



New Castle County Intersection Operations Analysis Summary 2014

May 2014

This page was intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| ; |
|---|
| ŀ |
| 5 |
|) |
| |
| |

List of Figures

| Figure 1: Delay-Based Intersection Level of Service (AM Peak) | . 3 |
|--|-----|
| Figure 2: Delay-Based Intersection Level of Service (PM Peak) | |
| Figure 3: Volume-Based Intersection Level of Service (AM Peak) | .4 |
| Figure 4: Volume-Based Intersection Level of Service (PM Peak) | .4 |
| Figure 5: Intersection Operational Analysis Intersection Prioritization | . 5 |
| Figure 6: Corridor Prioritization for TRS Implementation | . 9 |
| Figure 7: Corridors Undergoing Traffic Responsive Signalization (TRS) Implementation | |

List of Tables

| Table 1: Intersection Operations Analysis: Top Ranking Intersections: LOS E & F | 6 |
|---|---|
| Table 2: Intersection Operations Analysis: Top Ranking Intersections: LOS D | 7 |
| Table 3: Intersection Operations Analysis: Top Ranking Intersections: LOS C | 8 |
| Table 4: Corridor Prioritization for TRS Implementation | 9 |
| Table 5: Theoretical Signal Timing vs. Actual Traffic Flow | |
| 5 5 | |

INTRODUCTION

According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) recently released Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, known as MAP-21 a Congestion Management Process (CMP) is "Within a metropolitan planning area serving a transportation management area, the transportation planning process under this section shall address congestion management through a process that provides for effective management and operation, based on a cooperatively developed and implemented metropolitan-wide strategy, of new and existing transportation facilities eligible for funding under this title and chapter 53 of title 49 through the use of travel demand reduction and operational management strategies."

A CMP is required in metropolitan areas with population exceeding 200,000, known as Transportation Management Areas (TMAs). In TMAs designated as ozone or carbon monoxide nonattainment areas (the Wilmington Area is in non-attainment for ozone) the CMP takes on a greater significance. Federal requirements also state that in all TMAs, the CMP shall be developed and implemented as part of the metropolitan planning process.

The 2014 Intersection Operations Analysis is an outgrowth of the CMP process. It focuses upon the arterial roadway network and analyzes the current performance of the signals along all arterial roadways in New Castle County according to the FHWA's functional classification system. The goal of the analysis is to:

- Produce a regional delay/capacity analysis for signalized intersections along the arterial network.
- Identify which intersections have reached a point of limited capacity available to function efficiently.
- Prioritize intersections which need capital improvement, minor adjustments, or can still be addressed through signal timing efforts.
- Monitor the status and timing of any capital improvements scheduled along with the implementation of Traffic Responsive Signalization (TRS) technology to the identified corridors. This document is to serve as a way to update the decision-makers and members of the public on the progress that is being made.

Why the emphasis on signal timings & coordination?

Throughout the arterial network, research has shown that congestion it is not so much caused by lack of roadway capacity (i.e. number of lanes) but rather the ability of the traffic signals to manage peak period traffic efficiently. The DelDOT TMC has developed their Integrated Transportation Management System (ITMS) to help coordinate and implement advanced signal systems, along with various types of traffic management technologies, and the coordinating human resources that make it all work.

These efforts in producing better performing traffic signalization not only benefit automobile users, but cover all modes of transportation. Bus transit, walkers and bikers are also using the same transportation network and thus there can be times where there are competing demands for traffic movement flows.

What are the benefits of signal timings & coordination?

In 2011, the Philadelphia PA-NJ-DE-MD urban area spent 156 million hours and 75 million gallons of fuel sitting in traffic, which resulted in a congestion cost of about \$3.4 billion dollars.¹

- Cost-Effectiveness: With ever shrinking resources for expansive capital improvements, signal timing/coordination has proven to be one of the most effective methods to improve the throughput of traffic without the addition of through lanes or expanding turning bays. Optimal functioning intersections can eliminate or at least delay the need for expensive new roadway construction projects.
- Reduced air pollution emissions: Reductions in CO2 emissions along with other pollutants can be improved with more efficient traffic flow.
- Reduced Driver Delay: With signals coordinated along a corridor, a driver or mass transit vehicle can reduce the number of stops, thus creating better travel times along the corridor.
- Decreased Fuel Consumption: With shorter travel times and less delay, all residents and transit vehicles will use less fuel.



INTERSECTION OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS— Delay Based Level of Service (LOS)

The 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) defines Level of Service (LOS) for signalized intersections as a function of the average vehicle control delay. LOS may be calculated per movement or per approach for any intersection configuration, but LOS for the intersection as a whole is only defined for signalized and all-way stop configurations. The HCM recommends using delay LOS when determining a systems-based analysis for signalized intersections.

This "delay-LOS" method is used as one of the primary performance measures for identifying areas of congestion within the region. Intersection LOS is collected through a variety of sources. All measures are done for a 2-3 hour period, covering the most common peak period for weekday traffic (6-9am or 7-9am) for the AM period and (3-6pm or 4-7pm) in the PM period.

Figures 1 and 2 show Current AM and PM Level of Service for signalized intersections, identifying intersections which are functioning at LOS E or F in the morning and evening peak periods.

"Delay-Based" Intersection LOS

| LOS | Delay Measure |
|-----|------------------|
| А | under 10 seconds |
| В | 10-20 seconds |
| С | 20-35 seconds |
| D | 35-55 seconds |
| E | 55-80 seconds |
| F | over 80 seconds |



VILMAPCO

INTERSECTION OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS– Volume Based Level of Service (LOS)

This method focuses on "raw" intersection capacity, that is, the ability for an intersection to process a given traffic demand (volume) with a given lane use configuration and given phase sequence. It is a more simple, hands-on approach to get right to the point of an intersection's ability to handle traffic demands. The critical movement summation (CMS) method looks at each of the "critical" movements at an intersection. It is a <u>volume-based</u> measure.

At signalized intersections, capacity for a particular movement is defined by two elements: the maximum rate at which vehicles can pass through a given point in an hour under prevailing conditions, and the ratio of time during which vehicles may enter the intersection.

Figures 3 and 4 show all of the intersections where the volume-based level of service is calculated using the Critical Movement Summation analysis tool, which measures the peak hour traffic volume movements though each leg of the intersection. The LOS breakdown is shown below.

"Volume-Based" Intersection LOS Level of Service Critical Movement Summation (CMS) LOS A Less than 1,000 vehicles/hour LOS B 1,000 to 1,150 vehicles/hour LOS C 1,151 to 1,300 vehicles/hour LOS D 1,301 to 1,450 vehicles/hour LOS E 1,451 to 1,600 vehicles/hour LOS F More than 1,600 vehicles/hour



VILMAPCO

INTERSECTION OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS (cont.)

To take the analysis a little further, each of the intersections determined deficient through the delay-based analysis were additionally studied using the Critical Movement Summation (CMS) methodology. The combination of both methods allows us to quickly see which intersections not only have issues with delay, but have capacity problems as well. The purpose of this is to be able to determine whether a deficient intersection is suffering from a signal timing issue or if it has truly reached a level of volume in which it requires capital improvements. This effort will help determine the extent of demand reduction or capital improvements that are needed to provide an acceptable LOS and provide more efficient traffic flows for commuters and bus transit services.

Results of this effort can be used to provide a performancebased analysis to provide a prioritized list of needed improvements into the statewide Transportation Improvement Program listed each year in the Delaware Capital Transportation Program.

Intersections shown in RED are ones that are showing LOS E of F during the AM or PM peak period. These intersections have issues with capacity and will require strategies that will reduce demand through the intersection or will need capital improvements to improve LOS.

Intersections in ORANGE are unique in that they have acceptable "delay" LOS, but are showing a volume LOS of "E" or "F". Similar to intersections in yellow, these are likely in need of modest improvements unless traffic growth increases, thus needing added improvements.

Intersections in YELLOW are bordering on a deficient level of capacity if traffic demand grows. While not immediately needed, some modest improvements can be made to the intersection.

Intersections in GREEN can function at LOS "C" or better through proper signal timing / phasing. No significant capital improvements are needed unless traffic demand increases.

ID numbers next to each intersection correspond to the charts on pages 6 and 7.



WILMAPCO

INTERSECTION OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS (cont.)

Table 1 shows the LOS data for each intersection that was identified in the Intersection Operational Analysis. The analysis was conducted in two parts:

- Using delay-based LOS analysis, all intersections that were showing an LOS of "E" or "F" in the AM or PM peak were identified.
- Of those that were identified, a capacity –based LOS analysis was performed to determine the amount of capacity remains at that intersection.

The table reveals which intersections that have reached an LOS of E or F through the capacity analysis, which indicates that it has reached the limit of (or is very close to) its ability to handle any more peak period volume at its current configuration and any additional signal timing adjustments are limited as a way to improve LOS.

"Delay-Based" Intersection LOS

| LOS | Delay Measure |
|-----|------------------|
| А | under 10 seconds |
| В | 10-20 seconds |
| С | 20-35 seconds |
| D | 35-55 seconds |
| E | 55-80 seconds |
| F | over 80 seconds |

"Volume-Based" Intersection LOS Level of Service Critical Movement Summation (CMS) LOS A Less than 1,000 vehicles/hour LOS B 1,000 to 1,150 vehicles/hour LOS C 1,151 to 1,300 vehicles/hour LOS D 1,301 to 1,450 vehicles/hour LOS E 1,451 to 1,600 vehicles/hour

| | | Table 1: Inte | ersection | Operations | s Analysis: | Тор Капк | ng interse | ctions: LO | SE&F |
|----|--------|---|-----------|------------|-------------|----------|------------|------------|---|
| a- | | | | AM | PM | | AM | PM | |
| | | | Year of | Delay | Delay | Year of | Volume | Volume | |
| | PERMIT | Intersection | LOS | LOS | LOS | LOS | LOS | LOS | Status |
| ns | N303 | SR 141 & SR 37 (Commons Blvd.) | 2012 | D | F | 2012 | С | E | |
| М | N236 | Foulk Rd. & Murphy Rd. | 2010 | E | С | 2010 | С | E | |
| | N157 | SR 48 & Hercules Rd. | 2009 | D | E | 2009 | D | F | |
| | N156 | SR 48 & SR 141 | 2010 | D | F | 2012 | - | F | |
| | N422T | SR 2 & Cleveland Ave. | 2010 | F | F | 2012 | E | E | |
| | N162 | SR 2 & SR 41 | 2010 | F | F | 2010 | F | F | Intersections are showing either |
| | N021P | SR 141 & Barley Mill Rd. | 2010 | F | E | 2010 | F | F | AM/PM LOS of "E" of "F" using both |
| Э | N337 | SR 273 & Harmony Rd. | 2011 | F | F | 2011 | E | E | LOS methods. For improving LOS, |
| | N188 | SR 896 & Old Baltiomore Pk. | 2010 | F | F | 2010 | F | F | these intersections will require |
| | N225 | SR 7 (Limestone Rd) & SR 4 (Main St.) Stanton | 2011 | D | E | 2012 | D | E | significant reductions in demand |
| | N261 | SR 7 & Skyline Dr. | 2010 | D | F | 2010 | С | F | through the intersection and/or capital |
| | N393 | US 40 & Porter Rd. | 2012 | D | E | 2012 | В | E | improvements. |
| | N217 | US 13 & Bacon Ave/Boulden Blvd. | 2011 | F | F | 2011 | F | F | improvements. |
| | N367 | SR 273 & Chapman Rd (Eagle Run) | 2011 | F | F | 2011 | E | E | |
| | N108 | US 202 & Fairfax Blvd. | 1999 | D | E | 2012 | С | E | |
| | N423T | SR 273 & Main St. | 2008 | F | E | 2012 | С | E | |
| | N211 | SR 141 & Rising Sun Lane | 2000 | F | F | 2012 | С | F | |
| | N590 | SR 273 & Old Ogletown Rd./Paradise Ln. | 2012 | F | F | 2012 | В | E | |
| | N183 | US 13 & SR 273** | 2012 | D | D | 2012 | E | F | Intersections are showing either |
| | N184 | US 13 & US 40 | 2012 | В | D | 2012 | D | F | AM/PM LOS of "E" of "F" using |
| | N317 | SR 2 & Red Mill/Polly Drummond Rd.** | 2011 | D | D | 2011 | D | E | volume LOS methods, but not for |
| | N312 | SR 4 & Harmony Rd.** | 2011 | D | D | 2011 | E | E | delay LOS. For improving LOS, these |
| | N239 | US 40 & SR 72 ** | 2012 | D | D | 2012 | E | С | intersections will require significant |
| | N035P | US 40 & Gov. Sq.** | 2012 | С | D | 2012 | Α | E | reductions in demand through the |
| | N102 | US 202 & Silverside Rd.** | 2012 | С | С | 2012 | Α | E | intersection and/or capital |

Table 1: Intersection Operations Analysis: Top Ranking Intersections: LOS F & F



Intersection Operational Analysis

Table 2 contains intersections which have shown through the capacity-based analysis have an AM and/or PM LOS of "D". While not at the current time showing a pressing need, these intersections are bordering on a deficient level of capacity if traffic growth continues.

These are being viewed as "intersections to watch" as any traffic volume increases, new land use activity or changes in peak period travel conditions could move the intersection into E/F ranges.

While not immediately needed, some modest improvements can be warranted such as:

- Striping alterations
- Safety improvements
- Signal phasing adjustments
- Perform turning movement counts for updated signal timing sequences

"Delay-Based" Intersection LOS

| LOS | Delay Measure |
|-----|------------------|
| А | under 10 seconds |
| В | 10-20 seconds |
| С | 20-35 seconds |
| D | 35-55 seconds |
| Е | 55-80 seconds |
| F | over 80 seconds |

"Volume-Based" Intersection LOS Level of Service Critical Movement Summation (CMS) LOS A Less than 1,000 vehicles/hour LOS B 1,000 to 1,150 vehicles/hour LOS C 1,151 to 1,300 vehicles/hour LOS D 1,301 to 1,450 vehicles/hour LOS E 1,451 to 1,600 vehicles/hour

LOS E 1,451 to 1,600 vehicles/hour

| Table 2: Inte | Table 2: Intersection Operations Analysis: Top Ranking Intersections (cont.) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------|----------|---------|-----------|-----------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Year of | AM Delay | PM Delay | Year of | AM Volume | PM Volume | | | | | | |
| Intersection | LOS | LOS | LOS | LOS | LOS | LOS | Status | | | | | |
| SR 261 (Foulk Rd.) & Silverside Rd. | 2010 | D | E | 2010 | В | D | | | | | | |
| SR 41 & Brackenville Rd. | 2009 | D | С | 2009 | D | С | | | | | | |
| SR 48 & Loveville Rd. | 2012 | F | С | 2012 | D | А | | | | | | |
| SR 48 & Centerville Rd. | 2010 | C | С | 2012 | D | D | | | | | | |
| SR 2 (Kirkwood Hwy) & Harmony Rd. | 2011 | D | С | | | D | | | | | | |
| SR 2 & Milltown Rd. | 2012 | С | D | 2012 | А | D | | | | | | |
| SR 2 (Kirkwood Hwy) & SR 7 (Limestone Rd.) | 2011 | E | E | 2011 | С | D | | | | | | |
| SR 2 & Duncan Rd. | 2012 | D | D | 2012 | А | D | | | | | | |
| SR 141 & SR 100 | 2010 | D | E | 2010 | С | D | | | | | | |
| Cleveland Ave. & Paper Mill Rd./ N. Chapel St. | 2005 | E | F | 2012 | В | D | | | | | | |
| SR 4 & SR 7/JP Morgan Ent. | 2012 | С | С | 2012 | В | D | Intersections are | | | | | |
| SR 7/ SR 4 & Telegraph Rd. | 2012 | В | С | 2012 | С | D | bordering on a | | | | | |
| SR 4 (EB) & Stanton Rd. | 2012 | В | В | 2012 | Α | D | deficient level of | | | | | |
| SR 4 & Salem Church Rd. | 2010 | E | D | 2010 | В | D | capacity if traffic | | | | | |
| SR 4 & Samoset Dr. | 2010 | F | F | 2010 | В | D | growth continues. | | | | | |
| SR 896 (Glasgow Ave.E) & Porter Rd. | 2010 | D | E | 2010 | В | D | While not | | | | | |
| SR 896 (S. College Ave.) & Corporate Blvd. (GBC | 2011 | С | F | 2011 | В | D | immediately | | | | | |
| SR 896 & Welsh Tract Rd. | 2012 | F | F | 2012 | В | D | needed, some | | | | | |
| SR 41 & Faulkland Rd. | 2011 | E | E | 2011 | D | В | modest | | | | | |
| SR 299 & Silver Lake Rd. | 2012 | D | E | 2012 | С | D | improvements can | | | | | |
| SR 7 & Milltown Rd. | 2010 | F | F | 2010 | С | D | be warranted. | | | | | |
| US 40 & Church Rd. | 2012 | С | С | 2012 | В | D | be warranted. | | | | | |
| US 13 & Harrison Ave. | 0 | | | 2012 | D | D | | | | | | |
| US 13 & Roosevelt Ave. | 0 | | | 2012 | D | D | | | | | | |
| US 13 & Hamburg Rd | 2012 | С | С | 2012 | D | D | | | | | | |
| US 13 & Llangollen Blvd. | 2012 | E | С | 2012 | D | С | | | | | | |
| SR 273 & SR 1 SB Ramp | 2012 | D | С | 2012 | В | D | | | | | | |
| US 202 & Powder Mill/Murphy Rd. | 1999 | F | F | 2012 | В | D | | | | | | |
| US 202 & SR 92 Naamans Rd. | 2010 | D | D | 2010 | В | D | | | | | | |
| SR 7 & Stanton-Christiana Rd. | 1995 | С | | 2012 | А | D | | | | | | |
| Old Baltimore Pk. & Salem Church Rd. (West) | 2012 | В | D | 2012 | А | D | | | | | | |
| US 301 & Armstrong/Marl Pit Rd. | 2010 | D | С | 2010 | С | D | | | | | | |
| SR 4 (WB) & Stanton Rd. | 2008 | В | С | 2012 | Α | D | | | | | | |



Intersection Operational Analysis

Table 3 contains intersections which have shown through the capacity-based analysis have an AM and/or PM LOS of "C". While not at the current time showing a pressing need, these intersections are bordering on a deficient level of capacity if traffic growth continues.

These are being viewed as Intersections which can function at LOS "C" or better through proper signal timing / phasing. No significant capital improvements are needed unless traffic conditions change significantly.

| "Delay-Based" | Intersection LOS |
|---------------|------------------|
|---------------|------------------|

| LOS | Delay Measure |
|-----|------------------|
| А | under 10 seconds |
| В | 10-20 seconds |
| С | 20-35 seconds |
| D | 35-55 seconds |
| Е | 55-80 seconds |
| F | over 80 seconds |
| | |

"Volume-Based" Intersection LOS Level of Service Critical Movement Summation (CMS) LOS A Less than 1,000 vehicles/hour LOS B 1,000 to 1,150 vehicles/hour LOS C 1,151 to 1,300 vehicles/hour LOS D 1,301 to 1,450 vehicles/hour LOS E 1,451 to 1,600 vehicles/hour LOS F More than 1,600 vehicles/hour

| Table 3: Intersection Operations Analysis: Top Ranking Intersections (cont.) | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------------|
| | | Year of | AM Delay | PM Delay | Year of | AM Volume | PM Volume | |
| PERMIT | Intersection | LOS | LOS | LOS | LOS | LOS | LOS | Status |
| N286 | Foulk Rd. & Grubb Rd. | 2010 | E | E | 2010 | А | В | |
| N155 | SR 48 & N DuPont Rd. | 2010 | F | F | 2010 | А | А | |
| N166 | SR 2 & Possum Park Rd. | 2009 | С | F | 2009 | В | С | |
| N248 | SR 2 & Meadowood Dr. | 2012 | F | F | 2012 | А | С | |
| N272 | SR 2 & SR 100 | 2009 | D | E | 2009 | А | А | |
| N405 | Milltown Rd. & McKennans Church Rd. | 2010 | F | E | 2010 | А | А | |
| N439T | SR 896 & Hillside Rd. | 2010 | E | F | 2010 | А | В | |
| N259 | LInden Hill Rd. & Polly Drummond Rd. | 2010 | E | F | 2010 | С | С | |
| N347 | SR 7 & SR 72 | 2010 | F | E | 2010 | А | В | |
| N395 | SR 4 (WB) & James St. | 2012 | D | E | 2012 | А | A | |
| N200 | SR 4 & Boxwood Rd. | 2012 | F | F | 2012 | А | A | |
| N196 | SR 4 & Lorewood Ave. | 2012 | F | F | 2012 | А | A | |
| N146 | SR 92 / Naamans Rd. & Foulk Rd. | 2010 | D | F | 2010 | А | С | |
| N406 | Churchmans Rd. & Christiana Hosp. | 2006 | D | E | 2012 | А | A | |
| N587 | SR 273 & Lowes Entrance | 2012 | F | F | 2012 | А | А | |
| N315 | SR 273 & Brownleaf Dr. | 2012 | F | F | 2012 | С | С | Intersections which can function |
| N339 | SR 273 & Airport Rd. | 2011 | F | F | 2011 | С | С | at LOS "C" or better through |
| N369 | SR 4 & Churchman's Rd. | 2010 | E | F | 2010 | А | С | proper signal timing / phasing. No |
| N264 | New Castle Ave. & Terminal Ave. | 2009 | F | F | 2009 | А | А | significant capital improvements |
| N136 | SR 896 & Four Seasons Parkway | 2011 | С | Е | 2011 | В | С | are needed unless traffic |
| N140 | SR 3 (Marsh Rd) & Wilson/Veale Rd. | 2012 | F | F | 2012 | А | А | conditions change significantly. |
| N356 | SR 7 & Linden Hill Rd. | 2010 | Е | Е | 2010 | В | В | |
| N351 | SR 273 & Old Balt. Pike | 2011 | E | D | 2011 | С | С | |
| N192 | SR 7 & SR 273 | 2011 | Е | E | 2011 | С | С | |
| N460 | SR 273 & Appleby Rd. | 2011 | F | F | 2011 | В | В | |
| N254 | SR 273 & Churchmans Rd. | 2010 | С | Е | 2012 | А | A | |
| N427T | SR 273 (W. Main St.) & Hillside Rd. | 2009 | E | Е | 2010 | В | В | |
| N087P | SR 273 & White Clay Center Dr. | 2012 | F | F | 2012 | А | A | |
| N231 | SR 273 & Browns Lane | 2012 | F | D | 2012 | С | С | |
| N665 | SR 72 & Old Baltimore Pike | 2011 | E | F | 2011 | C | C | |
| N673 | SR 48 & S Dupont Rd. | 1999 | В | F | 2012 | B | B | |
| N674 | Lancaster Ave. & Greenhill Ave. | 2012 | F | D | 2012 | А | A | |
| N676 | Pennsuylvania Ave. & Greenhill Ave. | 2012 | F | F | 2012 | A | A | |
| N678 | Pennsylvania Ave. & Union St. | 2008 | D | E | 2010 | A | C | |
| N682 | SR 58 & Airport Rd. | 2012 | E | D | 2012 | A | B | |
| N030P | US 202 & Brandywine Pkwy. | 2000 | E | D | 2012 | A | A | |



Traffic Responsive Signalization (TRS) Planning Priorities

Through a joint effort with the DelDOT Traffic Management Center (TMC) and WILMAPCO, a technical exercise was performed to look at which corridors are priorities for applying Traffic Responsive Signalization technology. The CMS network was analyzed using traffic signal density, average traffic volumes, crashes, and failing signals to create a prioritized list of corridors for the TMC to consider for TRS implementation.

Traffic responsive signalization is a method of signal management that uses advanced technology to adjust timing to meet the needs of current traffic volume. The signals used in this method optimize signal timing according to traffic volume in each direction. Sensors are used to detect vehicular traffic in a certain direction at a particular point and an algorithm is used to predict when and where the traffic will be. The signal controller utilizes these algorithms to adjust the length of green time to allow the maximum amount of vehicles through the intersection. This method can react to fluctuating traffic volume in order to reduce congestion.

Table 4: Corridor Prioritization for TRS Implementation

| | | | I able . | +: Corridor | FIIOIII | zation | | - | mation | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------|---|-------------------|--------------------|----------|--------------|------------------|---|------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|----|---------|----------|
| ID | Route | Segment limits | Segment Length | Road Type (FC) | Avg AADT | # Signals | Signals/ mile | # Failing Intersections (LOS E or F in AM or PM) | Crashes/ Mile | AADT Rank | Signal Rank | Crash Rank | | Overall | Priority |
| 10 | | Wilmington Line to PA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | US 202 | line | 5.1 | Principal Arterial | 51,261 | 23 | 4.5 | 8 | 193 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | High |
| 27 | SR 2 (Kirkwood Highway) | Newark to Wilmington Line | 9.54 | Principal Arterial | 35,200 | 32 | 3.4 | 12 | 181 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1.5 | High |
| 8 | SR 4 | SR 7 to Wilmington Line | 5.79 | Principal Arterial | 23,239 | 37 | 6.4 | 2 | 159 | 11 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 5.75 | High |
| 2 | SR 7 | SR 273 to US 40 | 1.93 | Minor Arterial | 25,732 | 7 | 3.6 | 2 | 177 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 5.75 | High |
| 16 | SR 273 | SR 273(Newark) to SR 141 | 9.4 | Principal Arterial | 30,781 | 25 | 2.7 | 5 | 156 | 6 | 15 | 6 | 5 | 6 | High |
| 10 | US 13 | South of Wilmington, I- 495 to US 40 split | 5.25 | Principal Arterial | 65,238 | 16 | 3.0 | 2 | 222 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 14 | 6.75 | High |
| 7 | SR 4 | Elkton Rd. to SR 7 | 7.48 | Principal Arterial | 23,214 | 20 | 2.7 | 3 | 128 | 12 | 15 | 9 | 7 | 8.75 | High |
| 11 | US 40 | MD line to US 13 split | 9.93 | Principal Arterial | 33,251 | 23 | 2.3 | 3 | 149 | 5 | 21 | 7 | 7 | 10 | High |
| 1 | SR 7 | SR 4 Split to PA Line | 6.65 | Principal Arterial | 28,670 | 21 | 3.2 | 1 | 126 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 10 | High |
| 13 | Churchmans Rd. | SR 4 to SR 273 | 3.89 | Minor Arterial | 15,536 | 14 | 3.6 | 2 | 123 | 21 | 4 | 12 | 14 | 10.75 | High |
| 25 | SR 141 | SR 37 to SR 9 | 2.76 | Principal Arterial | 16,341 | 10 | 3.6 | 1 | 133 | 17 | 4 | 8 | 20 | 11.25 | Moderate |
| 15 | SR 92 (Naamans Rd.) | US 202 to US 13 | 5.7 | Principal Arterial | 23,395 | 20 | 3.5 | 1 | 109 | 10 | 7 | 15 | 20 | 13 | Moderate |
| 29 | SR 141 | SR 2 to US 202 | 6.00 | Principal Arterial | 28,722 | 12 | 2.0 | 6 | 63 | 7 | 22 | 24 | 3 | 13 | Moderate |
| 22 | Old Baltimore Pike | SR 896 to SR 273 | 4.62 | Minor Arterial | 16,550 | 12 | 2.6 | 2 | 118 | 16 | 18 | 13 | 14 | 13.25 | Moderate |
| 19 | Foulk Rd. | US 202 to Naaman's Road | 3.99 | Minor Arterial | 15,972 | 11 | 2.8 | 3 | 81 | 19 | 14 | 19 | 7 | 13.75 | Moderate |
| 14 | Chapman Rd. | Salem Church Rd. to SR 273 | 1.43 | Minor Arterial | 11,269 | 5 | 3.5 | 2 | 112 | 26 | 7 | 14 | 14 | 14.25 | Moderate |
| 28 | Silverside Rd | US 202 to US 13 | 4.56 | Minor Arterial | 16,213 | 12 | 2.6 | 3 | 76 | 18 | 18 | 22 | 7 | 14.25 | Moderate |
| 20 | Milltown Rd. | SR 2 to SR 41 | 2.94 | Minor Arterial | 34,021 | 6 | 2.0 | 1 | 124 | 4 | 22 | 11 | 20 | 14.25 | Moderate |
| 6 | SR 896 | South of Newark to Boyd's Corner | 12.92 | Principal Arterial | 22,433 | 23 | 1.8 | 6 | 78 | 13 | 25 | 21 | 3 | 14.5 | Moderate |
| 21 | SR 41 | PA line to SR 2 | 6.15 | Minor Arterial | 15,098 | 15 | 2.4 | 3 | 79 | 22 | 20 | 20 | 7 | 15.25 | Low |
| 4 | SR 72 | South of Newark to US 13 | 9.06 | Minor Arterial | 18,194 | 17 | 1.9 | 3 | 95 | 15 | 24 | 16 | 7 | 15.5 | Low |
| 26 | SR 48 | SR 41 split to Wilmington border | 4.83 | Principal Arterial | 18,531 | 8 | 1.7 | 4 | 55 | 14 | 27 | 26 | 6 | 16.25 | Low |
| 9 | US 13 | North of Wilmington to PA line | 5.89 | Minor Arterial | 11,656 | 22 | 3.7 | 0 | 90 | 25 | 3 | 17 | 27 | 18 | Low |
| 18 | SR 299 | US 301 to US 13 | 3.71 | Minor Arterial | 6,969 | 11 | 3.0 | 0 | 85 | 28 | 11 | 18 | 27 | 19 | Low |
| 17 | SR 9 | Terminal Ave. to Chesnut St. | 4.17 | Minor Arterial | 15,696 | 12 | 2.9 | 1 | 73 | 20 | 13 | 23 | 20 | 19 | Low |
| 3 | SR 72 | North of Newark | 5.61 | Minor Arterial | 11,719 | 10 | 1.8 | 3 | 34 | 24 | 25 | 27 | 7 | 20.75 | Low |
| 24 | SR 52 | Wilmington border to PA line | 5.51 | Principal Arterial | 14,968 | 15 | 2.7 | 1 | 60 | 23 | 15 | 25 | 20 | 20.75 | Low |
| 5 | SR 896 | North of Newark | 2.92 | Minor Arterial | 11,179 | 3 | 1.0 | 1 | 25 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 20 | 25 | Low |
| 23 | SR 71 | US 13 to SR 896 | 4.73 | Major Collector | 2,792 | 2 | 0.4 | 0 | 32 | 29 | 29 | 28 | 27 | 28.25 | Low |





2014 Intersection Operations Analysis

<u>**Traffic Responsive Signal Controls:**</u> Through coordination with the DelDOT TMC and WILMAPCO, an effort was made to use the performance measures developed through the corridor identification process to help the operations community to prioritize their efforts to address the corridors which are in need of installing traffic signal improvements, including retiming and/or installing Traffic Responsive Signalization (TRS). This technology will allow signals to respond to changing traffic conditions as opposed to a pre-determined time of day signal timings. Figure 4 shows which corridors that are under TRS implementation.

Time-of-day plan selection works well when traffic conditions are consistent and predictable – that is, similar traffic patterns generally occur during the same times each day. When incidents, a planned event (e.g., construction, county fair, football game, etc.), extreme weather, or any other unusual occurrence causes a significant change in the normal traffic conditions, the timing plan selected by the time-of-day method may not be the plan best suited to current conditions.

To address this situation, the traffic responsive plan selection method uses data from traffic detectors, rather than time of day, to automatically select the timing plan best suited to current conditions. To implement traffic responsive operations, it may be necessary to update TOD/coordination plans. Along with fine tuned plans, it is critical to confirm that the local controller clocks are in sync to maintain the coordination plans.



Table 5: Theoretical Signal Timing vs. Actual Traffic Flow

The following pages break down each of the corridors shown in figure 4, showing:

- Corridor limits
- Current intersections (capacity-based) with LOS "C" or worse
- Current status of TRS implementation, which consists of 5 phases
- Any capital intersection projects in the WILMAPCO TIP / DelDOT Capital Transportation Plan





Corridor 1: Kirkwood Highway: Wilmington to Newark **Capital Projects Along Corridor** INTERSECTION STATUS Progress in Traffic Responsive Signalization (TRS) Implementation Peak Volume Based LOS No planned/programmed improvements. Possible (Vehicles per Hour) SR-2 & Milltown Rd. Implementation Progress signal improvement option(s) listed below. LOS C: Under 1,300 veh/hr. Timing improvements implemented; Timing Improvements Implemented LOS D: 1,300-1,450 veh/hr. corridor still being monitored. Intersection monitored through Churchman's SR-2 (Kirkwood Hwy.) & SF Crossing Area Study. Possible signal LOS E: 1,450 - 1,600 veh/hr. Traffic Monitoring Equipment Installed 7 (Limestone Rd.) improvement option(s) listed below. LOS F: More than 1,600 veh/hr. Signals Brought Online with TMC Other signals along corridor No planned/programmed improvements. Possible SR-2 & SR-41 signal improvement option(s) listed below. Signal Software Upgrades SR 2 & SR 41 Subject to possible developer funded Converted to Traffic Responsive AM LOS F/ PM LOS F SR 2 & Duncan Rd. SR 2 & Duncan Rd. improvement (Wawa Traffic Impact Study). System (TRS) AM LOS A/ PM LOS D Has been studied but currently not funded in TIP/CTP. Intersection monitored through SR 2 & Harmony Rd. Churchman's Crossing Area Study. 7 Identified in the Highways Safety Improvement SR 2 & Red Mill/Polly Program (HSIP). \$5.9 million, scheduled for SR 2 & SR 7 Drummond Rd.** AM LOS C/ PM LOS D construction FY 2019. Inset Map SR 2 & Milltown Rd. AM LOS A/ PM LOS D **Possible Improvement Options for Priority Intersections** DEMAND IMPROVED EXISTING VOLUME LOS OVERAGE VOLUME LOS INTERSECTION OPTIONS COMMENTS AM PM AM PM AM PM 1. Provide dual left turn lanes for . Left turn volumes exceed 300 VPH in both peak D EB SR 2 vehicles turning left on to В SR 2 & Red Mill Rd. 1 1 periods. AM LOS D/ PM LOS E Milltown Rd. SR-2 & Milltown Rd. 202 D -₩ 2. Adding a 3rd thru lane in the EB direction . Provide 3 thru lanes for WB SR В С provides a modest benefit in the AM (LOS B to LOS A) but no benefit in the PM peak. SR 2 & Harmony Rd. 게만 게또 SR-2 (Kirkwood 17 1. Intersection already has dual left turns all the AM LOS C/ PM LOS D 1. Provide 3 thru lanes for NB & 73 В С Hwy.) & SR-7 ____ C D way around and 3 thru lanes on Kirkwood Hwy. (DE SB direction. Dife Silc (Limestone Rd.) 2). 1. Provide 4 thru lanes in EB & WB 1. Trying to pick and choose the improvements to direction (currently 3 thru), 3 left get to a LOS D did not work because something 456 SR-2 & SR-41 368 С С turn lanes SB, 2 thru lanes SB, 1 that helped in the AM did not help in the PM and Ú, Ú, SIC SIC thru lane NB (currently shared vice versa. So all improvments are shown in one L/LT). CMS. 言 A A 1. Provide exclusive EB/WB right С SR 2 & Duncan Rd. D 20 Α* 1 turn lanes on SR 2. Tr TC

WILMAPCO

Corridor 2: US 202

| The second | 7 / | Progress in Traffic Respons | entation | | Capital Projects Along Corridor | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|----------------|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|---|---|
| | 14 - 11 | Implementation | | Progress | | | IN | TERSE | CTION | STATUS |
| US 202 & Naamans Rd. | | Timing Improvements Impleme | c | corridor still being monitored. | | | US 2 | 02 & Fai | rfax Blvd. | No planned/programmed improvements. |
| AM LOS B/ PM LOS D | 92 | Traffic Monitoring Equipment In | stalled Partia | lly completed; will b after constructi | | ed | US 20 |)2 & Silv | erside Rd. | No planned/programmed |
| Мар | | Signals Brought Online with | TMC | \checkmark | | | | | | improvements. |
| | RAJE V | Signal Software Upgrades | s | \bigcirc | | US | 5 202 & F | Powder | Mill/Murphy Rd. | No planned/programmed improvements. |
| | ATT A | Converted to Traffic Respons System (TRS) | sive | - | | | IS 202 & | SR 92 | Naamana Pd | No planned/programmed improvements. |
| | 2 & Silverside Rd. S A/ PM LOS E | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 261 INTERSECTION | EXISTING | Possible Imp | DEMA | AND | IMPROVED | O VOLUME | | COMMENTS |
| US 202 & Fairfax Blvd. AM LOS C/ PM LOS E | | INTERSECTION | EXISTING | • | | AND | | O VOLUME | Sections | COMMENTS |
| US 202 & Fairfax Blvd. AM LOS C/ PM LOS E US 202 & Powder Mil Rd. AM LOS B/ PM LOS D | | | | G VOLUME LOS | DEMA OVER/ | AND AGE | IMPROVED LC | PM C | OPTIONS | COMMENTS Note: Pave and Rehab Project (Fall 2013) may yield minor improvement. |
| AM LOS C/ PM LOS E US 202 & Powder Mill Rd. | | INTERSECTION | AM | | DEMA OVER/ | AND AGE PM | IMPROVED LC | PM C | OPTIONS 1. Provide a 4th NB through lane on US 202. 1. Provide a 4th NB | Note: Pave and Rehab Project (Fall 2013) |
| AM LOS C/ PM LOS E US 202 & Powder Mill Rd. AM LOS B/ PM LOS D 141 Peak Volume Based LOS | | INTERSECTION US 202 & Silverside Rd. | | | DEMA OVER/ | AND AGE PM 166 | IMPROVED LC AM A* | PM C | OPTIONS 1. Provide a 4th NB through lane on US 202. 1. Provide a 4th NB through lane on US 202. | Note: Pave and Rehab Project (Fall 2013) may yield minor improvement. - This option assumes retaining split phasing on side streets. - Note: Pave and Rehab Project (Fall 2013) may yield minor improvement. |

2014 Intersection Operations Analysis

Corridor 3: Cleveland Ave.

| | | | | T | | | | C. | apital Projects Along Corrido | - |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----|-------------------------|-------|---|---|
| Inset Map | | | 2 | | | | ITERS Clevelar SF | ECTIC | ON STAT | JS eliminary |
| | Cleveland Ave. & Paper Mill Rd. AM LOS B/ PM LOS D | H | | | 2) | | Paper M Chap | | & No planned/program | |
| | | | land Ave. & SR 2 DS E/ PM LOS E | | - | | | | | |
| Peak Volume Based LOS | | 1 | | Possible | _ | | | | ty Intersections | |
| (Vehicles per Hour) | | INTERSECTION | EXISTING V | OLUME LOS | DEM/ OVER | | IMPR(VOLUN | | OPTIONS | COMMENTS |
| LOS C: Under 1,300 veh/hr. | | INTERSECTION | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | OPTIONS | CONNINENTS |
| LOS D: 1,300-1,450 veh/hr. LOS E: 1,450 - 1,600 veh/hr. LOS F: More than 1,600 veh/hr. Other signals along corridor | | | | | | | D | D | Provide dual left turn lanes for NB vehicles on SR turning on to Cleveland Avenue. | DSTEP project recommended another option to restripe |
| Progress in Traffic Responsive Signaliza | ation (TRS) Implementation Progress | Cleveland Ave. & SR-2 | | | 334 | 315 | D | | 2. Provide a channelized right turn lane for EB vehicles on Cleveland Avenue. | Cleveland Ave. which would provide LOS E/D (AM/PM). |
| Timing Improvements Implemented | | | | | | | C* | В* | | * If both improvements |
| Traffic Monitoring Equipment Installed | - | | | | | | | _ | | are made. |
| Signals Brought Online with TMC | \bigcirc | | ML T/ | 14/1/ | | | | | | 1. Designer should consider Pomeroy Trail |
| Signal Softw are Upgrades | - | Cleveland Ave. & Paper Mill Rd/N. | (B) ⊂ | | - | 140 | 0 B* | | 1. Provide a 2nd WB through | impact on signal timing. Intersection LOS |
| Converted to Traffic Responsive System (TRS) | - | Chapel St. | | - Jur | | | | | lane on Cleveland Ave. | improved from (F/F) to B/D since signal timings were changed. |



Corridor 4: SR 896, Welsh Tract Rd. to Mt. Pleasant





STATUS

COMMENTS

. There are two receiving lanes which quickly taper to a single lane

2. This section of SR 896 has an AADT greater than 30,001. With close

proximity to I-95, SB is critical movment in both peak periods.

1. Current lane assignment for WB movement is L-LT. The thru

movement is higher than the left turns in both peak periods.

which immediately crosses a bridge.

2. Did not improve either peak to a LOS D.

3. Did not improve either peak to a LOS D.

2014 Intersection Operations Analysis

Corridor 5: Old Baltimore Pike

| Peak Volume Based LOS (Vehicles per Hour) | | $\langle \cdot \rangle$ | - | . – | zation (TRS) Implementation |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|--|
| (Vehicles per Hour) • LOS C: Under 1,300 veh/hr. | \mathcal{D}/\mathcal{X} | | Impleme Timing Improveme | | Progress |
| LOS D: 1,300-1,450 veh/hr. | 27 | 1 | • • | | |
| LOS E: 1,450 - 1,600 veh/hr. | | > | Traffic Monitoring E | | - |
| LOS F: More than 1,600 veh/hr. | | H | Signals Brought C | Online w ith TMC | \bigcirc |
| Other signals along corridor | | 1 | Signal Softwa | re Upgrades | \bigcirc |
| Old Baltimore Pike & Salem Church Rd. AM LOS A/ PM LOS D | Co D | V DT | Converted to Traf System | | \bigcirc |
| | | XA | С | apital Projects Alo | ng Corridor |
| | 25 20 | INTE | ERSECTION | | STATUS |
| 896 Old Baltimore Pike & SR 72 | Inset Map | & Sa | alem Church | Improvement P | Highways Safety rogram (HSIP). construction in FY 2017 |
| 72 Old Baltimore Pike & SR 896 | | | R 72 & Old Itimore Pk. | Improvement P | Highways Safety rogram (HSIP). construction in FY 2017 |
| AM LOS F/ PM LOS F | Saura | | -806 & Old | | ogrammed improvemen |
| Possible Improvement Options for Priority Intersection | ns | | | | |
| EXISTING VOLUME LOS DEMAND OVERAGE LIMPROVED VOLUME LOS | c | | | | |

Possible Improvement Options for Priority Intersections

| INTERSECTION | EXISTING VOLU | JME LOS | DEMAN | O OVERAGE | IMPROVE | D VOLUME LOS | OPTIONS | |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------|-----------|---------|--------------|---|--|
| INTERSECTION | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM PM | | OP HONS | |
| Old Baltimore Pk. & Salem Church Rd. (West) | | | - | 149 | A* | С | 1. Provide a 2nd WB left turn lane on OBP. | |
| SR-896 & Old | | | | 403 | D | | 1. Provide 3 thru lanes in NB & SB direction and 1 thru lane in the WB direction (currently L/LT) | |
| Baltimore Pk. | | F) ≓< \n⊪r | 406 | | F | Е | 2. Analyzed as 8 - phase operation. | |
| | • | . 101 | | | E | | 3. Change lane assignment to triple left turn for Old Baltimore Pk. EB. | |



Possible Improvement Options for Priority Intersections

| INTERSECTION | EXISTING VO | LUME LOS | DEMAND OVE | RAGE | IMPROVED | OLUME LOS | OPTIONS | COMMENTS |
|---|-------------|----------|------------|------|----------|-----------|--|--|
| INTERSECTION | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | OPTIONS | CONIMENTS |
| SR-273 & Harmony Rd. | | | 121 | 155 | В | С | 1. Provide 3 thru lanes in each direction for SR 273. | 1. This section of SR 273 has an AADT approaching 50,000. Immediately adjacent to I-95, adding a lane in only one direction would not provide a benefit since the critical movement would always be the direction that hadn't been widened. |
| SR-273 & Chapman Rd. (Eagle Run) | | | 160 | 242 | С | С | 1. Provide 3 thru lanes in each direction for SR 273. | 1. This section of SR 273 has an AADT approaching 50,000. Immediately adjacent to I-95, adding a lane in only one direction would not provide a benefit since the critical movement would always be the direction that hadn't been widened. |
| , | | ≌ 1/1 | | | D | Е | 2. Change lane assignment to triple left turn for Chapman Rd. | |
| SR 273 & Old Ogletown Rd./Paradise Ln. | | | - | 151 | В* | С | 1. Provide a 3rd EB through lane on Rt. 273. | |
| US 13 & SR 273 | | | 235 | 326 | С | С | Widening on all approaches required: 3rd NB and SB left turn lanes, 3rd WB left turn lane, 3rd and 4th EB left turn lanes, and 3rd EB and WB through lane. | Note: Consider grade separation. Note: 5 through lanes on US 13 would go beyond standard CMS methodology. |



Corridor 7: SR 72



Progress in Traffic Responsive Signalization (TRS) Implementation

| Implementation | Progress |
|---|------------|
| Timing Improvements Implemented | \bigcirc |
| Traffic Monitoring Equipment Installed | \bigcirc |
| Signals Brought Online with TMC | \bigcirc |
| Signal Softw are Upgrades | - |
| Converted to Traffic Responsive System (TRS) | - |

Capital Projects Along Corridor

| INTERSECTION | STATUS |
|------------------------------------|---|
| | Identified in the Highways Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). Scheduled for preliminary engineering in FY 2019 (\$50,000). |
| SR 273, Library Ave. & Main St. | No planned/programmed improvements. |

| | INTERSECTION | EXISTING VOLUME LOS | | DEMAND OVERAGE | | IMPROVED VOLUME LOS | | OPTIONS | COMMENTS |
|--|------------------------------------|---------------------|----|----------------|-----|---------------------|----|--|--|
| | INTERSECTION | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | OPTIONS | COMIMENTS |
| 4 | SR 273, Library Ave. & Main St. | | | 10 | 226 | В | С | 1. Provide a 3rd NB through lane on Library Ave. | 1. Will require modification of receiving lanes. |
| Peak Volume Based LOS (Vehicles per Hour) LOS C: Under 1,300 veh/hr. | SR 72 & | | | 195 | 185 | С | | INB left turn lane | 1. Will require modification of receiving lanes. Also, railroad bridge is a major issue (for |
| LOS D: 1,300-1,450 veh/hr. LOS E: 1,450 - 1,600 veh/hr. | Cleveland Ave. | | | 100 | 100 | U | | ITROM SR 72 ONTO | roadway widening underneath). |
| LOS F: More than 1,600 veh/hr. Other signals along corridor | | | - | - | | | - | - | · |

Possible Improvement Options for Priority Intersections



Corridor 8: US 40, from US 13 split to MD Line

| Corridor 8: US 40, from US 13 s | split to MD Line | | | Capit | al Projects Along Corridor |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Progress in Traffic Responsive Sig | nalization (TRS) Implementation | Peak Volume Based LOS (Vehicles per Hour) | HE REALE | INTERSECTION US 40 & Pleasant | STATUS Recently converted to 4-way intersection |
| Implementation Timing Improvements Implemented | Progress Timing improvements implemented; corridor still being monitored. | | US 40 & US 13 AM LOS D/ PM LOS F | valley Rd. | Identified in the Highways Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). Schedu for construction in FY 2015 (\$250,000). |
| raffic Monitoring Equipment Installed Signals Brought Online with TMC | | Other signals along corridor | | SR 896 & US 40 | Programmed for Preliminary Engineeri for grade separation (FY 2016-2018). |
| Signal Softw are Upgrades | - | US 40 & Gov. Square AM LOS A/ PM LOS E | Stor all the | US 40 & Church Rd. | No planned/programmed improvemen |
| Converted to Traffic Responsive System (TRS) | - 5 | US 40 & Church Rd. AM LOS B/ PM LOS D | SR7 | | Identified in the Highways Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). Sched for construction in FY 2014. |
| F. F. L. M. | | | Inset | US 40 & SR 72 | Currenty programmed in TIP/CTP . Scheduled for construction in FY 2018 (\$11,500,000). |
| US 40 & | US 40 & SR 72 AM LOS E/ PM LC | | X | US 40 & SR 7 | Identified in the Highways Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). Sched for construction in FY 2016 (\$750,000 |
| US 40 & Pleasant Glasgow Ave. Valley Rd. | | US 40 & Porter Rd. AM LOS B/ PM LOS E | | US 40 & Governor's Sq. | No planned/programmed improvemen |
| | | ADA TAT | Sound | US 13 & US 40 | No planned/programmed improvement |
| VA | - | Possible Improvement Options for Priority Intersection | ons | | |
| | | IMPROVED VOLUME LOS OPTIONS | COMMENTS | | |

| INTERSECTION | EXISTING VOLU | JME LOS | DEMAND | OVERAGE | IMPROVED | VOLUME LOS | OPTIONS | COMMENTS | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------|--------|---------|--------------|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| INTERSECTION | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | OPTIONS | COMINENTS | | | | |
| US 40 & Governor's Sg. | | | - F | F | J.C. | - | 229 | A* | С | | 1. Phasing change will require pavement marking updates and signal head changes for the side street approaches. Phasing change alone will not reduce LOS to C or better. | |
| Governor 3 oq. | | ₹ T\$r | | | A* | | 2. Retain split phasing. Provide a 4th WB through lane on Rt. 40. | | | | | |
| US 40 & Church Rd. | | | - | 66 | В* | С | 1. Provide a 3rd WB through lane. | | | | | |
| US 40 & Porter Rd. | | | - | 218 | В* | С | 1. Provide a 3rd WB and EB through lane on Rt. 40. Provide a 2nd SB through lane on Porter Rd. | 1. With added WB and EB through lanes on Rt. 40 but without the added SB through lane on Porter Rd. the PM LOS is a D -1306 vph. | | | | |
| | | | | | B* | D | 2. Provide a 3rd WB and EB through lane on Rt. 40. | | | | | |
| US 40 & SR 72 | | | 213 | - | turn lanes a | Currenty programmed in TIP/CTP to add northbound/southbound through lanes and eastbound/westbound left-turn lanes which will provide double left- turn lanes at all legs of the intersection to address operational problems at the intersection. This project will also include improvements to the SR 72, Wrangle Hill Road/Del Laws Road Intersection. Scheduled for construction in FY 2018 (\$11,500,000). | | | | | | |
| US 13 & US 40 | 11 | II F | 61 | 440 | A | B | 1. Provide a 3rd SB through lane, and provide a 3rd EB through lane. | | | | | |
| 00 10 & 00 40 | = | | | 440 | С | D | 2. Provide 3rd SB through lane only. | | | | | |

Corridor 9: SR 4

| Progress in Traffic Responsive Si | gnalization (TRS) Implementation | | | | Capital P | Projects Along Corridor |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------|--------------------|---|
| Implementation | Progress | - HU+ | | ÷ | INTERSECTION | STATUS |
| Timing Improvements Implemented | Timing improvements implemented; corridor still being monitored. | HERE V | SR 4 & Samoset Dr. AM LOS B/ PM LOS D | 1- | | Intersection to be improved as part of SR2, Elkton Road |
| Traffic Monitoring Equipment Installed | | | | SR 4 & SR 7 | | reconstruction. Construction slated for FY 2020 |
| Signals Brought Online with TMC | \bigcirc | | | AM LOS B/ PM LOS D | | (\$20,000,000). |
| Signal Software Upgrades | - | SR 4 & Salem Church Rd. AM LOS B/ PM LOS D | | | SR-4 & Salem | Intersection monitored through Churchman's Crossing Area |
| Converted to Traffic Responsive System (TRS) | - | | SR 4 & Harmony Ro AM LOS E/ PM LOS | | | Study. |
| | | | ak Volume Based LOS | | SR 4 & Harmony Rd. | Intersection monitored through Churchman's Crossing Area Study. |
| SR 4 & Elkton Rd. 896 | 72 | | LOS C: Under 1,300 veh/hr. LOS C: Under 1,300 veh/hr. LOS D: 1,300-1,450 veh/hr. LOS E: 1,450 - 1,600 veh/hr. LOS F: More than 1,600 veh/h | Inset Map | SR-4 & Samoset Dr. | Intersection monitored through Churchman's Crossing Area Study. Possible signal improvement option(s) listed below. |
| ALC SCA | | • | Other signals along corridor | | - | Has been studied but currently not funded in TIP/CTP. |

Possible Improvement Options for Priority Intersections

| INTERSECTION | EXISTING V | OLUME LOS | DEMAND | OVERAGE | IMPROVED VOLUME LOS | | OPTIONS | COMMENTS |
|----------------------------|------------|-----------|--------|---------|---------------------|----|--|--|
| INTERSECTION | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | OPTIONS | COMMENTS |
| |) ∭r | | | | B* | С | 1. Provide a 4th WB through lane to accommodate 2 through lanes and 2 left turn lanes (JP Morgan). | 1. Appropriate number of receiving lanes exist. |
| SR 4/7 & JP Morgan Ent. | | | - | 50 | В* | С | 2. Same as Option 1, plus convert from split phasing to standard 8-phase timing. | |
| SR-4 & Samoset Dr. | | | - | 95 | A | В | 1. Provide 3 thru lanes in EB & WB direction. | 1. No improvement on any minor approaches was substantial enough to reduce the LOS to below a D. |

Corridor 10: US 13, from US 40 to Wilmington

Progress in Traffic Responsive Signalization (TRS) Implementation

| riegioco in manie Roopenone eig | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|---|--|
| Implementation | Progress | INTERSECTION/ SEGMENT | STATUS | |
| Timing Improvements Implemented | Timing improvements implemented; corridor still being monitored. | | No planned/programmed improvements. | |
| Traffic Monitoring Equipment Installed | \bigcirc | US 13 & US 40 | Intersection monitored through US 40 20-year study. | |
| Signals Brought Online with TMC | \bigcirc | US 13 & SR 273 | No planned/programmed improvements. | |
| Signal Softw are Upgrades | - | US 13, Tybouts Corner | Addition of one lane in each direction. Project is unfunded and is on the "Aspirations List" in | |
| Converted to Traffic Responsive | _ | to Wilmington | the WILMAPCO RTP. | |
| System (TRS) | | US 13, Memorial Dr. | Pedestrian Safety Improvements. Currently | |
| | | to US 40 | unfunded in FY 2015-2018 TIP/CTP. | |

| | | Possible Improv | ement C | Options | | AM LOS F/ PM LOS F | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|------------------|---------|-----------|----|--------------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| INTERSECTION | EXISTING | S VOLUME LOS | DEMAND | O OVERAGE | | PROVED UME LOS | OPTIONS | COMMENTS | | |
| | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | | | // | |
| US 13 & Roosevelt Ave. | | | 28 | 16 | В | с | 1. Provide a 4th NB through lane on US 13 and provide a 2nd WB left turn lane. | Need for 4th NB through lane on US 13 is generated by AM peak only,whereas need for 2nd WB left turn lane is generated by PM peak only. | 12 | 141 US 13 & Roosevelt Ave. AM LOS D/ PM LOS D |
| US 13 & Harrison Ave. | | | 41 | 76 | с | В | 1. Provide a 2nd NB left turn lane from US 13 to Harrison Ave. and provide a 4th SB through Lane on US 13. | 1. Need for 2nd NB left turn lane on US 13 is generated by AM peak only,whereas need for 4th SB through lane is generated by PM peak only. | | US 13 & Harrison Ave. AM LOS D/ PM LOS D 9 |
| | 1 r | 1111 | | | D | В | 2. Provide a 4th SB through lane on US 13. | × | ~ | |
| US 13 & SR 273 | | | 235 | 326 | с | с | 1. Widening on all approaches required: 3rd NB and SB left turn lanes, 3rd WB left turn lane, 3rd and 4th EB left turn lanes, and 3rd EB and WB through lane. | Note: Consider grade separation. Note: 5 through lanes on US 13 would go beyond standard CMS methodology. | US 13 & SR 273 AM LOS E/ PM LOS F | 141 |
| US 13 & US 40 | | II F | 61 | 440 | A | В | 1. Provide a 3rd SB through lane, and provide a 3rd EB through lane. | | 273 | Peak Volume Based LOS (Vehicles per Hour) |
| | | | | | с | D | 2. Provide 3rd SB through lane only. | | | LOS C: Under 1,300 veh/hr. LOS D: 1,300-1,450 veh/hr. |
| US-13 & Bacon Ave./Boulden Blvd. | | .꺄.) | 391 | 370 | D | D | 1. Provide 4 thru lanes in NB & SB direction. | No improvement on any minor approaches was substantial enough to reduce the LOS to a D. | US 13 & US 40 AM LOS D/ PM LOS F | LOS E: 1,450 - 1,600 veh/hr. LOS F: More than 1,600 veh/hr. Other signals along corridor |

-295

US 13 & Bacon Ave.

Capital Projects Along Corridor

PERMIT #

N303

INTERSECTION

SR 141 & SR 37

(Commons Blvd.)

Map ID #

14

Corridor 11: SR 141, Basin Road

Progress in Traffic Responsive Signalization (TRS) Implementation

| Implementation | Progress |
|---|----------|
| Timing Improvements Implemented | - |
| Traffic Monitoring Equipment Installed | - |
| Signals Brought Online with TMC | I |
| Signal Softw are Upgrades | - |
| Converted to Traffic Responsive System (TRS) | - |

Capital Projects Along Corridor

| INTERSECTION/ SEGMENT | STATUS |
|------------------------------------|---|
| SR 141 & SR 37 (Commons Blvd.) | Currenty programmed in TIP/CTP . Scheduled for construction in FY2018 (\$9,000,000). |
| SR 141 & US 13 Interchange | Replacment of bridge deck and safety improvements for on ramps. Currenty programmed in TIP/CTP . Scheduled for construction in FY 2020 (\$12,000,000). |
| SR 141, US 13 to Burnside Blvd. | Capacity improvements along road segment. Currenty NOT programmed in TIP/CTP. Shown in BLUE on map. |

PM

2110

₹

EXISTING VOLUME LOS

AM

C

211

*

Possible Improvement Options for Priority Intersections

AM

-

DEMAND OVERAGE

PM

242

IMPROVED VOLUME LOS

PM

С

AM

C*



Corridor 12: SR 7, Limestone Rd. from PA line to SR 4

Progress in Traffic Responsive Signalization (TRS) Implementation

| Implementation | Progress |
|---|------------|
| Timing Improvements Implemented | In design. |
| Traffic Monitoring Equipment Installed | |
| Signals Brought Online with TMC | |
| Signal Softw are Upgrades | - |
| Converted to Traffic Responsive System (TRS) | - |

Capital Projects Along Corridor

| INTERSECTION | STATUS |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| No programmed proje | ects along corridor. |

Possible Improvement Options for Priority Intersections

| | | | | 1 000101 | • | | options for i nority intersection | |
|---|-------------|-----------|-----|--------------|----|----------------|--|--|
| INTERSECTION | EXISTING VC | DLUME LOS | | MAND RAGE | | OVED ME LOS | OPTIONS | COMMENTS |
| | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | | |
| SR-7 & Skyline Dr. | | | - | 337 | В | С | 1. Provide 1 thru lane in EB & WB direction (both approaches currently have L/LT lane assignment). | |
| SR-7 & Milltown Rd. | | | - | 30 | - | - | | *AM & PM CMS were completed for this intersection using updated counts (10/28/2010) as part of the Newport Viaduct project. The LOS reported using these updated counts (AM - C & PM - D) removed this intersection from the Major Modifications list. |
| SR 7 (Limestone) & SR 4 (Main St. Stanton) | | | 196 | 400 | С | С | 1. Add a 3rd WB through lane, and add a 3rd EB left turn lane. | 1. Signal phasing adjustment would improve AM LOS to C. |
| SR-2 (Kirkwood Hwy.) & SR-7 (Limestone Rd.) | | | - | 73 | В | С | 1. Provide 3 thru lanes for NB & SB direction. | 1. Intersection already has dual left turns all the way around and 3 thru lanes on Kirkwood Hwy. (DE 2). |





Corridor 13: SR 52



Progress in Traffic Responsive Signalization (TRS) Implementation

| Implementation | Progress |
|---|---|
| Timing Improvements Implemented | Timing improvements implemented; will be again after construction. |
| Traffic Monitoring Equipment Installed | - |
| Signals Brought Online with TMC | In design. |
| Signal Software Upgrades | \bigotimes |
| Converted to Traffic Responsive System (TRS) | - |

Capital Projects Along Corridor

| INTERSECTION | STATUS |
|---------------|--|
| SR 52 & SR 82 | Currenty programmed in TIP/CTP as an HSIP project . Scheduled for construction in FY 2014 (\$1,800,000). |

Possible Improvement Options for Priority Intersections

No Intersections along corridor have significant congestion deficiencies



Corridor 14: Elkton Rd.



Capital Projects Along Corridor

| INTERSECTION | STATUS |
|-------------------|--|
| SR 4 & Elkton Rd. | Intersection to be improved as part of SR2, Elkton Road reconstruction. Construction slated for FY 2020 (\$20,000,000). |

Progress in Traffic Responsive Signalization (TRS) Implementation

| Implementation | Progress (as of Nov. 2013) |
|--|----------------------------|
| Timing Improvements Implemented | \bigotimes |
| Traffic Monitoring Equipment Installed | (|
| Signals Brought Online with TMC | \bigotimes |
| Signal Softw are Upgrades | - |
| Converted to Traffic Responsive | _ |
| System (TRS) | |

Possible Improvement Options for Priority Intersections

No analysis has been performed on any intersections along this corridor.

Wilmington Area Planning Council

Maryland and Delaware respectively; and

850 Library Avenue, Suite 100 Newark, Delaware 19711 302-737-6205; Fax 302-737-9584 From Cecil County: 888-808-7088 e-mail: wilmapco@wilmapco.org web site: www.wilmapco.org

WILMAPCO Council:

Joseph L. Fisona, Chair Mayor of Elkton

Connie C. Holland, Vice-shair Delaware Office of State Flanning Coordination, Director

BY THE WILMINGTON AREA PLANNING COUNCIL (WILMAPCO) APPROVE THE NEW CASTLE COUNTY INTERSECTION OPERATIONS ANALYSIS

Shailen P. Bhatt Delpware Dept. of Transportation Secretary Thomas P. Gordon New Castle County County Executive

Donald A. Halligan Maryland Dept. of Transportation Director, Office of Planning and Capital Programming Tari Moore

Cecil County Executive John Sisson Delaware Transit Corporation Chief Executive Officer

Dennis P. Williams Mayor of Wilmington

WILMAPCO Executive Director Tigist Zepeve

WHEREAS, the Wilmington Area Planning Council (WILMAPCO) has been designated the MPO for Cecil County, MD and New Castle County, DE by the Governors of

WHEREAS, the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Regulations of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) which require that MPOs with over 200,000 population, in cooperation with participants in the planning process, produce a document to satisfy the Congestion Management Process (CMP) requirements; and

WHEREAS, a CMS Subcommittee of the Technical Advisory Committee was formed in November 2000, following the WILMAPCO Council's recommendation, and met on a regular basis to develop the 2014 Intersection Operations Analysis; and

WHEREAS, The Operations Analysis is an outgrowth of the CMP efforts. It focuses upon the arterial roadway network and analyzes the current performance of the signals along all arterial roadways in New Castle County according to the FHWA's functional classification system.

WHEREAS, the Analysis has undergone the appropriate technical review from the project Advisory Committee and the WILMAPCO TAC;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Wilmington Area Planning Council approve the New Castle Intersection Operations Analysis.

Joseph J. Fresona Useph Fisona, Chairperson Wilmington to T <u>5-13-14</u> Date:

Wilmington Area Planning Council

