Operations | Has the existing bicycle and pedestrian suitability or level of service on the current transportation facility been identified？ | $\square$ | 】 | $\square$ | There are limited to no shoulders and limited side walk along the project area． |
|  | Have the bicycle and pedestrian conditions within the study area， including pedestrian and／or bicyclist treatments，volumes， important connections and lighting been identified？ | $\square$ | 】 | $\square$ | There are no adequate existing facilities for bicycle and pedestrian |
|  | Do bicyclists／pedestrians regularly use the transportation facility for commuting or recreation？ | $\square$ | 】 | $\square$ | The limited bus service is to the office complexes． |
|  | Are there physical or perceived impediments to bicyclist or pedestrian use of the transportation facility？ | $\square$ | 区 | $\square$ | There are no physical or perceived impediments to cyclists or pedestrians． |
|  | Is there a higher than normal incidence of bicyclist／pedestrian crashes within the study area？ | $\square$ | 区 | $\square$ | There are no incidences of cyclist／pedestrian crashes recorded within the study area |

## NJDOT Complete Streets Checklist

| Item to be Addressed | Checklist Consideration | YES | NO | N／A | Required Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Have the existing volumes of pedestrian and／or bicyclist crossing activity at intersections including midblock and nighttime crossing been collected／provided？ | $\square$ | 区 | $\square$ | There are no existing cyclist／pedestrian volumes |
| Existing Transit Operations | Are there existing transit facilities within the study area，including bus and train stops／stations？ | 】 | $\square$ | $\square$ | There are limited Bus services off Park Avenue，Bus stops at Park Place and Campus Drive． |
|  | Is the transportation facility on a transit route？ | $\square$ | 】 | $\square$ | This is a local service Morris－ Florham Park－ Madison． |
|  | Is the transportation facility within two miles of＂park and ride＂or＂kiss and go＂lots？ | $\square$ | 】 | $\square$ | There is a RR station（Convent Station on Morris and Essex Line） |
|  | Are there existing or proposed bicycle racks，shelters，or parking available at these lots or transit stations？Are there bike racks on buses that travel along the facility？ | 区 | $\square$ | $\square$ | There are existing bicycle racks at Madison Train Station |
| Existing Motor Vehicle Operations | Are there existing concerns within the study area，regarding motor vehicle safety，traffic volumes／congestion or access？ | 区 | $\square$ | $\square$ | There are safety concerns with the weave from vehicles exiting 24 EB to Park Avenue SB and the volumes in the intersection during the peak periods． |
| Existing Truck／Freight Operations | Are there existing concerns within the study area，regarding truck／freight safety，volumes，or access？ | $\square$ | 】 | $\square$ | No concerns with the truck traffic or volume． |
| Existing Access and Mobility | Are there any existing access or mobility considerations，including ADA compliance？ | 区 | $\square$ | $\square$ | There are no pedestrian crossings or ADA compliant curb ramps within the intersection．There |

## NJDOT Complete Streets Checklist



## NJDOT Complete Streets Checklist

| Item to be Addressed | Checklist Consideration | YES | NO | N/A | Required Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | compatible with pedestrians and cyclists |
| Major Sites | Have you identified the major sites, destinations, and trip generators within or proximate to the study area, including prominent landmarks, employment centers, recreation, commercial, cultural and civic institutions, and public spaces? | ® | $\square$ | $\square$ | Jets Training Camp, <br> Morristown Airport, Numerous office buildings and downtown Florham Park, Madison and Morristown. |
| Existing Streetscape | Are there existing street trees, planters, buffer strips, or other environmental enhancements such as drainage swales within the study area? | $\boxtimes$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | There are street trees, planters, buffer strips or other environmental enhancement. |
| Existing Plans | Are there any comprehensive planning documents that address bicyclist, pedestrian or transit user conditions within or proximate to the study area? <br> Examples include (but are not limited to): <br> - SRTS Travel Plans <br> - Municipal or County Master or Redevelopment Plan <br> - Local, County and Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans <br> - Sidewalk Inventories <br> - MPO Transportation Plan <br> - NJDOT Designated Transit Village | $\boxtimes$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | The following study reports are available: <br> 1. Florham Park Local Traffic Study - 2027 <br> Transportation Needs Assessment Study. <br> 2. Route 24 Interchange and Columbia Turnpike - smart Solution study. <br> 3. Circulation Plan Element Township of Hanover Master Plan <br> 4. Review of Existing \& Future Conditions to various Intersections due to the potential |

## NJDOT Complete Streets Checklist

| Item to be <br> Addressed | Checklist Consideration | YES | NO | N/A | Required <br> Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Redevelopment of <br> the Former Exxon <br> Research facility. |

## PROJECT MANAGER SIGN-OFF

| Statement of Compliance | YES | NO | If NO, Please <br> Describe Why (refer <br> to Exemptions <br> Clause) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The Preliminary Preferred Alternative (PPA) <br> accommodates bicyclists and pedestrians as set forth in <br> the New Jersey Department of Transportation's <br> Complete Streets Policy. | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |

## Appendix " X "

## Life Cycle Cost Analyses <br> (Not Applicable)

## Appendix " $Y$ "

## Systems Engineering Review Form <br> (Not Applicable)

## Appendix "Z"

## Preliminary Engineering Public Involvement Action Plan

## PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTION PLAN (PIAP)

## Improvements at Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange Morris Township, Borough of Florham and Hanover Township Morris County, New Jersey

## PURPOSE:

The purpose of this project is to develop recommendations that would improve the traffic flow between the Route 24 EB Ramp 2A and the Columbia Turnpike intersection with Park Avenue along with providing improvements to the operation of the intersection that could be investigated further.

## PROJECT HISTORY:

Operational Deficiency:
The Route 24 EB Ramp 2A merges with Columbia Turnpike approximately 650' east of the signalized intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue. At this intersection there is a heavy AM left turn movement on the Columbia Turnpike WB approach that currently utilizes a double left turn lane.

Columbia Turnpike WB is impacted by the vehicles entering from Route 24 EB Ramp 2A weaving to the left turn lanes to Park Avenue SB. There is inadequate length for this movement to operate smoothly. This creates congestion that backs up onto the Route 24 mainline during the morning peak.

The intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue operates at or close to capacity during both peak hours. During the morning peak hours, the WB left and SB through movements operate at unacceptable levels of service. During the evening peak hour, the NB approach operates at marginal levels of service.

## DATA COLLECTION:

During this study the information was collected from NJDOT management system units especially from CMS, Value Engineering, ROW, Bureau of Landscape Architecture and Environmental Solutions, crash data, and as-built plans.

## CRASH DATA:

Crash Data were obtained from NJDOT and county personals. As the project is not on NJDOT road, the crash analysis was not available. The following response from NJDOT Safety Management System:

Route 24, MP 2.09, EB Ramp to CR 510 is within limits of Route 24, MP 0.2 to 2.20, roadway segment which is ranked \#69 on our preliminary 2015 NJDOT Corridor Segment List (2011-2013 crash data). This list has not been approved to date but we expect final approval soon. We do not expect the ranking to change significantly. Upon final approval, we will provide you with the final ranking.

In response to your Safety Management System ranking request for CR 510 (Columbia Avenue), Park Avenue to Route 24, MP 14.23 to 14.60, and the signalized intersection of Columbia Avenue and Park Avenue, MP 14.23, Hanover and Morris Townships, Morris County, we are unable to provide a ranking. Our Safety Management System provides rankings for locations under the state's jurisdiction, this location, per SLD, appears to be under the jurisdiction of the county.


## Project Location Map

## PIAP GOALS:

Public participation is required to ensure that the community's issues and concerns are identified and addressed in the study outcome and consequently achieve community "ownership" of the proposed project. Public participation is a critical element in the successful implementation of the NJDOT Transportation Program. The PIAP goals are:

- Promote an on-going public partnership between the Department and the community where the project is located.
- Ensure early, frequent and continuous consultation with the public, notification of the affected parties, and provide opportunities for citizen in put in the identification of the solutions.
- Assist in building public support for, and agreement on the problem definition.
- Identify early in the process any potential "fatal flaws" that would prevent the advancement of the project or its ability to adequately address the identified problem(s) and the identification of potential impacts associated with each identified solutions.

The PIAP is intended to establish a public involvement process that is dynamic in nature so that it can evolve with the progress of the project, and serve as a framework for Public Involvement through the other phases of project development.

## PIAP IMPLEMENTATION:

The Concept Development phase of the project development includes the collection, review and analysis of background data and existing physical features; the development of alternatives; and the selection the PPA.

The proposed public involvement process during the Preliminary Engineering Phase is outlined as follows:

## Communication Methods

1. Develop and maintain a contact/mailing list of key project stakeholders, including, but not limited to, County and Township Officials, property owners, businesses, neighborhood associations, civic and cultural groups, environmental organizations, associations of low income, minority, elderly, and disabled constituents, etc. An initial stakeholders list can be found on page 6 (six) of this document. Stakeholders may be added throughout the project process as pertinent individuals/groups become evident.
2. Investigate the need for a Community Advisory Committee and/or a Business Advisory Committee to allow for efficient coordination between the community and its businesses with the NJDOT.
3. Develop visualization techniques, such as display boards, site photographs and traffic simulations prior to meetings to be utilized, where appropriate, to illustrate various concepts. Prepare handouts/fact sheets for distribution for each meeting summarizing the project status, various alternatives and eventually the PPA.
4. Identify and develop appropriate communication methods based on the results of the Environmental Justice Screening and input from OCR that may include, where appropriate, handouts/fact sheets in foreign languages, notices in foreign language newspapers, availability of interpreters, etc.

## Meetings

1. If deemed necessary, hold smaller key stakeholder meetings with property owners, businesses, neighborhood associations, Parent Teacher Associations, civic and cultural groups, environmental organizations, associations of low income, minority, elderly, and disabled constituents, etc., who might be impacted by the project.
2. Hold a Local Officials Briefing - Governing Body to present the PPA to the Morris Township, Borough of Florham and Hanover Township for their acceptance and to request a Resolution of Support from each entity for the project. Minutes of the meeting will be prepared and distributed to the attendees for comment.
3. Hold Public Information Center (PIC) to solicit public comments on the project. Minutes of the meeting will be prepared and distributed for comment.

Evaluate the Public Involvement and make recommendations for the (Final Design Phase). This will ensure that the public involvement efforts remain seamless from one project development phase to another.

## Preliminary Engineering Meeting Schedule:

| Activity | Target Audience | Objective | Tentative |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Local Officials <br> Briefing - Governing <br> Body | County and <br> Municipal Officials | Present the project <br> to officials for their <br> acceptance; <br> Request a Resolution <br> of Support | TBD |
| Public Information <br> Center (PIC) | General Public, <br> impacted and <br> interested parties, <br> key stakeholders, <br> etc. | Present project and <br> solicit comments | TBD |

## PIAP DELIVERABLES:

## Meeting Minutes:

Minutes will be prepared for all public involvement meetings. The minutes will be comprehensive and include an action item list. The minutes will be completed within five (5) business days of the meeting and distributed to all of the attendees.

## Display Boards:

Display boards will be utilized to illustrate the proposed improvements to the local officials and the public. Project display boards may include project aerials and Preliminary Engineering Plans.

## KEY PROJECTS STAKEHOLDERS

The following is a list of the key stakeholders identified to date for this project:

| Morris County |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Christopher Vitz - Engineer | 973-285-6758 | cvitz@co.morris.nj.us |
| Danielle Ferland - Asst. Bridge Engineer | 973-829-8622 | dferland@co.morris.nj.us |
| Morris Township |  |  |
| Peter Mancuso - Twp. Committee | 973-704-1937 | mancuso@att.net |
| Jim Slate | 973-326-7443 | jslate@morristwp.com |
| Lt. Ed Conrads - Morris Twp. PD | 973-326-7454 | econrads@mtpd1422.com |
| Mark Osterhoudt -Morris Twp. PD | 973-326-7436 | mosterhoudt@mtpd1422.com |
| Jesse Kaar - Morris Twp. FD | 973-326-7462 | jkaar@morristwp.com |
| Borough of Florham Park |  |  |
| Mark Taylor - Mayor | 973-410-5302 | mtaylor@fpboro.net |
| Michael Sgaramella - Engineer | 973-410-5473 | msgaramella@fpboro.net |
| Chief Robert Treiber - Florham Park PD | 973-377-2200 | 532@fppd.net |
| Joseph Orlando - Florham Park PD | 973-410-5440 | 545@fppd.net |
| Hanover Township |  |  |
| Dave Leo - Engineering | 973-428-2489 | dleo@hanovertownship.com |
| Bryan Pilipie - Hanover PD | 973-428-2512 | bpilipie@hanoverpolice.com |
| Borough of Chatham |  |  |
| Steve Williams - Administrator | 973-701-6807 | swilliams@chathamborough.org |
| Borough of Madison |  |  |
| Robert Vogel - Engineer | 973-593-3060 | vogelr@rosenet.org |
| Whippany Township |  |  |
| Joe Cortright - Whippany FD | 973-703-0285 | jcortright@whippanyfire.com |
| Stakeholders may be added throughout the project as pertinent individuals/groups become evident. |  |  |
| Concurrence by |  |  |
| Office of Community and Constituent Relations |  | Date |
| Anthony Sytko 609-530-2110 | Antho | @dot.nj.gov |
| Project Manager, Division of Project Management (DPM) |  | Date |
| Ed D'Arcy 609-530-3631 | Edwar | @dot.nj.gov |
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## Preliminary Engineering Scope Statement

## Preliminary Engineering

## Concept Development Report Improvements at <br> Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike Interchange Morris Township, Borough of Florham and Hannover Township Morris County, New Jersey


#### Abstract

Purpose: The Preliminary Engineering Scope Statement lists the proposed project's deliverables and the activities required to create those deliverables. The scope statement also provides a common understanding of the proposed project's scope to stakeholders, subject matter experts, and the designer and lists the proposed project's major objectives. It enables the Project Manager to perform more detailed planning, it helps guide the design team's work during execution, and provides the baseline for evaluating whether change requests or additional work are contained within or outside the proposed project's boundaries.


Notes: The intent of the Preliminary Engineering (PE) Scope Statement is to provide useful project information to designers who are interested in becoming the designer of record for PE and possibly Final Design and Construction for this project. In addition, it will be used to solicit a man-hour estimate and cost proposal. The PE Scope Statement identifies the key elements of PE that are necessary to advance the proposed project to the Final Design (FD) Phase.

The PE Scope Statement is developed by the Division of Project Management (DPM) Project Manager and the Concept Development (CD) Designer near the conclusion of CD, prior to requesting the services of a designer to perform PE. The Scope of Work section is approved by the appropriate Subject Matter Experts (SME).

Section 1 of the document focuses on Proposed Project Identification Information and CD data including the location and description. Section 2 of the document specifies the Scope of Work for PE.

## PROPOSED PROJECT IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION

## Proposed Project Specifics

| Proposed Project Name | Limits |
| :---: | :---: |
| Concept Development Report <br> Improvements at Route 24 and Columbia Turnpike <br> Interchange, Morris Township, Borough of Florham and <br> Hanover Township <br> Morris County, New Jersey | CR 623 (Park Avenue) - MP 1.57 to MP 2.34 <br> Route 510 (Columbia Turnpike) - MP 14.06 to MP 14.60 |
| NJDOT Project Manager | NJDOT Executive Regional Manager |
| Edward D'Arcy | Atul Shah |
| Counties | Municipalities |
| Morris Select County 2 Select County 3 | Morris Township Hannover Township Borough of Florham Park |
| UPC Number | 154330 |
| DB Number | 15433 |
| Legislative District(s) | $\underline{25} \underline{27}$ |
| Congressional District (s) | $\underline{11}$ |
| Route | Route 510, CR 623 and NJ Route 24 |
| Start Milepost | [ |
| End Milepost | - |
| Alternate Route | - |


|  | - |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $\overline{-}$ |
|  | $\underline{\text { FY 2016-2017 Study and Development Program }}$ |
|  | $\overline{ }$ |
|  | $\underline{6-\text { Intersection Improvements }}$ |
|  | $\underline{\text { NJTPA }}$ |

## Proposed Project Estimate

List the Proposed Project estimates for each category from Concept Development.

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| ROW | $\$$ |
| Utility Relocation | $\$ \quad 452,421.00$ |
| Construction | $\$ 5,026,895.00$ |
| Construction Engineering | $\$ 813,281.00$ |
| Contingencies | $\$ 205,807.00$ |
| Total | $\$ 6,298,404.00$ |

CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION

| Date of Concept Development Report: | Date of Federal Approval of CD Report: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date of CPC decision to advance project to PE: |  |
| CD Designer: | $\square$ In-House |
| PE to be Completed by (check one): | $\square$ Consultant |
| Purpose and Need: The purpose of this project is to develop recommendations that would improve the traffic flow between the |  |
| Route 24 EB Ramp 2A and the Columbia Turnpike intersection with Park Avenue along with providing improvements to the |  |
| operation of the intersection that could be investigated further. |  |
| The Route 24 EB Ramp 2A merges with Columbia Turnpike approximately 650 feet east of the signalized intersection of |  |
| Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue. At this intersection there is a heavy AM left turn movement on the Columbia Turnpike WB |  |
| approach that currently utilizes a double left turn lane. |  |
| Columbia Turnpike WB is impacted by the vehicles entering from Route 24 EB Ramp 2A weaving to the left turn lanes to Park |  |
| Avenue SB. There is inadequate length for this movement to operate smoothly. This creates congestion that backs up onto the |  |
| Route 24 mainline during the morning peak. |  |
| The intersection of Columbia Turnpike and Park Avenue operates at or close to capacity during both peak hours. During the |  |
| morning peak hours, the WB left and SB through movements operate at unacceptable levels of service. During the evening peak |  |
| hour, the NB approach operates at marginal levels of service. |  |
| Description of Preliminary Preferred Alternative: A barrier or island will be constructed on Columbia Turnpike WB to the east |  |

## Morris County, New Jersey

## Preliminary Engineering

of the entering traffic from Route 24 EB Ramp to prevent these vehicles from weaving over to the left onto Park Avenue SB. The ramps to and from Columbia Turnpike EB and Route 24 EB will be modified to bring traffic to Park Avenue at a new signalized intersection. The modifications will accommodate the vehicles that can no longer turn left at Park Avenue from Columbia Turnpike WB. The ramp from Columbia Turnpike EB to Route 24 EB will be closed and traffic diverted to the new ramp connection at Park Avenue.

Project Goals and Objectives: It is the intent of this project to fulfill the purpose and address the needs while minimizing impacts to the environment, quality of life, access, right of way and utilities. Any proposed improvements will consider improvements to circulation, as well as impacts to emergency services and road user costs.

PRELIMINARY ENGINDERING INFORMATION (to be filled in upon selection of a designer)

| PE Designer: | - |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FMIS Contract ID Number (e.g., 89 00766): | - | Funding Source: $\quad$ |
| Agreement Number (e.g., 2001PM03): | - |  |

## Morris County, New Jersey

## Morris County, New Jersey

## Morris County，New Jersey



## Preliminary Engineering Deliverables

| 3．1 Preliminary Engineering Initiation | $\boxtimes$ Utility Agreement | 3．9 Preliminary Engineering Report |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \ Kickoff Meeting Minutes | $\boxtimes$ Subsurface Utility Engineering Test Pit Report | \ Approved Project Plan |
| 3．2 Roadway Engineering | 凹 Updated Base Plans（With Identified Conflicts） | \ Construction Cost Estimate |
| $\boxtimes$ Control Survey Report | $\square$ Railroad Diagnostic Team Meeting Memo of Record | $\boxtimes$ Design Exception Report |
| \ Topographic Survey | 3．6 Quality Management | Q Final Design Scope Statement |
| \ Base Maps | $\square$ PE Quality Management Certification | $\square$ Project Management Plan（Major Projects |
| \ Preliminary Drainage Design Report | 3．7 Communications | $\boxtimes$ Alternatives Analysis Report |
| $\square$ Traffic Engineering Facility Location | $\boxtimes$ Design Communications Report | $\boxtimes$ Core Group Meeting Minutes |
| Q Constructability and Maintenance Review Comments | 3．8 Environmental Documents | $\boxtimes$ Final Design Public Involvement Action Plan |
| $\square$ Preliminary ITS Facility Design Plans | Technical Environmental Studies | Q Complete Streets Checklist |
| $\square$ Updated Preliminary Detour and Construction Staging Plans | $\square$ Air Study | 3．10 Contracts |
| \ Preliminary Roadway Plans | $\square$ Noise Study | Final Design Addendum |
| Q Pavement Design Data | $\square$ Ecology Study | Q Final Design Designer Fee Proposal |
| Q Pavement Recommendation | $\square$ Hazardous Waste Study | Q Final Invoice |
| Lighting Warrant Analysis Report | $\square$ Socio－Economic Study | Final Design Independent Cost Estimate |
| I Initial Deforestation／Reforestation Plan | $\square$ Cultural Resources Study | 区 Summary Independent Cost Estimate Report |
| Preliminary Construction Schedule | Section 4（f） | V Final Design Schedule |
| 3．3 Structural Engineering | $\square$ Individual Section 4（f）Evaluation | $\triangle$ Final Design Budget |
| $\square$ Structural Design Recommendation | $\square$ Programmatic Section 4（f） | \ Notice of Authorization |
| Q Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report | $\square$ De Minimis Section 4（f）Evaluation | 3．11 Preliminary Engineering Approvals |
| 3．4 Right of Way and Access | $\square$ Net Benefit Section 4（f）Evaluation | 【 Capital Program Screening Committee Recommendation |
| Project Access Plan | $\square$ Executive Order 215 （E．O．215） | $\boxtimes$ Capital Program Committee Approval |
| Q Access Impact Summary | $\square$ Environmental Impact Statement | ® FHWA Approval |
| Q Right of Way Report | $\square$ Record of Decision（ROD） |  |
| Q Right of Way Impact Plan | $\square$ Categorical Exclusion Document |  |
| \ Initial Right of Way Estimate | $\square$ Certified Categorical Exclusion |  |
| 3．5 Utility Engineering | Q Environmental Assessment |  |
| $\triangle$ Utility Base Plans | $\square$ Finding of No Significant Impact （FONSI） |  |
| U Utility Letter No． 2 | $\boxtimes$ Environmental Commitments／Plan Sheets |  |
| 《 Utility Engineering Funding Authorization | $\square$ Historic Sites Council Concurrence |  |

Morris County, New Jersey


## Preliminary Engineering

SUMIMARY OF COMMITMIENTS
List any commitments made to the public, local officials or other government agencies:

| Project Commitment | Unit Requesting <br> the Commitment | Unit Fulfilling <br> Commitment | Special Needs |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

List any anticipated commitments that may be made:

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Preliminary Engineering

| APPROVAL | Name | Title |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date Approved |  |  |
|  | Manager <br> Bureau of Landscape Architecture and Environmental Solutions |  |
| Edward D'Arcy | Project Manager <br> Division of Project Management |  |
| Atul Shah | Executive Regional Manager <br> Division of Project Management |  |
|  | Director <br> Division of Project Management |  |

## Morris County, New Jersey

## Preliminary Engineering

## PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING SCOPE OF WORK
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NOTE: The PE Designer will perform the tasks associated with PE as so marked, in preparation for Final Design. The Project Manager will review and negotiate the proposal, execute the Agreement and instruct the designer to begin work. The Project Manager will direct the proposed project through PE.

## Right of Way

| Activity <br> No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 3110 | Prepare ROW Report | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\boxtimes$ Designer |  |
| 3115 | Initiate ROW Impact Plan | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\boxtimes$ Designer |  |
| 3120 | Hold ROW Kickoff Meeting | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\boxtimes$ ROW $\boxtimes$ DPM |  |
| 3125 | Prepare Initial ROW Estimate | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\boxtimes$ ROW $\boxtimes$ DPM |  |

Total Number of Parcels: 11

## 1. Fee Parcel/Easements

| Number of fee parcels (partial): | 10 | Number of fee parcels (entire): | 1 | Number of residential relocations: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of permanent easements <br> (E parcels): |  | Number of temporary easements: |  | Number of commercial relocations: |  |

2. List any known or potential environmental problems or issues that may impact Right of Way processes or decisions (cross reference with the
Environmental section of the Scope Statement document:
$\qquad$
3. List any environmentally sensitive parcels (ESPs), underground storage tanks, freshwater wetlands: wetlands
4. Identify Riparian Parcels (currently flowed), Easements and/or Green Acres Diversions by contacting NJDEP for any Right of Way to be acquired:
5. Identify parcels that can be eliminated by design change modifications and attempts to mitigate damages suffered by the remaining properties. $\qquad$
6. Decision to expand parcel for further use or contingency. $\qquad$ .
$\qquad$
. List the number of Non Real Estate Engineering (NRE) parcels.
7. List any commitments and conditions made to the public or to private property owners that may impact Right of Way processes or decisions: $\qquad$
8. Green Acres mitigation method: $\square$Dollar ReimbursementProperty Replacement

## Preliminary Engineering

## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include number and type of parcels, known environmental problems, riparian parcels, public commitments, etc.

## Access

| Activity <br> No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3105 | Prepare Project Access Plan and Access Impact <br> Summary | Yes $\quad \square$ No | $\boxtimes$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer <br> $\boxtimes$ OAD |  |


| Number of Adjustments: | 1 | Number of Modifications: | 1 | Number of Revocations: | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

1. Note any pending agreements or access applications within the proposed project limits: $\qquad$
2. Are proposed left turn lanes in compliance with the Access Level?Yes
3. Is the proposed Typical Section of the roadway in compliance with the Highway Access Code?YesNo
4. Total No. of Driveways impacted: $\underline{3}$
5. Any commercial properties with access modifications and/or Revocations that have potential impacts to site parking slots, circulations and operation of business? $\qquad$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No If yes, provide details of impact with Block and Lot Nos. $\qquad$
6. Any commercial properties that will require necessary assistance in the establishment of the alternative access (as per NJAC 16:47-4.33)? $\boxtimes$ YesNo If yes, provide details of assistance with Block and Lot Nos. Block 4802-Lot 1, Block 1201-Lot 1
7. Any commercial properties that will require the preparation of an Access Impact Assistance (AIA) report?YesNo If yes, provide Block and Lot Nos. $\qquad$ -

## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include number of driveways impacted, pending agreements or major access permit applications, driveway modifications causing circulation issues, alternative access issues, Access Impact Assistance issues, etc.

## Drainage Management

Regional Maintenance
Hydrology and Hydraulics

| Activity <br> No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3085 | Prepare Preliminary Drainage Design | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\boxtimes$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer |  |

## Drainage Management

1. Identify all existing drainage deficiencies as per the Drainage Management System: None

## Regional Maintenance

2. Identify all existing drainage deficiencies (undersized system, excessive spread into travel lanes, insufficient inlets, flooding at low points, etc.): None Hydrology and Hydraulics
3. List proposed improvements including outfalls (especially tidal): $\qquad$
4. Is compliance with Stormwater Management rules triggered (> $>1 / 4$ acre new impervious surface, or 1 acre disturbance)? $\boxtimes$ YesNo
5. Identify all NJDEP permits required: Freshwater Watlands, Stormwater Management, Highland Rules/Prevention Area, Morris County Soil Conservation District Certification
6. List proposed structural Best Management Practices (BMP) (e.g., Bioretention System, Constructed Wetlands, extended detention basins, infiltration system, wet ponds, porous pavement): Infiltration Basin
7. List proposed nonstructural BMP (e.g., Vegetation and Landscaping, Minimize Site Disturbance, Impervious Area Management, and Time of Concentration Modifications): $\qquad$
$\qquad$ Will property rights need to be acquired? $\boxtimes$ YesNo
8. Identify drainage outflow owner:

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include drainage deficiencies, new/improved ouffalls, storm water management rules, permits, Best Management Practices (structural and non-structural), easements/right-of-way, etc.

## Preliminary Engineering

## Landscape

| Activity <br> No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3010 | Determine and Calculate Deforested Areas | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | BLAES <br> $\boxtimes$ Besigner |  |

1. List any landscape architecture related commitments such as:

| a. Wetland or Riparian Mitigation Planting: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| b. Historic Site commitments |  |
| c. Vegetative Screens or Buffers |  |
| d. Noise Barrier Aesthetics: |  |
| e. Architectural Treatments on Bridge Retaining Walls: |  |
| f. Tree Removal Mitigation: | Extensive tree removal required for the proposed ramp. Mitigation will be required. |
| g. Urban Design Work (paving, streetscapes, etc.): |  |
| h. Aesthetic plantings: |  |
| i. Existing tree preservation and protection: |  |
| j. Reforestation Application: |  |

2. Anticipated visualization work for in-house and public information meetings:

| a. Rendered Plans: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| b. 2D computer generated before \& after photographs: |  |
| c. 3D computer generated mode: |  |
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This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include screens or buffers, aesthetic plantings, mitigation plantings, reforestation, etc.

Environmental

| Activity No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3300 | Initiate Cultural Resources (Section 106) Process | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \boxtimes \text { Designer } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3305 | Conduct CR Survey | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \boxtimes \text { Designer } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3310 | Prepare CR Survey Report | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \square \text { Designer } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3315 | Review CR Survey Report | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\square$ BLAES |  |
| 3320 | Address Comments on CR Survey Report | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \boxtimes \text { Designer } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3325 | Approve CR Survey Report | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\triangle$ blaEs |  |
| 3330 | Obtain SHPO Concurrence (No Resources, No Effect, No Adverse Effect) | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \boxtimes \text { SHPO } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3335 | Prepare Draft MOA (Adverse Effect Only) | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \square \text { Designer } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3340 | Obtain SHPO Concurrence (No Adverse Effect with Conditions or Adverse Effect) | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \boxtimes \text { SHPO } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3345 | Obtain FHWA Approval of CR Survey Report | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\boxtimes} \text { FHWA } \\ & \square \text { BLAES } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3350 | Prepare Adverse Effect Documentation \& Submit to FHWA (Adverse Effect Only) | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES |  |
| 3355 | FHWA Sends Adverse Effect Documentation to ACHP | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ FHWA |  |
| 3360 | ACHP Reviews and Accepts or Declines Participation | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square \mathrm{ACHP}$ |  |
| 3365 | Resolve Adverse Effects | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \square \text { FHWA } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3370 | Circulate MOA for Comment | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES |  |

## Morris County, New Jersey

## Preliminary Engineering

| 3375 | Prepare Final MOA | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3380 | Execute the MOA | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \square \text { DPM } \\ & \square \text { FHWA } \square \text { ACHP } \\ & \square \text { SHPO } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3390 | Submit Historic Sites Council Application | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES $\square$ Designer $\square$ SHPO |  |
| 3395 | Present to Historic Sites Council | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES $\square$ Historic Sites Council |  |
| 3400 | Inform Jurisdictional Agency Regarding Programmatic Section 4(f) Impacts | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES |  |
| 3405 | Receive Concurrence Regarding Programmatic Section 4(f) Impacts | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ Jurisdictional Agencies |  |
| 3410 | Prepare Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \square \text { Designer } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3420 | Prepare De Minimis Section 4(f) Evaluation | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \square \text { Designer } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3425 | Prepare Programmatic Net Benefit Section 4(f) Evaluation | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \square \text { Designer } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3430 | NJDOT Reviews Programmatic Section 4(f) <br> Evaluation | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES |  |
| 3435 | Revise Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation (NJDOT Comments) | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES $\square$ Designer |  |
| 3440 | FHWA Reviews Programmatic Section 4(f) <br> Evaluation | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ FHWA |  |
| 3445 | Revise Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation (FHWA Comments) | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES $\square$ Designer $\square$ FHWA |  |
| 3450 | FHWA Approves Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ FHWA |  |
| 3460 | Inform Jurisdictional Agency Regarding Draft Individual Section 4(f) Impacts | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES |  |
| 3465 | Receive Concurrence Regarding Draft Individual Section 4(f) Impacts | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ Jurisdictional Agencies |  |

## Preliminary Engineering

$\left.\begin{array}{|c|l|l|l|l|}\hline 3470 & \text { Prepare Draft Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation } & \square \text { Yes } \boxtimes \text { No } & \square \text { BLAES } \\ \square \text { Designer }\end{array}\right]$
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| 3555 | Revise EA (NJDOT Comments) | $\square$ Yes $\triangle$ No | $\square$ Designer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3560 | FHWA Reviews EA | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ FHWA |  |
| 3565 | Revise EA (FHWA Comments) | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \square \text { Designer } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3570 | FHWA Approves EA | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ FHWA |  |
| 3575 | Conduct Draft Individual Section 4(f) Legal Sufficiency Review (EA) | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES $\square$ Designer $\square$ FHWA |  |
| 3580 | Circulate EA | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES |  |
| 3585 | Hold EA Public Hearing and Comment Period | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \square \text { Designer } \square \mathrm{CCR} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3590 | Address EA Comments | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES $\square$ Designer $\square$ FHWA |  |
| 3595 | Submit FONSI Request Package | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES |  |
| 3600 | FHWA Approves Final Individual Section 4(f) (EA) | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ FHWA |  |
| 3605 | FHWA Reviews and Issues FONSI | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ FHWA |  |
| 3610 | Publish Notice of FONSI Availability | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No |  |  |
| 3620 | Publish Notice of Intent in Federal Register (EIS Only) | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \\ & \square \text { FHWA } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3625 | Invite Cooperating Agencies (EIS Only) | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ FHWA |  |
| 3630 | Hold NEPA Scope Meeting (EIS Only) | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ BLAES $\square$ DPM $\square$ Designer $\square$ FHWA |  |
| 3635 | Prepare Alternatives Analysis Report | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { BLAES } \square \text { DPM } \\ & \square \text { Designer } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3640 | Prepare DEIS or DEIS/4(f) | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ Designer |  |

## Preliminary Engineering

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline 3645 & \text { NJDOT Reviews DEIS } & \square \text { Yes } \boxtimes \text { No } & \square \text { BLAES } & \\ \hline 3650 & \text { Revise DEIS (NJDOT Comments) } & \square \text { Yes } \boxtimes \text { No } & \square \text { Designer } & \\ \hline 3655 & \text { FHWA Reviews DEIS } & \square \text { Yes } \boxtimes \text { No } & \square \text { FHWA } & \\ \hline 3660 & \text { Revise DEIS (FHWA Comments) } & \square \text { Yes } \boxtimes \text { No } & \square \text { BLAES } \\ \square & \text { Designer }\end{array}\right]$

## Preliminary Engineering

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline 3730 & \text { FHWA Publishes ROD in Federal Register } & \square \text { Yes } \boxtimes \text { No } & \square \text { FHWA } & \\ \hline 3735 & \text { Circulate FEIS } & \square \text { Yes } \boxtimes \text { No } & \square \text { BLAES } \\ \square & \text { Designer } & \\ \hline 3740 & \text { Conduct Air Quality Study } & \boxtimes \text { Yes } \square \text { No } & \begin{array}{l}\text { BLAES } \\ \text { Designer }\end{array} & \\ \hline 3745 & \text { Prepare Air Quality TES } & \square \text { Yes } \boxtimes \text { No } & \square \text { BLAES } \\ \square \text { Designer }\end{array}\right]$
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$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline 3825 & \text { NJDOT Reviews Noise TES } & \square \text { Yes } \boxtimes \text { No } & \square \text { BLAES } & \\ \hline 3830 & \text { Address Noise TES Comments } & \square \text { Yes } \boxtimes \text { No } & \square \text { BLAES } \\ \square \text { Designer }\end{array}\right]$

## Preliminary Engineering

| 3940 | Address NJDEP Comments and Prepare Final EO <br> 215 Document | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | $\square$ BLAES <br> $\square$ Designer |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3945 | NJDEP Approves EO 215 Document | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No |  |  |
| $\square$ NJDEP |  |  |  |  |

Anticipated Environmental Document:CCED CEDEAEISEO 215

Total Number of Permits: 3

1. List any environmental impacts and/or issues: $\qquad$
2. List any environmental commitments (made in approved environmental documents, through Memoranda of Agreement with environmental agencies, other commitments made to the public, local officials or other government agencies such as 4f, Section 106 (historic architecture, archaeology), air, noise, hazardous waste and ecology: $\qquad$ —
3. Check the environmental clearances or permits required on the project:

## Federal

$\square$ U.S. Coast Guard (Bridge)
$\square$ USACOE Section 404 (Individual/Nationwide) discharge of fillUSACOE Section 10 (Navigable Waters) USACOE Section 9 (Dam or Dike)
National (or State) Wild \& Scenic RiversUSDOA Forms AS-1006Section 7 Endangered Species Consultation State
CAFRANJDEP Water Lowering NJDEP RiparianHazardous Waste Site Investigation (SI/RI) HazWaste Remedial Action Work plan NJDEP Sanitary Facilities

## Other

Hackensack Meadowlands CommissionPinelands CommissionNJDEP Tidal Wetlands NJDEP Waterfront Development NJDEP Freshwater WetlandsNJDEP Pollutant Discharge NJDEP Flood Hazard Area NJDEP Water Quality Certificate ® NJDEP NJPDES Stormwater Construction GP (RFA)
## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include a list of the anticipated NEPA document, type of permits anticipated, anticipated environmental impacts and environmental commitments made in CD if any, etc.

It is anticipated that an EA or an EIS Document will be required.

Risk \& Value Engincering

| Activity <br> No. Activity Name Execute Responsible Unit Comments <br>   $\square$ Yes $\square$ No   |
| :--- |
| Total Estimated Cost including Construction, ROW and Utilities: |
| Value Engineering Analysis Performed? |
| Risk Analysis to be Performed? |

## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include Value Engineering Analysis, Risk Analysis, and Cost information
An extensive Value Engineering Analysis was performed prior to Concept Development.
A Risk Register was prepared during Concept Development.
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## Utilities

| Activity No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3035 | Prepare Utility Base Plans | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\triangle$ Designer |  |
| 3040 | Establish Utility Engineering Funding | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\boxtimes$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer $\boxtimes$ Program Coord. |  |
| 3045 | Send Letter No. 2 and Plans to Utility Company | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { DPM } \triangle \text { Designer } \\ & \square \text { Utility Co. } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3050 | Prepare Utility Agreement | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\boxtimes$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer |  |
| 3055 | Update Base Plans and Identify Conflicts | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { DPM } \boxtimes \text { Designer } \\ & \square \text { Utility Co. } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3060 | Execute Utility Agreement | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \boxtimes \text { DPM } \boxtimes \text { Utility Co. } \\ & \boxtimes \text { DAG } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3080 | Conduct Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\square$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer $\boxtimes$ SUE Contractor $\square$ Utility Co. |  |
| 3985 | Update Utility Risk Assessment Plan | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\square$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer |  |

Total Number of Utility Companies:

| Utility Type | Utility Company | Size (Units of Measure) | Location (aeria//underground) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gas | PSE\&G, NJ Natural Gas | Pipe | Underground |
| Electric | JCP\&L | Polts | Overhead |
| Cable | Cablevision | Pairs/ Strands | Overhead |
| Telephone | Verizon | Pipe | Overhead |
| Water | Southeast Morris County Municipal <br> Utility Authority (SMCMUA) | Pipe |  |
| Sewer | Morris Township Sewer |  | Underground |
| Fiber-Optic (non-Department) |  |  |  |
| Other: | Algonquin Gas Transmission Line |  | Underground |
| Other: | Texas Eastern Gas Transmission Line |  | Underground |
| Other: |  |  |  |
| Other: |  |  |  |
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1. Identify if the Utility Discover and Verification requires sub-surface utility exploration: no
2. Is a SUE (Subsurface Utility Engineering) Consultant required? $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No
3. Identify Potential Conflicts: $\qquad$ -
4. Identify Temporary Relocations that are needed during construction: $\qquad$
5. Number of poles? Approximately 25
6. Number of guy wires on existing poles? Approximately 8
7. Are there cell towers or substations? $\qquad$ _
8. Can utility relocations be avoided or performed in advance of the project? Advance of the project
9. Can utility design/construction be performed by designer/contractor? $\qquad$ -
10. Can ROW needed for utilities be identified? Yes

## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include location of cell towers, location/presence of fiber optic lines, etc.

## Preliminary Engineering

## Jurisdiction

| Activity <br> No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No |  |  |

Total Number of Maps: $\qquad$ Total Number of Agreements: Are there streetscape or esthetic items intended for this project? $\qquad$ YesNoYesNoNA

## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include the anticipated number of maps and agreements, presence of streetscape or aesthetic treatments, local approval of such, etc.

Geometrics \& Roadway

| Activity <br> No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3030 | Prepare Horizontal \& Vertical Geometry | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\square$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer |  |
| 3070 | Prepare Preliminary Roadway Plans | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\square$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer |  |
| 3135 | Prepare Construction Cost Estimate | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\square$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 3165 | Finalize Project Plan | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\boxtimes$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer |  |

Construction Plans/Estimated Number of Sheets

| Roadway and Bridges |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Key Map | 30 | Grades | $\underline{5}$ | Method of Cross Sections |
| $\underline{2}$ | Estimate-Distribution of Quantities | 30 | Traffic Control and Staging Plans | $\underline{60}$ | Cross Sections |
| 3 | Typical Sections | 30 | Traffic Control Plans | 10 | Alternate Retaining Wall System |
| 1 | Plan Sheet Index |  | ITS Plans | $\underline{1}$ | Estimate of Quantities - Bridge |
| 30 | Construction Plans | $\underline{5}$ | Electrical Details | $\underline{1}$ | Earthwork Summary |
| 10 | Environmental Plans | $\underline{6}$ | Traffic Signal Plans | 1 | Earthwork Chart Sheet |
| $\underline{8}$ | Profiles | 30 | Highway Lighting Plans | $\underline{5}$ | Non-standard Roadway Construction Details |
| 3 | Ties | $\underline{5}$ | Landscape Plans |  | Non-standard Bridge Construction Details |
|  |  | 30 | Traffic Signing and Striping Plans | 10 | Drainage Plans |
| Right of Way Documents |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Entire Tract Map | 1 | Tabulation Sheets | 11 | Individual Property Maps (IPM) |
| 30 | General Property Parcel Maps | 11 | Parcel Descriptions | $\underline{3}$ | Alignment Sheets |
| Other Documents |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jurisdictional Maps | 30 | Utility Agreements Plans |  | Railroad Crossing Element Plans |
| 1 | Project Specific Specifications |  |  |  |  |
| Are there any additional documents? $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No |  |  |  |  |  |

## Preliminary Engineering

Please identify any additional documents: $\qquad$

1. Existing Roadway(s):

|  | Roadway No. 1 | Roadway No. 2 | Roadway No. 3 | Roadway No. $\mathbf{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Roadway Name: | Route 510 (Columbia <br> Turnpike) | CR 623 (Park Avenue) |  |  |
| Posted Speed(s): | 40 MPH | 35 MPH |  |  |
| Highway Classification: | Urban Principal Arterial | Urban Principal Arterial |  |  |
| Significance (local or regional): |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Interchanges: | 1 | 0 |  |  |
| Traffic Volumes: | $24,026(2011)$ | $13,807(2014)$ |  |  |
| Design Speeds: | 45 MPH | 40 MPH |  |  |
| Development Class: |  |  |  |  |
| No. of Traffic Signals: | 1 | 2 |  |  |
| No. of Intersections: | 1 | 2 |  |  |

## 2. Typical Section(s):

|  | Typical Section No. 1 | Typical Section No. 2 | Typical Section No. 3 | Typical Section No. 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right of Way width: | $66^{\prime}$ and varies at intersection | $66^{\prime}$ and varies at intersection |  |  |
| Number of Lanes: | $4-5$ | 4 |  |  |
| Lane width \& cross slope: | $12^{\prime}$, Cross Slope varies | $12^{\prime}$, Cross Slope varies |  |  |
| Shoulder width \& cross slope: | 0 | $0^{\prime}-4 '$ |  |  |
| Median width: | $0^{\prime}-4{ }^{\prime}$ |  |  |  |
| Sidewalk/border width: |  |  |  |  |
| Median description and the <br> overall roadway width: | None - curbed | None - Curbed |  |  |

3. Intersection/Interchange (describe the existing intersection and/or interchanges including turning and auxiliary lanes.): $\qquad$
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4. Existing Deficiencies (provide an overview of the existing deficiencies. Geometric: Substandard horizontal and vertical sight distance, insufficient sight triangle, substandard vertical clearance, substandard or no shoulders, acceleration/deceleration lanes, etc. Safety Issues: check crash data for indicators of specific problems. Substandard/nonexistent guiderail, attenuators, pavement condition, skid resistance, median, etc. Note on substandard guiderail: the project limits should be extended to include upgrading any existing substandard guiderail run that extends beyond the proposed work limits as required by the Design Manual.): Non DOT Roads
5. Proposed Improvements (provide a brief narrative of the proposed improvements and how they address the identified deficiencies. Note changes to be made to profiles, alignment, guiderail, and typical section): $\qquad$No

If no, please explain: No shoulders, sidewalk only on southeast corner, No shopping area only offices and bussiness complexes.
7. List any commitments made to the public, local officials or other government agencies: $\qquad$

ADDITIONAL INPUT
This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include a discussion of substandard design elements, design exceptions, and perhaps a quick description of the proposed geometry if it is unusual, commitments made to the community, etc.

The Project Location is not on NJDOT Road

## Preliminary Engineering

## Design Exceptions

| Activity No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3150 | Prepare Design Exception Report | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ DPM $\square$ Designer $\square$ QMS $\square$ State Trans. Engr. $\square$ FHWA |  |

## 1. Design Exception(s):

a. Is a Design Exception required?Yes $\boxtimes \mathrm{N}$
b. List substandard features that are to remain and require Design Exception: County Roadway
c. Has the Design Exception Crash Analysis been received from the Bureau of Safety Programs?YesNo
d. Has the Design Exception Crash Data for each controlling substandard design element been requested from the Bureau of SafetyYesNo Programs?
e. Has FHWA provided preliminary concurrence on the Design Exceptions decisions (a) and (b) above?Yes $\boxtimes \mathrm{N}$
f. Has Value Solutions provided Reasonable Assurance on the Design Exceptions decisions (a) and (b) aboveYes $\checkmark$ No

[^8]
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## Pavement

| Activity No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3960 | Obtain Pavement Design Data | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\boxtimes$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer |  |
| 3970 | Collect Existing Pavement and Subgrade Soil Information | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\square$ Pvmt. Design Unit <br> Q Designer |  |
| 3975 | Conduct Pavement Testing Program | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Pvmt. Design Unit } \\ & \boxtimes \text { Designer } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3995 | Preform Pavement Lifecycle Cost Analysis | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Pvmt. Design Unit } \\ & \boxtimes \text { Designer } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3980 | Prepare Pavement Recommendation | $\triangle$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pvmt. Design Unit } \\ & \boxtimes \text { Designer } \end{aligned}$ |  |

## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include evidence of subsurface drainage issues, settlement problems, stability problems, etc.

The Project Location is not on NJDOT Road

## Structures

| Activity <br> No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3100 | Prepare Structural Design Recommendation <br> Summary | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ Designer <br> $\square$ SME's |  |


| Total Number of New Bridges: |  | Total Number of New Spans: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Number of Rehab Bridges: | Total Number of Rehab Spans: |  |  |
| Total Number of Replacement Bridges: |  | Total Number of Replacement Spans: |  |

## 1. Condition of existing bridge(s):

|  | Bridge No. 1 | Bridge No. 2 | Bridge No. 3 | Bridge No. 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a. NJDOT Structure Number: |  |  |  |  |
| b. Year Built: |  |  |  |  |
| c. Date/type of any major modifications: |  |  |  |  |
| d. Type \& material of superstructure: |  |  |  |  |
| e. Type and material of substructure: |  |  |  |  |
| f. Feature that is spanned: |  |  |  |  |
| g. Type of roadway it carries: |  |  |  |  |
| h. Vertical Clearance of structure if it <br> spans a roadway or railroad: |  |  |  |  |
| i. Number of Spans: |  |  |  |  |
| j. Length of Structure: |  |  |  |  |
| k. Width of Structure: |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Horizontal Clearance of the <br> pier/abutment with respect to the riding <br> lane: |  |  |  |  |
| m. Typical Section (number of lanes, width <br> and cross slope and width of each <br> sidewalk): |  |  |  |  |

## Preliminary Engineering

|  | Bridge No. 1 | Bridge No. 2 | Bridge No. 3 | Bridge No. 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| n. Parapet railing Type: |  |  |  |  |
| o. Identify the structural deficiencies: |  |  |  |  |
| p. Bridges over waterways <br> scouring evaluation, bridge openifify <br> capacity, and frequency of storm): |  |  |  |  |

## 2. Proposed Bridge(s)/Bridge Improvements:

|  | Bridge No. 1 | Bridge No. 2 | Bridge No. 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a. Number of spans: |  |  |  |
| b. Identify the type of maintenance of <br> traffic that will be used (staging or detour): |  |  |  |
| c. Identify the changes to the typical <br> section of the existing structure: |  |  |  |
| d. Vertical Clearance of structure if it <br> spans a roadway or railroad: |  |  |  |
| e. Length of Structure: |  |  |  |
| f. Width of Structure: |  |  |  |
| g. Horizontal Clearance of the <br> pier/abutment with respect to the riding <br> lane: |  |  |  |
| h. Typical Section (number of lanes, width <br> and cross slope and width of each <br> sidewalk): |  |  |  |
| i. Parapet railing Type: |  |  |  |
| j. Identify the structural deficiencies: |  |  |  |
| k. Coast Guard Permit Required: |  |  |  |

3. Are the minimum vertical clearance requirements over waterways, roadways, railroads met?Yes No
a. If no, please explain? $\qquad$
4. List other substandard features of proposed bridge:
5. Other Existing Structure(s):

## Morris County, New Jersey

## Preliminary Engineering

a. Identify existing minor structures (Noise barriers, Retaining Walls (cast in place or alternate system), Gabions, High Tower Lighting foundations, Pre-cast Culverts, Culvert extensions, Type and number of Overhead Sign Structures): $\underline{2 \text { retaining walls are required for the new }}$ ramp
b. Specify type and number of each substandard feature: $\qquad$
6. Proposed Other Structure(s):

|  | Structure No. 1 | Structure No. 2 | Structure No. 3 | Structure No. 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a. Identify changes in the existing minor <br> structure that are being improved: |  |  |  |  |
| b. List substandard features to be included in <br> the design exception: |  |  |  |  |
| c. Length: |  |  |  |  |
| d. Width: |  |  |  |  |
| e. Number of spans/units: |  |  |  |  |

## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include scour, unusual existing or proposed structural elements, clearances, substandard elements, design exceptions, etc.

Geotechnical

| Activity <br> No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3095 | Prepare Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering <br> Report | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ Geotechnical <br> Engineering Unit <br> $\square$ DPM $\square$ Designer |  |

1. Is there evidence of subsurface drainage problems? no
2. Is there evidence of settlement problems? no
3. Is there evidence of stability problems? no
4. Is there evidence of scour problems? NA
5. Are there existing soil-borings within the project limits? $\qquad$
6. Are there rock slopes/cuts located within the project limits? $\qquad$ -
a. Are the rock cuts listed in the Rockfall Hazard Rating System? $\qquad$
b. Do catchment areas need to be cleaned or modified? $\qquad$
c. Are there apparent safety problems with protruding rock, sight lines, rock-fall and substandard existing mitigation measures? $\qquad$
7. Alternate site exploration (test pits)? $\qquad$

ADDITIONAL INPUT
This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include rock slope issues, soil borings, scour, unusual existing or proposed structural elements, clearances, etc.
Retaining Walls are required

Survey

| Activity No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3015 | Prepare Control Survey Report | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { DPM } \boxtimes \text { Designer } \\ & \square \text { Geodetic Survey } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3020 | Conduct Topographic Survey | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \boxtimes \text { Designer } \\ & \square \text { Geodetic Survey } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 3025 | Prepare Base Maps | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\square$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer $\square$ Geodetic Survey $\square$ CADD Support |  |

1. Identify available mapping information (aerial/conventional methods): aerial
2. How were the existing and proposed baselines established? NA
3. How were the existing and proposed ROW lines established? tax records
4. How was the horizontal and vertical control established; and which existing monumentation was used? NA
5. Is project in Tidal area?YesNo
If yes, then current mean high water elevation must be established in tidal water areas under Tidelands Bureau jurisdiction. $\qquad$
6. Has NJDOT Regional Survey office been contacted regarding existing Control, and as-built plans within the project? NA
7. Compliance with MAP filing law required? $\boxtimes$ YesNo
8. Has NJDOT Geodetic Survey been contacted regarding existing control within the project?YesNo
9. Does Primary Control exist within the project limits or immediately adjacent to the project?Yes $\boxtimes$ No If yes, what year was control established in? $\qquad$ If no, will primary control be required? yes
10. Will plans be developed from aerial photogrammetry or as-built plans and conventional survey? Conventional Survey
11. Geodetic Survey Services will be provided by:In-HouseConsultant

## Morris County, New Jersey
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This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include base mapping obtained in CD, tidal issues, compliance with MAP filing laws, geodetic control issues, etc.

## Preliminary Engineering

Railroads

| Activity No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3075 | Hold Diagnostic Team Meeting | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No |  <br> Safety Unit <br> $\square$ DPM $\quad \square$ <br> Designer |  |


| Railroads Affected | Select RR Line | Select RR Line 2 | Select RR Line 3 | $\ldots$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

1. Grade Crossings Affected? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No
a. How many? $\qquad$
2. Is there sufficient overhead structure clearance?YesNo
3. Diagnostic Team Meeting Required:Yes No
4. Diagnostic Team Meeting Held: $\qquad$ (DATE)
[^9]
## Preliminary Engineering

Construction

| Activity <br> No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3130 | Update Preliminary Detour and Construction Staging <br> Plans | Yes $\quad \square$ No | $\boxtimes$ <br> Designer $\square$ TSSE <br> SME's |  |
| 3145 | Conduct Constructability and Maintenance Review | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer <br> $\square$ |  |

## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include commitments made to local officials or other agencies, staging details, detour discussion, schedule constraints, utility conflicts, etc.

## Traffic Engineering

| Activity <br> No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3090 | Determine Traffic Engineering Facility Locations | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ TSSE $\square$ Designer |  |


| Number of New Traffic Signals: | 1 | Number of Revised Traffic Signals: | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New overhead signs and sign structures | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\quad \square$ No | Revised overhead signs and sign structures | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No |
| New Guide Signs | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | Revised Guide Signs | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No |
| Number of Roundabouts: | none | Emergency signal pre-emption | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No |
| Revised Highway Lighting | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | Temporary Lighting 'for staging and diversion roadways" | $\square$ Yes $\quad$ No |
| Raised Pavement Markers | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No |  |  |

1. Maintenance of Traffic: (What type of maintenance of traffic will be used during construction, i.e. staging, detour, permanent lane closures, or diversion road): Lane Closer during night hours
2. Identify the number and location of temporary traffic signal(s) required during Staging or Detours: NA
3. Is there an adequate corner ROW cutout for signal equipment installation? $\square$ Yes $\quad$ No
4. Identify if a new or revised traffic signal agreement is required: yes - for the new Park Avenue ramp
5. Identify overhead utility conflicts for traffic signals to be identified and resolved: The roadway widening near intersection will need to relocate the poles.

## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include discussion of need for temporary signals, right-of-way constraints (related to traffic signal equipment), utility conflicts, etc.

Electrical Maintenance

| Activity <br> No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No |  |  |

1. Do any elements of this project scope require additional planned maintenance activities that would necessitate an increase in personnel or equipment resources? $\qquad$ YesNo
If yes, provide details: $\qquad$
2. Do any elements of this project scope include new roadway/electrical appurtenances that would require specialized training, equipment or materials to properly maintain the item (e.g., Vortech drainage chamber, ornamental lighting, and brick pavers)?YesNo
If yes, provide details: $\qquad$
3. Does this project scope include or overlap sections of roadway that are simultaneously being planned or scheduled for Operations maintenance/construction activities?$\square$ YesNo
If yes, provide details: $\qquad$
consideration be given to canceling or postponing the Operations activity?YesNo
If yes, provide details: $\qquad$

## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include elements of the design that will necessitate an increase in maintenance personnel or equipment, conflicting or overlapping projects with Operations, etc.

Traffic Operations and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Engineering

| Activity <br> No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3065 | Prepare Preliminary ITS Facility Design | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | Designer $\square$ ITS <br> $\square$ Traffic Ops |  |

1. Project scope complies with the requirements of the latest ITS Investment Strategy and ITS Architecture? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No
2. Traffic Operations (North/ South) has been consulted for needs and impacts? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No Identify needs and impacts.
3. Transportation Data Development has been consulted for needs and impacts? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No Identify needs and impacts.
4. Project limits have been visually inspected for the existing ITS facilities?YesNo
5. Check if the project includes the construction or relocation of any of the following Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) facilities:Controlled Traffic Signal Systems (CTSS)
Weigh-in-Motion (WIM)Dynamic Message Signs (DMS) Roadway Weather Information Systems (RWIS) Highway Advisory Radio (HAR) In-Road SensorsTraffic Detection systems
Closed Circuit TV Cameras (CCTV)Fiber Optic Conduit and/or Cable Traffic Volume Stationsstems
Electrical or Communicatio
Other ITS Devices:
6. Check if real time work zone ITS Systems are to be deployed during construction:Queue Detection
Variable Speed Limit or AdvisoryDynamic Merge

## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include compliance with latest ITS Investment Strategy and Architecture, consultation with Traffic Ops during CD, etc.
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Commuter Mobility

| Activity <br> No. | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No |  |  |

## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

Examples of information for this section include bicycle and pedestrian compatibility, Complete Streets compliance, presence of bus stops, interruption of pedestrian accommodations during construction, ADA issues, etc.

Technical and Administrative Activities

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Activity } \\ \text { No. }\end{array}$ | Activity Name | Execute | Responsible Unit | Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3005 | Initiate Preliminary Engineering | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\square$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer |  |
| 3160 | Prepare Draft Preliminary Engineering Report | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\square$ DPM $\boxtimes$ Designer |  |
| 3170 | Prepare Final Design Scope Statement | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\square$ SME's $\square$ DPM |  |
| $\boxtimes$ Designer |  |  |  |  |$]$


| 3255 | Develop FD Budget | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ DPM $\square$ OSBM |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3260 | Finalize FD Budget | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ DPM |  |
| 3265 | Approve FD Budget | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ DPM $\square$ OSBM |  |
| 3270 | Authorize Final Design | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ DPM $\square$ CIPD |  |
| 3275 | Execute FD Addendum | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | $\square$ DPM $\square$ Designer |  |
| 3285 | Complete PE Closeout | $\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No | $\boxtimes$ DPM |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. Have the objectives of the Public Involvement Action Plan (PIAP) been satisfied? $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No
2. Number of Local Workshop Meetings conducted in CD: none
3. Public Information Centers conducted in CD (number of meetings, location $\&$ dates): none
4. Number of Officials Briefings conducted in Concept Development: $\underline{1}$
5. List Issues, Commitments or Concerns: $\qquad$
6. Is the mailing list up to date?Yes
7. Are the Displays adequate to reuse in PE: $\boxtimes$ YesNo
8. Resolution of Support Number: $\qquad$
Resolution of Support Date: $\qquad$

## 9. Other Coordination:

a. List additional organizations (Historic Society, Chamber of Commerce, Board of Education, Fire Company's etc.) or authorities (NJ Transit, NJ Turnpike, NJ Highway Authority, Port Authority, etc.) that have interest in the project: $\qquad$
b. Proposed Formal Public Involvement Program (estimate number of Official Briefings and Public Info Centers/Meetings/Hearings): $\qquad$
c. If additional displays are required, provide the specifics (number, scale, special graphics 3D, simulations, models, etc): $\qquad$
d. If a mailing list is required, provide the approximate number of property owners: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ Consultant?In-house DesignOther (Specify) $\qquad$
e. If handouts are required (provide the specifics, number, size, color or black and white, mapping, etc):
f. List special needs (i.e. Community Involvement Sub-Consultant, Facility Needs, Interpreter, Website, etc.): $\qquad$
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g. Traffic Staging: How many lanes of traffic need to be maintained? $\qquad$
What will be the available working hours? $\qquad$
Can the project duration be significantly reduced by reducing the number of stages? $\qquad$
Can detours be used? detours are lengthy
h. Schedule - Identify scheduling constraints (environmental, seasonal construction limitations, community). $\qquad$
What is the optimum period to start construction? $\qquad$ -
i. Is the scope focused on replacement or rehabilitation of road/bridge? $\qquad$
Is condition likely to change/deteriorate between scoping and construction? no

## ADDITIONAL INPUT

This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

## Preliminary Engineering

Summary of Approvals

| SME Unit | Manager | Approval | SME Involved | Remarks |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right of Way | John Miksits |  |  |  |
| Access | Paul Ignari |  |  |  |
| Drainage Management | Sue Gresavage |  |  |  |
| Regional Maintenance | Nart Appesh |  |  |  |
| Hydrology and Hydraulics | Joseph Sweger |  |  |  |
| Landscape | Joseph Sweger |  |  |  |
| Environmental | Joseph Sweger |  |  |  |
| Risk \& Value Engineering | Robert Siley |  |  |  |
| Utilities |  |  |  |  |
| Jurisdiction |  |  |  |  |
| Geometrics \& Roadway | Robert Abitz |  |  |  |
| Pavement | Sue Gresavage |  |  |  |
| Structures |  |  |  |  |
| Geotechnical |  |  |  |  |
| Survey |  |  |  |  |
| Railroads |  |  |  |  |
| Construction |  |  |  |  |

NJDOT Scope Statement

## Preliminary Engineering

| Traffic Engineering | Chris Barretts |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Electrical Maintenance |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Operations \& ITS |  |  |  |  |
| Commuter Mobility | Eise Bremer-nei |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    Note:
    $* *$ These columns indicate the number of fatal crashes in each accident category. $\begin{array}{lr}\text { Length of Segment } \\ \text { Number of Years } & \square \\ \text { AADT } & \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Length of Segment } & - \\ \text { Number of Years } & \\ \text { AADT } & \end{array}$

    Crash Rate/MVM
    2018 Statewide Crash Rate/MVM

[^1]:    IWangan.comldatalTR\data91130032902\Office Data\Reports\Traffic\TIS revised Honeywell Redevelopment 05-2014.docx

[^2]:    Alt 3B AM Peak - 2020 8:00 am 01/18/2017 2020 Alt 3B AM
    BMS-IH

[^3]:    Data Note: Detail may not sum to totals due to rounding. Hispanic population can be of any race. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 3

[^4]:    Data Note: Detail may not sum to totals due to rounding. Hispanic population can be of any race. N/A means not available
    Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS) 2008-2012.

[^5]:    This report shows environmental, demographic, and EJ indicator values. It shows environmental and demographic raw data (e.g., the estimated concentration of ozone in the air), and also shows what percentile each raw data value represents. These percentiles provide perspective on how the selected block group or buffer area compares to the entire state, EPA region, or nation. For example, if a given location is at the 95th percentile nationwide, this means that only 5 percent of the US population has a higher block group value than the average person in the location being analyzed. The years for which the data are available, and the methods used, vary across these indicators. Important caveats and uncertainties apply to this screening-level information, so it is essential to understand the limitations on appropriate interpretations and applications of these indicators. Please see EJSCREEN documentation for discussion of these issues before using reports.

[^6]:    
    
    
    
    
     before taking any action to address potential EJ concerns.

[^7]:    NJDOT Project Manager / Date

[^8]:    This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

    Examples of information for this section include evidence of subsurface drainage issues, settlement problems, stability problems, etc.
    The Project Location is not on NJDOT Road

[^9]:    This section has been provided for the CD designer and the functional units to state any assumptions, to clarify and customize standard activities, and to add important information. Please be clear and concise. Provide your unit's contact person and number.

    Examples of information for this section include presence of at-grade crossings, overhead structure clearances, diagnostic team meetings, etc.

