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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## 1. Introduction

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) is studying ways to improve regional mobility in southern and eastern Wake County. NCDOT State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Projects R-2721, R-2828, and R-2829, known collectively as Complete 540 - Triangle Expressway Southeast Extension, in Wake and Johnston Counties currently feature 17 Detailed Study Alternatives (DSAs) that are approximately 28 miles long, extending from the NC 55 Holly Springs Bypass to I-40 near the US 70 Clayton Bypass (Southern Wake Freeway) and then to US 64 / US 264 Knightdale Bypass (Eastern Wake Freeway). The Complete 540 project is being considered and studied as a possible candidate toll facility. Figure ES. 1 shows the Detailed Study Alternative corridors. Appendix A contains all figures described in this report.

HNTB North Carolina, PC has been contracted by the NCDOT, to develop base and future year traffic capacity analyses for the Complete 540 project. The analyses and results for the base and future design year scenarios of the No-Build Alternative and 17 DSAs will be used to develop the environmental documentation required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

For the purposes of the environmental document, it was decided in a project scoping meeting on July 8, 2014, and through coordination with NCDOT, that the base year scenario would use a base year of 2012 and the future design year scenario would be for the year 2035. In this meeting, a traffic analysis project study area was also defined that would satisfy the requirements of NEPA and include all potential impacts for 17 DSAs. Separate No-Build and Build DSA traffic capacity analyses were conducted for both the 2012 base year and 2035 design year. Figure 2 shows the project study area for the traffic analyses.

The purpose of this traffic capacity analysis is to identify existing and projected roadway facility, interchange and intersection operations and any potential deficiencies for the major roadways surrounding and intersecting the Complete 540 functional designs for the 17 DSAs under 2012 Base Year and 2035 Design Year conditions. In addition to being included in NEPA documentation, the results of the analysis will be used to support the alternatives development process and preliminary designs for the project.

Traffic volumes used in this traffic capacity analysis were based on the Complete 540-Triangle Expressway Southeast Extension NCDOT STIP Project R-2721, R-2828 \& R-2829 Traffic Forecast Technical Memorandum prepared by HNTB in April 2014. The traffic capacity analysis references the following forecast volumes for the 2012 and 2035 analysis scenarios:

- 2012 Base Year No-Build
- 2012 Base Year Build DSA 1-17
- 2035 Design Year No-Build
- 2035 Design Year Build DSA 1-17

Complete 540 functional designs and interchange forms evaluated in this traffic capacity analysis were based on the designs and interchange form recommendations prepared by Lochner, based upon ongoing coordination, planning, analysis and design. The designs have been reviewed and approved by the NCDOT Roadway Design Unit.

As described in more detail within the report, several DSAs feature the same (or nearly identical) projected traffic volumes and interchange forms, depending on individual DSA corridor alignments. For example, DSAs 1-5 and 13-17 all follow the Orange or Orange-Lilac corridor from NC 55 Bypass to I-40 in southern Wake County, have similar projected traffic volumes and produce similar capacity analysis results. Similarly, DSAs 6 and 7 follow the Orange-Red corridor from NC 55 Bypass to I-40, have similar projected traffic volumes and produce similar capacity analysis results. DSAs 8-12 all follow the Orange-Purple-Blue-Lilac corridor from NC 55 Bypass to I-40, have similar projected traffic volumes and produce similar capacity analysis results. From I-40 to US 64 / US 264 in eastern Wake County, the Green, Mint, Brown, Tan and Teal DSA corridors are closer in proximity and there is relatively less variation in projected traffic volumes between DSAs and interchange configurations. Since there are generally three distinct corridors based on project traffic volumes and operations, DSAs 1, 6 and 8 are presented in additional detail in the report tables and figures as representative corridors for comparison. Additional detailed capacity analysis results for all DSAs 1-17 are located in the Appendices.

The following sections describe existing and future transportation conditions in the project study area, the capacity analysis methodology, capacity analysis results for the 2012 base year and 2035 design year, microsimulation operations analysis, and conclusions and recommendations derived from the capacity analyses related to current functional designs for the Complete 540 DSAs.

## 2. Existing and Future Conditions

The Complete 540 DSA corridor alignments in the project study area run primarily east-west between the existing Triangle Expressway termini at NC 55 Bypass in Apex to the existing l-40 corridor near Clayton. Corridor alignments then run primarily north-south between I-40 and the existing I-540 system interchange with US 64 / US 264 in Knightdale. The corridor alignments cross multiple existing freeway, arterial, and local roadway facilities. The 17 Complete 540 DSAs studied are shown on Figure ES.1.

Under existing conditions, there are five major access-controlled freeways, numerous major and minor arterial facilities, nine existing interchanges, one planned future interchange (STIP Project \# R-2635D), and 18 existing at-grade intersections on Y-line facilities that are directly impacted by the 17 DSA alignments in the project study area.

Existing traffic control information was provided by NCDOT for all signalized intersections. Other relevant study information and analysis inputs for the existing study area facilities and corridors was collected from existing aerial photography, traffic forecast and field verified in 2014 by HNTB staff.

Under future conditions, the Complete 540 project, Triangle Expressway Southeast Extension, will complete the Raleigh 540 outer loop. Construction is currently scheduled to be completed in phases. Phase I (southern portion) is between NC 55 Bypass in Apex and I-40 near the Johnston County line. Phase II (eastern portion) continues the project at I-40 and ends at US 64 / US 264 in Knightdale. The project is located primarily in Wake County with a small portion of the project that extends into Johnston County.

Transportation demands, social and economic demands and mobility considerations are the basis for additional transportation infrastructure in southeastern Wake County. Complete 540 will link the towns of Clayton, Garner, Fuquay-Varina, Holly Springs, Apex, Cary, Knightdale, and Raleigh. It will also connect major roadways in southern Raleigh and aid in easing
congestion on the I-40, I-440 (Raleigh Beltline), NC 42, NC 55, Ten Ten Road and other arterial surface streets by providing a high-speed, reliable transportation option. The Complete 540 project would increase the overall capacity of the existing study area roadway network and be expected to divert traffic from secondary roads. The Complete 540 DSA corridors are approximately 30 miles in length, beginning at the existing Toll NC 540 (Triangle Expressway) and NC 55 Bypass service interchange and terminating at the existing I-540 and US 64 / US 264 system interchange.

With construction of Complete 540, there are approximately 19 existing/future interchanges and 36 existing/future intersections on Y-line facilities and at interchange ramp terminals that are directly impacted by the 17 DSA alignments in the project study area, depending on the DSAs.

## 3. Capacity Analysis Methodology

Per standards for the preparation of capacity analyses for TIP projects used by the NCDOT Congestion Management Section, the Complete 540 project study area and DSAs were analyzed using methodologies set forth in the Highway Capacity Manual 2010 (Transportation Research Board, December 2010) and the accompanying Highway Capacity Software 2010 (HCS Version 6.60) for freeway facilities and unsignalized intersections. Signalized intersections were analyzed in Synchro Professional Version 7. Results for AM and PM peak hour timeframes are given as a Level-of-Service (LOS) for segments of freeway and intersections that correspond to a letter grade of LOS A through LOS F. In general, LOS D is the minimum threshold for acceptable peak hour traffic operations on the freeway segments and study area intersections, and was used as a benchmark in testing the DSA functional design geometrics for the 2012 and 2035 analysis years. Details for each analysis type are included in Table ES-1.

## Table ES-1. Capacity Analysis Details

| Analysis Type | Details |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freeway <br> System <br> Analysis | Segmented the DSA alignment networks into separate basic freeway, weaving, <br> merge, and diverge areas in HCS Freeway Facilities Module (FreeVal). Calculated <br> both individual segment vehicular density and LOS and overall directional system <br> operational statistics per HCM 2010 methods. |
| Signalized <br> Intersection <br> Analysis | Created Synchro networks that included individual intersections and corridors in the <br> vicinity of the proposed interchange ramp terminals and incorporated signal plan <br> information. Build networks analyzed all Complete 540 interchange ramp terminal <br> intersections as signalized intersections in the design year. |
| Unsignalized <br> Intersection <br> Analysis | Created unsignalized intersection files in HCS for the existing unsignalized study <br> area intersections. Signal warrants analyses were conducted to determine <br> intersection control type in the design year analyses. Added additional Build DSA <br> unsignalized intersections if DSA designs included changes to No-Build network. |

## 4. Development of Alternatives

The No-Build Alternative assumes that no further development of the Complete 540 project will occur within the project study area limits, but any other background improvements that are committed to and funded by NCDOT, local municipalities, or private development projects would occur by the 2035 design year. Additional capital improvements include the proposed Old Holly Springs-Apex Road interchange (R-2635D), widening of study area facilities (I-40, I-540 and other planned facilities) and basic traffic signal retiming.

The Build Alternatives assume construction of Complete 540 in addition other background improvements that are committed to and funded by NCDOT, local municipalities, or private development projects would occur by the 2035 design year. The 17 Complete 540 DSAs studied are shown on Figure ES.1. Each DSA roadway design (alignment, interchange form, geometrics, design criteria) was provided by Lochner for use in the traffic capacity analysis.

## 5. 2012 Base Year I 2035 Design Year Traffic Volume Development

Peak hour traffic volume estimates for the 2012 base year and 2035 design year No-Build and Build scenarios were developed using daily traffic forecast information from the Complete 540 Triangle Expressway Southeast Extension NCDOT STIP Project R-2721, R-2828 \& R-2829 Traffic Forecast Technical Memorandum prepared by HNTB North Carolina, PC and approved by NCDOT TPB in April 2014. Daily traffic data, such as Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) estimates for study area roadway segments, truck percentages, design hour volumes (DHVfactor), and peak directional flows (D-factor) were entered into NCDOT Congestion Management Section peak hour traffic volume breakout spreadsheets for each intersection and/or interchange. This traffic volume data were then entered into capacity analysis software, as appropriate.

## 6. Capacity Analysis Results

For Complete 540, all DSA freeway segments, interchange designs configurations, and interchange ramp terminal intersections are projected to operate at LOS D or better in the 2012 base year and 2035 design year based on the current functional designs for a Complete 540 six-lane, toll facility. For this reason, only the 2035 design year worst-case AM and PM peak hour LOS freeway summary results are presented in Table ES-2. Of the 115 to 137 freeway segments analyzed, depending on the individual DSA alignment, only one weaving segment between US 64 / US 264 and Poole Road in the westbound PM peak experiences projected operational deficiencies. To further investigate and assess expected freeway system performance in this weaving segment, supplemental VISSIM microsimulation analyses were prepared and showed acceptable weaving segment operations of a comparable LOS D or better for the simulation runs, as shown in Table ES-4. Of the 29 to 36 study area intersections analyzed at interchange ramp terminals or adjacent Y -lines, depending on the individual DSA alignment, only 1 to 4 intersections are projected to experience operational deficiencies, depending on the DSA as shown in Table ES-3. None of the intersections potentially experiencing operational deficiencies are interchange ramp terminal intersections directly impacting Complete 540 mainline freeway operations. The intersections projected to operate at LOS E or F either include unsignalized, minor Y -line intersections or signalized Y -line intersections that incorporate reasonably feasible geometric improvements to optimize intersection traffic operations. Overall, all seventeen (17) DSAs operate with nearly identical freeway and intersection measures of effectiveness (MOEs) and levels-of-service, even though each DSA includes different volumes, corridor alignments, interchange configurations, interchange access points and impacts to crossing freeway and arterial facilities.
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Table ES-2. 2035 Design Year No-Build \& Build Freeway Operations Summary

| Scenario | Complete 540 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| No-Build | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 1 | 2 | 32 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 39 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 2 | 2 | 32 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 39 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 3 | 1 | 38 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 37 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 4 | 3 | 29 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 37 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 5 | 3 | 37 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 35 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 6* | 0 | 14 | 40 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 7* | 0 | 15 | 39 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 8 | 1 | 31 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 9 | 1 | 31 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 10 | 1 | 28 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 11 | 1 | 28 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 12 | 1 | 34 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 36 | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 13 | 1 | 29 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 39 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 14 | 1 | 29 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 38 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 15 | 2 | 23 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 37 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 16 | 2 | 24 | 35 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 37 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 17 | 2 | 33 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 33 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

*DSA 6, 7 includes analysis of collector-distributor segment along Complete 540.

Table ES-3. 2012 \& 2035 No-Build \& Build Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary

| Scenario | Number of Intersections Operating at Given LOS in at Least One AM or PM Peak Hour* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2012 Base Year |  |  |  |  |  | 2035 Design Year |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS } \\ \text { A } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{LOS} \\ \mathrm{~B} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { LOS } \\ \text { C } \end{array}$ | LOS | $\underset{\mathrm{E}}{\mathrm{LOS}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS } \\ F \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { LOS } \\ \text { A } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \mathrm{LOS} \\ \mathrm{~B} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { LOS } \\ \text { C } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS } \\ \text { D } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\mathrm{E}}{\mathrm{LOS}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS } \\ F \end{gathered}$ |
| No-Build | 1 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| DSA 1 | 11 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| DSA 2 | 11 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| DSA 3 | 9 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| DSA 4 | 9 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| DSA 5 | 8 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| DSA 6 | 17 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| DSA 7 | 17 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| DSA 8 | 16 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 9 | 16 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 10 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 11 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 12 | 14 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 13 | 14 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 14 | 14 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 15 | 11 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 16 | 11 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 17 | 11 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 0 |

*-For signalized intersections, overall intersection LOS. For unsignalized intersections, worst-case critical movement.

## 7. Microsimulation Operations Analysis

Initial 2035 PM peak hour HCS FreeVal results at the northern/eastern project termini for the southbound Complete 540 weaving segment from US 64/US 264 to Poole Road produced densities that correspond to LOS D or E for Build DSAs 1-17. Since FreeVal methodologies are not set up to evaluate this area to the same level of detail as microscopic analysis, a microsimulation model was developed to test the weaving segment in greater detail and more realistically evaluate this area with demands nearing capacity and higher turbulence. Microsimulation results for the 2035 design year Build DSA 3, 4, 15, 16 indicate that the Complete 540 weaving segment between US 64 / US 264 and Poole Road in the westbound PM peak is projected to operate at LOS D or better and more efficiently than FreeVal results, as shown in Table ES-4. Thus, all of the Build Detailed Study Alternatives are expected to provide adequate traffic operations for this particular area of the project.

Table ES-4. 2035 VISSIM Measures of Effectiveness PM Peak Results

| Segment <br> Performance | Complete 540 DSA 3, 4, 15, 16 Southbound Weaving Segment |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCS Freeval | VISSIM |
| Volume [veh/hour] | 5,404 | 5,354 |
| Density [veh/mile] | $34.00^{2}$ | $25.58^{1}$ |
| Speed [mph] | 47.0 | 53.6 |

BOLD/ITALIC - Segment Density Exceeds LOS D Thresholds
1 - VISSIM density reported in average density (veh/mi/ln).
2 - HCS density reported in (veh/mi/ln) for comparison. Corresponding ( $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ ) is 38.30 and LOS E.

## 8. Summary and Recommendations

The Complete 540 study area traffic capacity analysis was completed to evaluate base year (2012) and design year (2035) peak hour traffic operations for 17 Complete 540 Detailed Study Alternatives and surrounding freeway facilities and nearby intersections within the traffic analysis study area. The capacity analysis report incorporates the ongoing coordination efforts between project planning, design and analysis study teams to produce DSAs that provide sufficient capacity, efficient operations, and acceptable future levels of service. The recommended freeway, arterial, interchange and intersection geometrics and intersection control for Complete 540 DSAs 1, 6 and 8 are schematically presented in Appendix A. Recommended and analyzed geometrics for all DSAs are included in the detailed capacity analysis outputs from HCS FreeVal, Synchro and HCS unsignalized intersections in Appendices E, F and G, respectively.

Based on the 2035 design year capacity analysis, the following conclusions and recommendations are presented for study area facilities and intersections:

## Complete 540 Corridors

All Complete 540 DSA freeway segments, interchange designs configurations, and interchange ramp terminal intersections are projected to operate at LOS D or better in the 2035 design year, based on the current functional designs for a Complete 540 six-lane, toll facility. Overall, all 17 DSAs operate with very similar freeway and intersection measures of effectiveness and levels of service, even though each DSA includes different volumes, corridor alignments, interchange configurations, interchange access points and impacts to crossing freeway and arterial facilities.

Figures ES.2-3, ES.4-5 and ES.6-7 provide a summary of freeway and intersection level of service operations for three representative DSAs, DSA 1, 6, and 8, respectively.

## NC 540 Corridor

Based on the 2035 design year Build DSA analysis results, the existing section of NC 540 from US 1 to NC 55 Bypass is projected to operate at acceptable LOS D or better for all DSAs with construction of Complete 540 and the Old Holly Springs-Apex Road interchange (R-2635D).

## I-540 Corridor

The existing section of I-540 from US 64 / US 264 to US 64 Business is projected to operate at acceptable LOS D or better for all DSAs with construction of Complete 540 and I-540 planned widening to an 8-lane facility.

## I-40 Corridor

I-40 from US 70 Business to NC 42 is projected to operate at acceptable LOS D or better for all DSAs with construction of Complete 540 and I-40 planned widening to an 8 -lane facility. DSAs 1-5 and 8-17 propose a five-leg system interchange with I-40 and US 70 and provide acceptable interchange spacing between US 70 and NC 42. DSAs 6 and 7 connect with I-40 as a four-leg system interchange further to the north and do not provide desirable interchange spacing between the I-40 and US 70 Business interchange. Therefore, DSA 6 and 7 propose collectordistributors on I-40 through the US 70 Business and Complete 540 system interchanges. DSA 6 and 7 also do not provide direct interchange access at US 70 Business due to undesirable interchange spacing from I-40. Rocky Quarry Road Extension is proposed to provide direct access from Complete 540 at the Rock Quarry Road interchange to US 70 Business. The potential impacts of Complete 540 on I-40, US 70, US Business and the system interchange operations should be re-evaluated at the appropriate time for an interchange access request study.

## US 70 Corridor

The existing section of US 70 from I-40 to NC 42 is projected to operate at acceptable LOS D or better for all DSAs with construction of Complete 540.

## US 64 I US 264 Corridor

Capacity analysis results indicate that US 64 / 264 is operating near or over capacity with operational deficiencies in the 2035 design year AM and PM peak hours with or without construction of Complete 540. Based on the 2035 design year No-Build DSA analysis results, US 64 / US 264 from Hodge Road to Smithfield Road is projected to operate at LOS E or F for 6 of 11 eastbound segments and 9 of 11 westbound segments as a six-lane freeway facility. In all Build DSAs, similar facility volumes and operational results are projected. Construction of Complete 540 proposes modifying the existing directional system interchange with US 64 / US 264 and I-540 by connecting the forth leg and constructing a flyover and a loop ramp. The system interchange was planned, designed and constructed to accommodate the future completion and connection of the 540 loop. This interchange modification would add one eastbound and one westbound freeway merge on US 64 / US 264. The potential impacts of Complete 540 on US 64 / US 264, I-540 and the system interchange operations should be reevaluated at the appropriate time for an interchange access request study.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) is studying ways to improve regional mobility in southern and eastern Wake County. NCDOT State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Projects R-2721, R-2828, and R-2829, known as collectively as Complete 540 - Triangle Expressway Southeast Extension, in Wake and Johnston Counties currently feature 17 Detailed Study Alternatives (DSAs) that are approximately 28 miles long, extending from the NC 55 Holly Springs Bypass to I-40 near the US 70 Clayton Bypass (Southern Wake Freeway) and then to US 64 / US 264 Knightdale Bypass (Eastern Wake Freeway). The Complete 540 project is being considered and studied as a possible candidate toll facility. Figure 1 shows the Detailed Study Alternative corridors. Appendix A contains all figures described in this report.

HNTB North Carolina, PC has been contracted by the NCDOT, to develop base and future year traffic capacity analyses for the Complete 540 project. The analyses and results for the base and future design year scenarios of the No-Build Alternative and 17 DSAs will be used to develop the environmental documentation required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

For the purposes of the environmental document, it was decided in a project scoping meeting on July 8, 2014 and through coordination with NCDOT that the base year scenario would use a base year of 2012 and the future design year scenario would be for the year 2035. In this meeting, a traffic analysis project study area was also defined that would satisfy the requirements of NEPA and include all potential impacts for 17 DSAs. Separate No-Build and Build DSA traffic capacity analyses were conducted for both the 2012 base year and 2035 design year. Figure 2 shows the project study area for the traffic analyses. Figures 3 - 6 provide sheet keys for No-Build and Build DSAs.

The purpose of this traffic capacity analysis is to identify existing and projected roadway facility, interchange and intersection operations and any potential deficiencies for the major roadways surrounding and intersecting the Complete 540 functional designs for the 17 DSAs under 2012 Base Year and 2035 Design Year conditions. In addition to being included in NEPA documentation, the results of the analysis will be used to support the alternatives development process and preliminary designs for the project.

Traffic volumes used in this traffic capacity analysis were based on the Complete 540-Triangle Expressway Southeast Extension NCDOT STIP Project R-2721, R-2828 \& R-2829 Traffic Forecast Technical Memorandum prepared by HNTB in April 2014. This forecast has been approved by the NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch. Appendix B contains the traffic forecast output used in this report. The traffic capacity analysis references the following forecast volumes for the 2012 and 2035 analysis scenarios:

- 2012 Base Year No-Build
- 2012 Base Year Build DSA 1-17
- 2035 Design Year No-Build
- 2035 Design Year Build DSA 1-17

Complete 540 functional designs and interchange forms evaluated in this traffic capacity analysis were based on the designs and interchange form recommendations prepared by

Lochner, based upon ongoing coordination, planning, analysis and design. The designs have been reviewed and approved by the NCDOT Roadway Design Unit.

As described in more detail within the report, several DSAs feature the same (or nearly identical) projected traffic volumes and interchange configurations, depending on individual DSA corridor alignments. For example, DSAs 1-5 and 13-17 all follow the Orange or Orange-Lilac corridor from NC 55 Bypass to I-40 in southern Wake County, have similar projected traffic volumes and produce similar capacity analysis results. Similarly, DSAs 6 and 7 follow the Orange-Red corridor from NC 55 Bypass to I-40, have similar projected traffic volumes and produce similar capacity analysis results. DSAs 8-12 all follow the Orange-Purple-Blue-Lilac corridor from NC 55 Bypass to I-40, have similar projected traffic volumes and produce similar capacity analysis results. From I-40 to US 64 / US 264 in eastern Wake County, the Green, Mint, Brown, Tan and Teal DSA corridors are closer in proximity and there is relatively less variation in projected traffic volumes between DSAs and interchange configurations. Since there are generally three distinct corridors based on project traffic volumes and operations, DSAs 1, 6 and 8 are presented in additional detail in the report tables and figures as representative corridors for comparison. Additional detailed capacity analysis results for all DSAs 1-17 are located in the Appendices.

The following sections describe existing transportation conditions in the project study area, the capacity analysis methodology, capacity analysis results for the 2012 base year and 2035 design year, microsimulation operations analysis, and conclusions and recommendations derived from the capacity analyses related to current functional designs for the Complete 540 DSAs.

## 2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

The following pages describe the context of the proposed project, the existing transportation system in the Complete 540 project study area and data collection activities conducted for the study.

### 2.1 Project Corridor Description

The Complete 540 DSA corridor alignments in the project study area run primarily east-west between the existing Triangle Expressway termini at NC 55 Bypass in Apex to the existing l-40 corridor near Clayton. Corridor alignments then run primarily north-south between I-40 and the existing I-540 system interchange with US 64 / US 264 in Knightdale. The corridor alignments cross multiple existing freeway, arterial, and local roadway facilities. Most of the project study area features lower density rural/suburban development.

Future DSA interchange spacing, in most cases, is well over one mile between interchanges, with exceptions from US 64 / US 264 to Poole Road for all DSAs and on Complete 540, I-40 and US 70 Business for DSA 6 and 7. In addition to proposed interchanges, the DSA corridors will have numerous grade separations with natural features and minor y-line local roadways. There are numerous existing roadway facilities, primarily surface arterial roadways, that parallel the proposed corridor alignments. The paralleling facilities directly impacted by DSA corridor functional designs were specifically studied in this analysis.

The proposed Complete 540 DSAs are being studied as a toll facility and designed for a 65 mph speed limit, with access limited to service and system interchanges with existing y-line facilities. Similar to existing Triangle Expressway, Complete 540 is being planned for all-electronic tolling with overhead toll gantries. No toll booths or speed reductions are required with this type of toll facility. No specific lane restrictions, truck climbing lanes, transit/non-motorized transportation/High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) features are planned for Complete 540.

Figure 2 shows the general project study area and the spatial relationship of the DSA corridor alignments to connecting transportation facilities, municipalities and notable physical and natural features in the region.

### 2.2 Study Area Transportation Facilities

Figure 2 shows schematics of the project study area which include the future location of DSA alignments in relation to existing No-Build surface street intersections and existing freeway crossings and freeway segments included in the No-Build and Build analyses. General descriptions and information about existing study area roadways to be included in the Complete 540 intersection and freeway capacity analyses are found in Table 1.

Table 1. Existing Study Area Roadways

| Build Corridor <br> Interchange \# | Build Corridor Analysis <br> Intersection ID\#s | SR Number I <br> Shield | Road Name | Functional <br> Classification* | Study Area <br> Cross Sections | 2013 AADT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | Speed Limit

*     - As defined on the NCDOT Urban Functional Classification Map (2012) ^2011 AADT $\quad$ ^^AADT station beyond studied portion of corridor


## Study Area Roadways

There are five major access-controlled freeways in the vicinity of the traffic forecast study area: I-40, I-540, NC 540, US 64 / US 264 (Knightdale Bypass) and US 70 (Clayton Bypass). The following are descriptions of the major roadways within the traffic forecast study area:

- I-40 is the primary freeway corridor for regional connectivity between Raleigh, RTP, Durham and Chapel Hill in the Triangle. I-40 varies from a four-lane to a six-lane freeway in the traffic analysis study area. The posted speed limit is 65 miles per hour (mph) through the traffic analysis study area.
- I-540 is an existing loop freeway around the northern portions of Wake County. It currently spans from I-40 on the western side of Wake County to US 64 / US 264 near Knightdale in eastern Wake County. The facility features a six-lane cross section in the study area, with auxiliary lanes at interchanges and a posted speed limit of 70 mph .
- NC 540 is an existing freeway facility that is an extension of l-540 in western Wake County from I-40 to NC 54 near RTP. The facility features a six-lane cross section with a posted speed limit of 70 mph. NC 540 from NC 54 to NC 55 Bypass is a toll facility.
- US 64 I US 264 (Knightdale Bypass) is an existing controlled access freeway in the traffic forecast study area providing access to areas of east Wake County to I-440 and further to I95. In the traffic forecast study area, US 64 / US 264 features a six-lane cross-section, with auxiliary lanes at interchanges and a posted 65 mph speed limit.
- US 70 (Clayton Bypass) is an existing controlled access freeway in the traffic forecast study area providing access to areas of Johnston County to l-40. In the traffic forecast study area, US 70 contains a four-lane cross-section, with auxiliary lanes at interchanges and a posted speed limit of 65 mph .

Other major/minor arterial roadways that are specifically included in the project study area include, NC 50, NC 55, US 70, US 401, Holly Springs Road, Bells Lake Road, Ten Ten Road, Old Stage Road, Rock Quarry Road, Auburn-Knightdale Road and Poole Road. These existing thoroughfares are primarily multi-lane and two-lane facilities with 35,45 , or 55 mph speed limits in the traffic forecast study area and provide regional connectivity and access throughout Wake County, with future interchange connections to the proposed DSA corridors.

## Y-Lines and Grade Separated Facilities

Along the 17 proposed DSA corridors, there are 39 proposed grade separations of the NC 540 freeway with intersecting minor study area roadways that have no interchange access to NC 540. These roadway facilities within the Complete 540 project corridor are currently planned to cross NC 540 via overpasses or underpasses, depending on preliminary functional designs. The grade separated facilities are identified in Appendix C, but were not studied specifically for any traffic operations impacts in this document, since they will not directly impact Complete 540 operations.

Along the 17 proposed DSA corridors, multiple Y-line facilities are impacted and re-routed/realigned based on proximity to the DSA corridors and interchange ramp terminals. Below is a list of notable Y -line facilities impacted and the corresponding DSAs:

- Kildaire Farm realigned (DSA 1-17)
- Doughtymews Lane extension (DSA 8-12)
- Donny Brook Road realigned (DSA 1-5, 13-17)
- Old McCullers Rd severed from US 401 and realigned to Wake Tech internal circulation (DSA 1-5, 13-17)
- Dwight Rowland Road severed and realigned via Meadow Drive (DSA 8-12)
- Vandora Springs Road and Buffaloe Road realigned (DSA 6-7)
- Norman Blalock Road realigned (DSA 8-12)
- Raynor Road and Tiffany Creek Drive realigned (DSA 1-2,5,8-9,12,13-14,17)
- Old Baucom Road realigned (DSA 1-2, 6-9, 13-14 )
- Red Brick Road Connector (DSA 8-17)


### 2.3 Study Area Interchanges / Intersections

The following paragraphs describe existing geometrics and traffic control at all study area interchanges and intersections. Refer to Figures 7.1 to 7.5 for additional schematic details, including laneage between intersections.

## Existing Study Area Interchanges

## Toll NC 540 (Triangle Expressway) \&

 NC 55 BypassExisting Toll NC 540 six-lane freeway facility currently terminates at the NC 55 Bypass four-lane divided facility. This service interchange is a partial cloverleaf design and features loop ramps in the northeast and southeast interchange quadrants with free-flowing entry/exit movements for each facility. Single lane on-ramp and off-ramps connect the two facilities. This interchange is designed to accommodate future Complete 540.

## I-40 \& US 70 Business

The US 70 Business interchange with I-40 is a partial cloverleaf design with loop ramps in the northeast, southeast, and northwest interchange quadrants. The interchange features single and dual lane on-ramps and off-ramps with free-flowing entry/exit movements for each facility. The US 70 Business is an existing four-lane divided facility.


## I-40 \& US 70 (Clayton Bypass)

US 70 (Clayton Bypass), opened to traffic in 2008, terminates at a system interchange with l-40. This system interchange is a trumpet interchange design with two lanes on the l-40 eastbound off-ramp flyover and a single lane on all other ramps.


US 64 I US 264 (Knightdale Bypass) \& Hodge Road The Hodge Road service interchange with US 64 / US 264 is a partial cloverleaf design with loop ramps in the northwest and southwest interchange quadrants. Signalized ramp terminals exist on both sides of the Hodge Road overpass. Per direction from NCDOT staff, these intersection ramp terminals are not included in this study.


I-540 \& US 264 / US 64 (Knightdale Bypass)
I-540 currently terminates at a system interchange with US 64 / US 264. This system interchange is a trumpet interchange design with a one lane flyover and loop ramp. This interchange is designed to accommodate future Complete 540.


US 264 I US 64 (Knightdale Bypass) \&
Smithfield Road
The Smithfield Road service interchange with US 64 / US 264 is a traditional diamond interchange design. Signalized ramp terminals exist on both sides of the US 64 / US 264 overpass. Per direction from NCDOT staff, these intersection ramp terminals are not included in this study.


US 64 Business \& I-540
The US 64 Business service interchange with I-540 is a diamond interchange design with a loop ramp in the southwest interchange quadrant. Signalized ramp terminals exist on both sides of the US 64 Business overpass. Per direction from NCDOT staff, these intersection ramp terminals are not included in this study.


## Existing Study Area Intersections

There are 18 existing at-grade intersections in the project study area that were analyzed in the No-Build and Build scenarios, as they are expected to be impacted by the Complete 540 DSA alignments. Not all intersections are impacted by every design scenario, and only those intersections that are directly impacted by the proposed functional designs are studied in each Build DSA analysis. Table 2 provides a list of existing intersections and their existing traffic control details.

Table 2. Existing Study Area Intersection Details

| Intersection | Study ID \# | Traffic Control | Signal Phases | Signal Operation | Cross walk | Ped Signals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NC 55 Bypass and NC 540 EB Ramps | 10 | Unsig | N/A | N/A | No | No |
| NC 55 Bypass and NC 540 WB Ramps | 11 | Unsig | N/A | N/A | No | No |
| Holly Springs Road (SR 1152) and Kildaire Farm Road (SR 1300) | 23 | Signal | 3 | Coord | No | No |
| US 401 and Donny Brook Road (SR 1503) / Old McCullers Rd (SR 2779) | 42 | Signal | 5 | Coord | No | No |
| US 401 and Wake Tech Drive | 43 | Signal | 5 | Coord | Yes | Yes |
| US 401 and Ten Ten Road (SR 1010) | 44 | Signal | 8 | Coord | No | No |
| US 401 and Dwight Rowland Road (SR 2753) | 45 | Unsig | N/A | N/A | No | No |
| US 401 and Meadow Drive (SR 2886) | 46 | Unsig | N/A | N/A | No | No |
| Old Stage Road (SR 1006) and Vandora Springs Road (SR 2711) | 52 | Signal | 2 | Free-Run | No | No |
| Old Stage Road (SR 1006) and Norman Blalock Road (SR 2750) | 53 | Unsig | N/A | N/A | No | No |
| Vandora Springs Road (SR 2711) and Buffaloe Road (SR 2711) | 54 | Unsig* | N/A | N/A | Yes | No |
| NC 50 and Cleveland Road (SR 1010) / Stevens Oaks Drive (SR 5324) | 66 | Signal | 3 | Free-Run | No | No |
| NC 50 and Ten Ten Road (SR 1010) | 67 | Signal | 3 | Free-Run | No | No |
| White Oak Road (SR 2700) and Raynor Road (SR 2555) | 82 | Unsig | N/A | N/A | No | No |
| Rock Quarry Road (SR 2542) and Auburn-Knightdale Road (SR 2555) | 102 | Signal | 2 | Free-Run | No | No |
| Rock Quarry Road (SR 2542) and Old Baucom Road (SR 5204) | 103 | Unsig | N/A | N/A | No | No |
| Poole Road (SR 1007) and Hodge Road (SR 2516) | 122 | Signal | 3 | Free-Run | No | No |
| Hilltop Needmore Road (SR 1393) and Old Mills Road (SR 1421) | 202 | Unsig | N/A | N/A | No | No |

Unsig = Unsignalized/Stop-Controlled Intersection $\quad$ * = Roundabout
Coord = Coordinated Signal Control (Closed Loop System)

### 2.4 Data Collection

Field verification of existing conditions and operations within the study area, including geometrics, traffic control devices, speed limits, and traffic patterns, was completed in September 2014. In August 2014 HNTB received the most recent traffic signal plans in the study area from the NCDOT Transportation Mobility and Safety Division. The 2035 LRTP and 2040 MTP documents were obtained from Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO).

### 2.5 Peak Hour Traffic Counts

The Complete 540-Triangle Expressway Southeast Extension NCDOT STIP Project R-2721, $R$-2828 \& R-2829 Traffic Forecast Technical Memorandum, prepared by HNTB North Carolina, PC in April 2014 and approved by the NCDOT Transportation Planning Branch (TPB), was used to develop the AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes analyzed in this study. Appendix B contains the traffic forecast used in this report. Refer to the original traffic forecast documentation for additional details on the traffic counts conducted to support the traffic forecast.

Raw count data was not directly used in the 2012 base year traffic analyses for Complete 540. 2012 base year volumes that were analyzed in this report are a product of the final traffic forecast data that included daily traffic estimates/directional splits/design hourly volume estimates that were reduced to AM and PM peak hour information. Appendix D contains the traffic forecast breakout peak hour traffic volumes.

## 3. CAPACITY ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

Evaluating traffic operations on suburban arterials and uninterrupted flow freeway facilities is generally done by the determination of level of service (LOS) criteria. The level of service on a freeway segment, arterial corridor, or individual intersection correlates qualitative aspects of traffic flow to quantitative terms. This enables transportation professionals to take the qualitative issues, such as congestion and substandard geometrics, and translate them into measurable quantities, such as operating speeds, flow densities, and vehicular delays. The 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM 2010) characterizes level of service by letter designations A through F. Level of service A represents ideal low-volume traffic operations, and level of service F represents over-saturated, high-volume traffic operations.

LOS for intersections is determined by average delay per vehicle, while LOS for freeway facilities is primarily determined by vehicular density of a defined freeway segment, merge/diverge area or weaving section. Level of service letter designations and criteria for arterial intersections (seconds of delay per vehicle) and for freeway facilities (average density in passenger cars per mile per lane ( $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ ) ) are described in Table 3.

The AM and PM peak hour results of this analysis are based on the LOS and delay procedures presented in the HCM 2010. To obtain optimized signal timings for the future traffic conditions, the timing optimization software Synchro Professional Version 7.0 was used to evaluate an optimal cycle length and phasing for the projected peak hour traffic volumes. Existing intersection signal plans were used in the analysis to develop cycle lengths, phasing, splits and intersection coordination along the project study area's arterial facilities (where applicable). NCDOT Congestion Management Section Capacity Analysis Guidelines were used in developing all other scenario timings for Build scenarios and/or future year analyses.

All freeway analyses, such as basic freeway segments and ramp merges and diverges, were analyzed using the Highway Capacity Software (HCS) 2010 freeway facilities system module (FreeVal). FreeVal allows the integration of individual segment analyses into corridor analysis to study potential multi-segment operational issues.

To simplify the process of organizing analysis results for all No-Build Alternative and Build Alternative scenarios, an identification scheme was developed for all freeway segments and study area intersections. In general, between 113 to 137 Build Complete 540 freeway segments (depending on a specific DSA alignment) were analyzed in the HCS FreeVal software package for all 17 DSAs in the 2012 and 2035 analysis years, for the AM and PM peak hours, and in the eastbound and westbound directions. Segments are numbered sequentially in the eastbound/northbound direction and then the westbound/southbound direction (with several segment numbers added/subtracted to account for changing designs between DSAs in 2012 and 2035 analyses). Each identification also includes a preceding letter designation for basic freeways (B), diverge ramp areas (D), merge ramp areas (M) and weaving sections (W) in the project study area.

To aid in the organizational process for analyzing surface street at-grade intersections and to assist in individual corridor signal coordination optimization, each Y-line facility intersecting Completing 540 was separated and numbered as individual zones in Synchro (1-12 and 20). Individual signalized and unsignalized study area intersections are then numbered 10-202 moving from west to east and south to north through the study area to correspond with the analysis zone (i.e. Zone 12 includes Intersections 120, 121 and 122). Tables 13 and 20 show the identification of all analyzed intersections for 2012 and 2035.

Table 3. Intersection \& Freeway Segment Level of Service (LOS) Characteristics

|  | Intersection |  | Freeway |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level of Service Description | Per Vehicle Delay Signal Control |  | Basic Freeway Segment Density (pc/mi/ln) | Merge / Diverge / Weaving Area Density (pc/mi/ln) |
| LOS A <br> > Free flow <br> > Freedom to select desired speed / maneuver is extremely high <br> > General level of comfort and convenience for motorists is excellent | $\begin{aligned} & <10.0 \\ & \text { seconds } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <10.0 \\ & \text { seconds } \end{aligned}$ | 0-11.0 | < $=10.0$ |
| LOS B <br> > Stable flow <br> > Other vehicles in the traffic stream become noticeable <br> $>$ Reduction in freedom to maneuver from LOS A | $\begin{aligned} & 10.0-20.0 \\ & \text { seconds } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.0-15.0 \\ \text { seconds } \end{gathered}$ | >11.0-18.0 | >10.0-20.0 |
| LOS C <br> > Stable flow <br> > Maneuverability/operating speed are significantly affected by other vehicles <br> > General level of comfort and convenience declines noticeably | $\begin{gathered} 20.0-35.0 \\ \text { seconds } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.0-25.0 \\ \text { seconds } \end{gathered}$ | >18.0-26.0 | >20.0-28.0 |
| LOS D <br> > High density but stable flow <br> > Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted <br> > General level of comfort / convenience is poor <br> $>$ Small increases in traffic will generally cause operational problems | $\begin{gathered} 35.0-55.0 \\ \text { seconds } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25.0-35.0 \\ \text { seconds } \end{gathered}$ | >26.0-35.0 | >28.0-35.0 |
| LOS E <br> > Unstable flow <br> > Speed reduced to lower but relatively uniform value <br> > Volumes at or near capacity level <br> > Comfort and convenience are extremely poor <br> > Small flow increases/minor traffic disturbances will cause breakdowns | $\begin{gathered} 55.0-80.0 \\ \text { seconds } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35.0-50.0 \\ \text { seconds } \end{gathered}$ | >35.0-45.0 | >35.0 |
| LOS F <br> > Forced or breakdown flow <br> > Volumes exceed roadway capacity <br> > Formation of unstable queues <br> > Stoppages for long periods of time because of traffic congestion | $\begin{gathered} >80.0 \\ \text { seconds } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >50.0 \\ \text { seconds } \end{gathered}$ | > 45.0 | Demand exceeds capacity |

### 3.1 Freeway Analysis Methodology

The initial procedure for freeway analysis input into the HCS 2010 freeway facilities module (FreeVal) involved the segmentation of existing (NC 540, I-40, US 70, US 64 / US 264, I-540) and the proposed freeway facility (Complete 540). Functional design files for all 17 DSAs were reviewed and each DSA was segmented appropriately depending on its unique alignment, proposed interchange forms and geometric characteristics. Segments fall into the following categories - basic freeway segments, merge areas, diverge areas, weaving segments and collector-distributor facilities.

After segmentation, geometric and traffic flow inputs were entered into the HCS FreeVal software module for each segment. For a basic freeway segment, these inputs (and typical values used in this analysis) include:

- Traffic Volume (From NCDOT Forecast non-adjustable peak hour breakouts for the first entering mainline segment only)
- Peak Hour Factor (Assume 0.90). Four 15-minute time periods with demand adjustment factors of $0.89,1.00,1.11$ and 1.00 were applied to the hourly demand to replicate a 0.90 PHF. See Appendix E for additional information.
- Number of lanes (Varies depending on existing geometrics, planned LRTP improvements to existing freeway facilities or DSA designs - standard DSA design is for a six-lane divided facility in most locations, with three travel lanes in each direction)
- Terrain Type (Assumed to be "Rolling" for this area per Design Criteria)
- Base Free Flow Speed (Assumed to be 5 mph greater than posted speed limits. See Appendix E for supporting Toll 540 and I-540 speed data)
- Truck Percentage (Taken from Traffic Forecast - Duals+TTST/2 for peak hour mainline - study area entry segment only. All other mainline segments calculated based on on/off-ramp percentages)
- Lane Width (12 feet - default)
- Right Shoulder Lateral Clearance (6 feet - default)
- Segment Lengths (as determined by aerial photography or functional designs between upstream/downstream merge/diverge points)

The FreeVal inputs for merging and diverging areas contain additional input parameters beyond the basic freeway segment information. These parameters, and typical values used in this analysis, include:

- On-Ramp/Off-Ramp Volumes (NCDOT Forecast peak hour breakouts)
- Location of Ramp Relative to Freeway - Left or Right (Right)
- Acceleration/Deceleration Lane Lengths (From aerial photography, field measurement or functional designs)
- Free Flow Speeds on Ramps (50 mph for cloverleaf/flyover on/off ramps/diamond on/off ramps and 30 mph for loop ramps)
- Truck Percentage (Taken from Traffic Forecast - Duals+TTST/2 for peak hour Y-line)

The FreeVal inputs for weaving areas contain additional input parameters beyond the basic freeway segment and ramp segment information. These parameters, and typical values used in this analysis, include:

- On-Ramp/Off-Ramp Volumes (From Factored Counts or Forecast)
- Location of Ramp Relative to Freeway - Left or Right (Right)
- Acceleration/Deceleration Lane Lengths (From aerial photography, field measurement or functional designs)
- Free Flow Speeds on Ramps (30 mph for loop ramps)

After inputs were entered into FreeVal and checked, output data for each segment was collected for the segment density and corresponding LOS. In addition, system-wide information (by freeway direction) from FreeVal was compiled and compared for the study alternatives. Detailed output from FreeVal can be found in Appendix E.

The following FreeVal analysis assumptions were also implemented in the development of the FreeVal network files:

- On-Ramp/Off-Ramp Volumes (Maximum 1-lane ramp demand of 2,200 vehicles per hour. Where ramp demands exceeded 2,200 vehicles per hour, ramp lane was increased from 1 to 2-lanes. This only occurred in the 2035 No-Build scenarios.)
- Acceleration/Deceleration Lane Lengths (Maximum input distance of 1,500 feet. All distances exceeding 1,500 feet were reduced to 1,500 feet).
- Drop Lanes (Due to FreeVal analysis limitations, an off-ramp was analyzed to remove volumes from the mainline to create the effect of a drop lane.)
- 2012 Build Complete 540 Westbound AM Volume Adjustment (Freeval input corridor volumes analyzed were increased on Complete 540 at I-40 to equal individual DSA breakout volumes at this location. The initial balanced FreeVal corridor volumes produced unreasonably low volumes based on incremental differences between individual peak hour breakouts.)


### 3.2 Signalized Intersection Analysis Methodology

Signalized intersection capacity analyses were performed using Synchro Professional Software Version 7.0 for all scenarios. GIS-based roadway centerline information and geo-referenced aerial photography were obtained from NCDOT and NC OneMap to establish a base map for developing the proper spatial orientation of the Synchro roadway network for the separate y-line arterial roadway corridors that have existing interchanges with I-40/US 264 or future DSA interchanges with Complete 540 corridors that are being analyzed for this study. Per direction from NCDOT Congestion Management staff, no analysis of the Y-line ramp terminal intersections intersecting I-40, US 64 / US 264 or US 64 Business beyond actual DSA design footprints were made for this study.

HNTB traffic forecast 2012 base year traffic volume data for the AM and PM peak hours was entered into the Synchro networks. Current signal plans were obtained from NCDOT and used for the 2012 No-Build Alternative inputs for signal phasing and timing (cycle length, splits, offset, and coordination). Additional signal timing details that comply with NCDOT Congestion Management practices and recommendations were also updated (lost time, no right-turn-on-red, PHF, etc...) for the AM and PM peak hours.

2012 Build Alternative analyses and 2035 design year No-Build and Build analyses included updates to Synchro inputs and parameters as follows:

- Traffic volume updates for each alternative from traffic forecast breakouts
- Reoptimization of cycle lengths/splits/offsets for the 2012 Base Year Build alternatives holding cycle lengths constant between alternatives with similar interchange forms for relevant comparison of Build alternative impacts
- Reoptimization of cycle lengths/splits/offsets for 2035 No-Build conditions
- Further reoptimization checks for 2035 Build alternatives - keeping cycle lengths constant between alternatives with similar interchange forms
- Updating intersection control from unsignalized to signalized between No-Build and Build and/or base and future year scenarios, if warranted based on unsignalized intersection capacity analysis results and Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) peak hour signal warrant criteria/thresholds
- Permissible changes in signal phasing in situations where phase orders could improve performance and complied with NCDOT Congestion Management policies/guidelines
- Synchro default lane utilization factors (LUFs) were updated at intersections where dual left turns and/or downstream lane drops were present using the calculation methods outlined in the NCDOT research report titled False Capacity for Lane Drops by Lee, et al. (2005).

Detailed Synchro output reports, including both LOS and delay results for all analyses, is included in Appendix F.

### 3.3 Unsignalized Intersection Analysis Methodology

Unsignalized intersection capacity analyses were performed using the HCS software module for two-way stop-controlled intersections. There are six existing unsignalized, two-way stopcontrolled intersections in the project study area that were included in this analysis:

- Hilltop-Needmore Road and Old Mills Road
- US 401 and Dwight Rowland Road
- US 401 and Meadow Drive
- Old Stage Road and Norman Blalock Road
- White Oak Road and Raynor Road
- Rock Quarry Road and Old Baucom Road

In addition, the DSA Build alternatives introduced unsignalized intersections at Vandora Springs Road and Buffaloe Road (conversion from an existing single-lane roundabout) and Rock Quarry Road and Rock Quarry Road Extension. Inputs into the unsignalized intersection analysis module included:

- Direction of major street
- Laneage for all approaches
- Traffic Volumes for all approaches
- Median Type (no median)
- Peak Hour Factor (Assume 0.90)
- Truck Percentages (Taken from Traffic Forecast - Duals+TTST/2 for peak hour)

Detailed output from the unsignalized HCS module can be found in Appendix G.

### 3.4 Roundabout Intersection Analysis Methodology

Roundabout intersection capacity analysis for the existing roundabout at the intersection of Vandora Springs Road and Buffaloe Road was performed using SIDRA Version 5.1.6.2039. This intersection was evaluated as a single-lane roundabout in the 2012 No-Build alternative and as a two-lane roundabout in the 2035 No-Build alternative due to the widening of Vandora Springs from a two-lane to four-lane cross-section in the 2035 long-range transportation plan (LRTP).

Detailed SIDRA output is located in Appendix $\boldsymbol{H}$.
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## 4. DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

The following sections describe the alternatives analyzed in this report. During the project scoping process, it was agreed by all project stakeholders that seventeen (17) Build DSA alternatives would be compared to No-Build scenarios in the base (2012) and design (2035) year. These alternatives are discussed in detail below.

### 4.1 No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative assumes that no further development of the Complete 540 project will occur within the project study area limits, but any other background improvements that are committed to and funded by NCDOT, local municipalities, or private development projects would occur by the 2035 design year. Based on information collected to date for the Complete 540 project, the additional improvements shown in Table 4 are currently anticipated (or approved in the 2035 CAMPO LRTP) in the project study area by the 2035 design year. After the beginning of the project process, CAMPO adopted a 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Therefore, the project is currently using assumptions from the 2035 LRTP and will consider 2040 MTP assumptions at the most appropriate time in the future project process.

Additionally, NCDOT STIP Project \# R-2635D, also referred to as Access 540, proposes to convert the existing bridge on Old Holly Springs-Apex Road at Triangle Expressway (Toll NC 540) to a partial cloverleaf interchange and construct auxiliary lanes between US 1 and NC 55 Bypass. The project is currently scheduled to be open to traffic in 2017. The 2035 design year No-Build and Build freeway analyses include this future planned interchange.

It was assumed that all existing roadway geometrics, laneage, and traffic control would remain consistent with 2012 base year information along all other areas. The only additional improvement assumed in the No-Build Alternative between the 2012 and 2035 analysis years was signal timing optimization for all arterial corridors in the project study area.

Table 4. LRTP Changes to Study Area Roadways

| SR <br> Number | Road Name | Segment | Existing Laneage | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 2035 \\ \text { LRTP } \\ \text { Laneage } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | I-40 | Exit 303 (Jones Sausage Road) to Exit 306 (US 70 Business) | 6 | 8 |
|  | 1-40 | Exit 306 (US 70 Business) to Exit 312 (NC 42) | 4 | 8 |
| - | I-540 | Exit 24 (US 64 Business) to Exit 26 (US 64/264) | 6 | 8 |
| - | US 64 / US 264 | Exit 422 (Hodge Road) to Exit 425 (Smithfield Road) | 6 | 6 |
| - | US 70 | Exit 318 (1-40) to Exit 320 (NC 42) | 4 | 4 |
|  | US 401 | Simpkins Road to Ten Ten Road | 4 | 6 |
| - | US 401 | Ten Ten Road to Tech Road | 4 | 6 |
|  | US 401 | Hilltop Road to Johnson Pond Road | 4 | 6 |
| - | NC 50 | Timber Drive to Ten Ten Road | 2 | 4 |
|  | NC 50 | Ten Ten Road to Cleveland School Road | 2 | 4 |
| - | NC 55 Bypass | E Williams Street to Old Smithfield Road | 4 | 4 |
| - | US 70 Business | I-40 to NC 42 | 4 | 4 |
| 1007 | Poole Road | Hodge Road to Clifton Road | 2 | 4 |
| 1010 | Ten Ten Road | Lake Wheeler Road to Old McCullers Road | 2 | 2 |
| 1010 | Ten Ten Road | Jordan Road to NC 50 | 2 | 2 |
| 1152 | Holly Springs Road | Ten Ten Road to Kildaire Farm Road | 2 | $6^{1}$ |
| 1152 | Holly Springs Road | Kildaire Farm Road to Sunset Lake Road | 2 | 2 |
| 2713 | Vandora Springs Road | Old Stage Road to Timber Drive | 2 | 4 |
| 2711 | Buffaloe Road | Vandora Springs Road to Aversboro Road | 2 | 2 |
| 1006 | Old Stage Road | US 401 to Ten Ten Road | 2 | $2^{2}$ |
| 1006 | Old Stage Road | Ten Ten Road to Banks Road | 2 | 2 |
| 1006 | Old Stage Road | Fanny Brown Road to Panther Lake Road | 2 | 2 |
| 1010 | Cleveland School Road | NC 50 to NC 42 | 2 | 2 |
| 1393 | Hilltop Needmore Road | Sunset Lake Road to Johnson Pond Road | 2 | 2 |
| 2542 | Rock Quarry Road | Battle Bridge Road to E. Garner Road | 2 | 4 |
| 1386 | Bells Lake Road | Ten Ten Road to Optimist Farm Road | 2 | 2 |
| 2700 | White Oak Road | Raynor Road to Carley Circle | 2 | 4 |
| 2555 | Auburn-Knightdale Road | Battle Bridge Road to Grasshopper Road | 2 | 2 |
| 1300 | Kildaire Farm Road | Ten Ten Road to Kildaire Farm Connector | 2 | 4 |
| 1503 | Donny Brook Road | Lake Wheeler Road to US 401 | 2 | 2 |
| 2555 | Raynor Road | White Oak Road to Twain Drive | 2 | 2 |
| 5204 | Old Baucom Road | Rock Quarry Road to Brown Field Road | 2 | 2 |
| 2516 | Hodge Road | US 264/64 to Poole Road | 2 | 2 |
| 2779 | Old McCullers Road | US 401 to Ten Ten Road | 2 | 2 |
| 1421 | Old Mills Road | Hilltop-Needmore Road to Rivington Road | 2 | 2 |
| 2750 | Norman Blalock Road | Johnny Baker Road to Old Stage Road | 2 | 2 |
| 2753 | Dwight Rowland Road | US 401 to Ken Drive | 2 | 2 |
| 2886 | Meadow Drive | US 401 to Long Street | 2 | 2 |

[^0]
### 4.2 Build DSA Alternative Descriptions

The DSA Complete 540 corridors incorporate the ongoing coordination efforts between project planning, design and analysis for development in the NEPA process. Table 5 represents a basic description of the specific corridor segmentation and the resultant 17 DSA combinations, as shown on Exhibit 1 below and in Appendix A.

Table 5. Detailed Study Alternatives

| Detailed Study <br> Alternative | NC 55 Bypass to I-40 | I-40 to US 64 I US 264 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Orange | Green |
| 2 | Orange | Green-Mint-Green |
| 3 | Orange | Brown-Tan-Green |
| 4 | Orange | Brown-Green |
| 5 | Orange | Green-Teal-Brown-Green |
| 6 | Orange-Red | Green |
| 7 | Orange-Red | Mint-Green |
| 8 | Orange-Purple-Blue-Lilac | Green |
| 9 | Orange-Purple-Blue-Lilac | Green-Mint-Green |
| 10 | Orange-Purple-Blue-Lilac | Brown-Tan-Green |
| 11 | Orange-Purple-Blue-Lilac | Brown-Green |
| 12 | Orange-Purple-Blue-Lilac | Green-Teal-Brown-Green |
| 13 | Orange-Lilac | Green |
| 14 | Orange-Lilac | Green-Mint-Green |
| 15 | Orange-Lilac | Brown-Tan-Green |
| 16 | Orange-Lilac | Brown-Green |
| 17 | Orange-Lilac | Green-Teal-Brown-Green |

Exhibit 1. Detailed Study Alternatives Corridors


Detailed Study Alternative 1 - This alternative features the Orange Corridor for the southern section of the project. The Orange Corridor, also known as the NCDOT Protected Corridor (August 1996, North Carolina Transportation Corridor Official Map Act, N.C.G.S. § 136-44.50), begins at the Triangle Expressway and NC 55 interchange in Holly Springs and travels eastward to the I-40 and US 70 interchange near the border of Wake and Johnston Counties. The Orange Corridor primarily runs to the south of and parallel to SR 1010 (Ten Ten Road) for the majority of its alignment. The Orange Corridor includes planned interchanges at NC 55, SR 1152 (Holly Springs Road), SR 1386 (Bells Lake Road), US 401, SR 1006 (Old Stage Road), NC 50 and I-40.

DSA 1 includes the Green Corridor for the eastern section of the project. The Green Corridor begins at the I-40 and US 70 interchange and heads north/northeast to the existing I-540 and US 64/264 interchange. The Green Corridor has planned interchanges with I-40, SR 2700 (White Oak Road), US 70 Business, SR 2542 (Rock Quarry Road), SR 2555 (AuburnKnightdale Road), SR 1007 (Poole Road) and US 64/264.

Detailed Study Alternative 2 - DSA 2 utilizes the Orange Corridor (see description above) for the southern section. The eastern section includes the Green and Mint Corridors. The Mint Corridor has interchanges at the same locations as the Green Corridor. The only difference between the two alignments is that the section of the project between Rock Quarry Road and Auburn Knightdale Road has a proposed alignment slightly further to the east in the Mint Corridor option.

Detailed Study Alternative 3 - The Orange Corridor is used for the southern section. The Green, Brown, and Tan Corridors are used for the eastern section of DSA 3. DSA 3 has planned eastern section interchanges with I-40, SR 2700 (White Oak Road), US 70 Business, SR 5204 (Old Baucom Road), SR 2555 (Auburn-Knightdale Road), SR 1007 (Poole Road) and US 64/264. The I-40, Poole Road, and US 64/264 interchanges are proposed to be at the same locations as the Green Corridor. The Brown Corridor's White Oak Road interchange is located slightly to the east of the Green Corridor interchange. The Brown Corridor then takes a more eastern turn to it proposed US 70 Business interchange, which is located near the Wake and Johnston County line. Next, the Tan Corridor alignment begins and heads north to the proposed Old Baucom Road interchange, different from the Rock Quarry Road location found in the Green Corridor. The planned Auburn-Knightdale Road interchange is at the same location in the Tan Corridor as it is in the Green Corridor. From that point, the Tan Corridor merges back into the Green Corridor alignment.

Detailed Study Alternative 4 - DSA 4 is a slight variation of DSA 3. The Orange Corridor is used for the southern section. The Green and Brown Corridors are utilized for the eastern section of DSA 4. The Brown and Tan Corridors have interchanges on the same facilities. The only variations between the Brown and Tan are that the proposed Brown Corridor interchange with Old Baucom Road is slightly to the east of the Tan interchange location and the planned Auburn-Knightdale Road interchange location is slightly more to the east than the Green and Tan Corridor location. After the Auburn-Knightdale Road interchange the Brown Corridor merges back into the Green Corridor alignment.

Detailed Study Alternative 5 - DSA 5 is a combination of DSAs 1-4. The Orange Corridor is used for the southern section. The Green, Teal, and Brown Corridors are combined to create the eastern section of the project. DSA 5 has proposed interchanges with I-40, SR 2700 (White

Oak Road), US 70 Business, SR 5204 (Old Baucom Road), SR 2555 (Auburn-Knightdale Road), SR 1007 (Poole Road), and US 64/264. The planned I-40, White Oak Road, and US 70 Business interchanges are the same as the Green Corridor. The Teal Corridor then aligns to the east and shares the proposed Old Baucom Road and Auburn-Knightdale Road interchanges with the Brown Corridor. This DSA then rejoins the Green Corridor at the Poole Road and US 64/264 interchange locations.

Detailed Study Alternative 6 - This alternative is a combination of the proposed Orange and Red Corridors for the southern section of the project. DSA 6 follows the Orange Corridor through the planned interchanges at NC 55 Bypass, SR 1152 (Holly Springs Road), and SR 1386 (Bells Lake Road). After the proposed Bells Lake Road interchange, the Red Corridor continues eastward crossing SR 1010 (Ten Ten Road) and forming an interchange with US 401 north of SR 1010. The Red Corridor then continues northeast, traveling between Lake Wheeler and Lake Benson, featuring planned interchanges with SR 1006 (Old Stage Road) and NC 50 north of Lake Benson. The planned I-40 interchange location for the Red Corridor is located south of the existing I-40 and US 70 Business interchange (l-40 Exit 306) and north of the SR 2700 (White Oak Road) overpass.

Continuing into the eastern section of the project, the Red Corridor does not have an interchange with US 70 Business, but instead has a proposed interchange at SR 2542 (Rock Quarry Road) that includes an extension of Rock Quarry Road to the south that forms an intersection with US 70 Business. The proposed Rock Quarry Road interchange on the Red Corridor is in the same location as the Rock Quarry Road interchange on the Green Corridor. After the Rock Quarry Road interchange, DSA 6 follows the remainder of the Green Corridor, with future interchanges at SR 2555 (Auburn-Knightdale Road), SR 1007 (Poole Road) and US 64/264.

Detailed Study Alternative 7 - DSA 7 is a slight variation of DSA 6. DSA 7 utilizes the Orange and then the Red Corridor for the southern section, as described in DSA 6. The eastern section alignment includes the Red Corridor, Mint Corridor (see DSA 2 description above), and Green Corridor.

Detailed Study Alternative 8 - This alternative combines the Orange and then the Purple, Blue, and Lilac Corridors for the southern section of the project. The proposed DSA 8 alignment follows the Orange Corridor through the future interchanges at NC 55 Bypass and SR 1152 (Holly Springs Road). After the Holly Springs Road interchange, the Purple Corridor diverges southward from the Orange Corridor. The proposed Purple Corridor has an interchange with SR 1393 (Hilltop Needmore Road). The Purple Corridor alignment then continues southeast to a planned interchange with US 401. DSA 8 continues eastward on the Blue Corridor alignment, with a proposed interchange at SR 1006 (Old Stage Road). The Blue Corridor then merges into the Lilac Corridor alignment just west of the proposed NC 50 interchange. DSA 8 follows the Lilac Corridor alignment to the I-40 and US 70 interchange.

On the eastern section of the project, the Lilac Corridor alignment merges into the Green Corridor prior to the White Oak Road interchange. After the future White Oak Road interchange location, DSA 6 follows the remainder of the Green Corridor alignment, with future interchanges at SR 2542 (Rock Quarry Road), SR 2555 (Auburn-Knightdale Road), SR 1007 (Poole Road) and US 64/264.

Detailed Study Alternative 9 - DSA 9 is a slight variation of DSA 8. DSA 9 utilizes the Orange, Purple, Blue, and Lilac Corridors for the southern section, as described in DSA 8. The eastern section uses the Green and Mint Corridors (see DSA 2 description above).

Detailed Study Alternative 10 - DSA 10 features the Orange, Purple, Blue, and Lilac Corridor alignments (see DSA 9 description above) for the southern section. The eastern section utilizes a combination of the Brown, Tan, and Green Corridors (see DSA 3 description above).

Detailed Study Alternative 11 - DSA 11 features the Orange, Purple, Blue, and Lilac Corridor alignments (see DSA 9 description above) for the southern section. The eastern section proposed alignment features a combination of the Brown, and Green Corridors (see DSA 4 description above).

Detailed Study Alternative 12 - DSA 12 features the Orange, Purple, Blue, and Lilac Corridor alignment (see DSA 9 description above) for the southern section. The Green, Teal, and Brown Corridors are combined to create the eastern section alignment of this project alternative (see DSA 5 description above).

Detailed Study Alternative 13 - This alternative contains the Orange and Lilac Corridor alignments for the southern section of the project. The proposed Lilac Corridor diverges from the Orange Corridor east of the future SR 1006 (Old Stage Road) interchange. The planned Lilac Corridor interchanges with NC 50 and I-40 and US 70 are north of the locations of the proposed NC 50 and I-40 and US 70 interchanges on the Orange Corridor. On the eastern section of the project, the Lilac Corridor alignment merges into the Green Corridor prior to the proposed White Oak Road interchange. After the White Oak Road interchange, DSA 6 follows the remainder of the Green Corridor.

Detailed Study Alternative 14 - DSA 14 is a slight variation of DSA 13. DSA 14 utilizes the Orange and Lilac Corridor alignments for the southern section. The eastern section features the Green and Mint Corridors (see DSA 2 description above).

Detailed Study Alternative 15 - DSA 15 utilizes the Orange and Lilac Corridor alignments (see DSA 13 description above) for the southern section. The eastern section contains a combination of the Brown, Tan, and Green Corridors (see DSA 3 description above).

Detailed Study Alternative 16 - DSA 16 features the Orange and Lilac Corridor alignments (see DSA 13 description above) for the southern section. The eastern section utilizes a combination of the proposed Brown, and Green Corridors (see DSA 4 description above).

Detailed Study Alternative 17 - DSA 17 features the Orange and Lilac Corridor alignments (see DSA 13 description above) for the southern section. The proposed Green, Teal, and Brown Corridors are combined to create the eastern section of this project alternative (see DSA 5 description above).

Table 6, on the following page, summarizes the interchange forms for each DSA along the southern and eastern sections of NC 540.

Table 6. Interchange Forms by Detailed Study Alternative

|  |  | DSA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interchange | Interchange \# | 12 | 4 | 5 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 7 |
| NC 55 BYP \& NC 540 | 1 | 6 Ramp ParClo AD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Holly Springs \& NC 540 | 2 | DDI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bells Lake \& NC 540 | 3 | ParClo AC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ParClo AC |  |
| US 401 \& NC 540 | 4 | 6 Ramp ParClo AC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6RParClo BD |  |
| Old Stage \& NC 540 | 5 | Diamond |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6RParClo AC |  |
| NC 50 \& NC 540 | 6 | Half TghtDiam B Parclo BC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DDI |  |
| 1-40 \& NC 540 | 7 | Dreamcatcher |  |  | 4 Level Directional |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CloSemiDir D C/D |  |
| White Oak \& NC 540 | 8 | ParClo BC | ParClo AD ${ }^{\text {Parclo BC }}$ |  | ParClo AD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| US 70 BUS \& NC 540 | 9 | 6RParClo AC | TghtDiam | 6RParClo AC | 6RParC | Io AC | TghtD | am | Parclo AC | 6RPar | o AC | Tght | iam | arClo AC |  |  |
| Rock Quarry / Old Baucom \& NC 540 | 10 | ParClo AD | Tight Diamond |  | ParClo AD |  | Tight Diamond |  |  | ParClo AD |  | Tight Diamond |  |  | Diamond |  |
| Auburn-Knightdale \& NC 540 | 11 | ParClo AD |  | ParClo BC | ParClo AD |  |  | ParClo BC |  | ParClo AD |  |  |  | o BC | ParClo AD |  |
| Poole \& NC 540 | 12 | Half Tight Diamond B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| US 64/264 \& NC 540 | 13 | Semidirectional BD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hilltop-Needmore \& NC 540 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Parclo BC |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Abbreviations:
ParClo AD - Partial Cloverleaf with Loops in Quadrants A \& D
DDI - Diverging Diamond Interchange
6R - 6 Ramp
TghtDiam - Tight Diamond Interchange
CloSemiDir D C/D - Cloverleaf with a semi-direct connection in Quadrant D and Collector-Distributor Roads

## 5. 2012 BASE YEAR / 2035 DESIGN YEAR TRAFFIC VOLUME DEVELOPMENT

NCDOT-approved traffic forecast information from the Complete 540 - Triangle Expressway Southeast Extension NCDOT STIP Project R-2721, R-2828 \& R-2829 Traffic Forecast Technical Memorandum, prepared by HNTB North Carolina, PC in April 2014 was used as a basis for developing AM and PM peak hour traffic volume data for the 2012 base year and 2035 design year. The daily traffic forecasts for the Complete 540 study area from that document are shown in Appendix B. Daily traffic flows and design data (DHV and D) were entered into the NCDOT Congestion Management Section peak hour breakout spreadsheets for conversion into peak hour volumes at each study area intersection. Truck percentages from the forecast were utilized in the traffic analysis using the assumption of (Duals + TTST / 2) equals peak hour truck percentages.

The peak hour breakout spreadsheet results were converted into individual AM and PM peak hour movements for the proposed DSA interchange forms in a separate conversion spreadsheet developed by HNTB. Both the peak hour breakout spreadsheets and the interchange conversion spreadsheets are found in Appendix $\boldsymbol{D}$.

Design year (2035) peak hour traffic volumes in the project study area are shown in the freeway segment / intersection LOS result figures for DSA 1, 6 and 8 in Appendix A. These figures, described in the following sections, schematically show the Complete 540 freeway system, study area analysis segments, intersections, and laneage for each alternative for the design year.

Traffic flows were balanced between ramp terminals at each interchange, and were balanced (through the FreeVal software data entry) for mainline segments along existing and proposed DSA alignments based on an entry input volume and subsequent peak hour breakout on-ramp/off-ramp volumes. In this manner, the existing freeway and proposed DSA freeway systems were balanced with a different methodology (and results) than if individual interchange mainline volume breakouts were analyzed in individual HCS freeway segment analyses.

## 6. 2012 BASE YEAR CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS

This section presents capacity analysis results for the 2012 base year AM and PM peak hours for freeway facilities and intersections within the Complete 540 project study area. Detailed segment measures of effectiveness results for the worst-case AM and PM peak hour for DSA's 1,6 and 8 freeway are presented in Tables 11 and 12 to provide an overall representation of projected operations for all DSA's.

### 6.1 2012 Freeway Segment Results

This analysis uses the 2012 base year No-Build and Build peak hour traffic volumes and existing/proposed freeway geometrics to evaluate traffic operations on the Complete 540, NC 540, I-40, US 70, US 64 / US 264 and I-540 uninterrupted flow facilities in the project study area. The analysis determines individual freeway segment and system-wide density and LOS measures of effectiveness for No-Build and Build DSA scenarios. Figure 3 provides a sheet key for the No-Build freeway segment figures. Figures 7.1 to 7.5 schematically show 2012 base year No-Build existing laneage and intersection traffic control for roadways in the study area, along with the scheme for freeway segment identification numbers. For 2012 No-Build and Build DSAs, Tables 7, 8, 9 and 10 provide an overall summary and comparison of LOS results for the worst-case AM and PM peak hour LOS for each facility direction for basic freeway sections, merges, diverges and weaves. Appendix E contains the detailed HCS 2010 FreeVal output files and corridor summary tables for all DSAs. Individual alternative scenario results are highlighted below.

AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes and existing geometrics were entered into the HCS 2010 FreeVal software module. Since Toll NC 540, Complete 540 and I-540 will form a continuous freeway facility corridor once Complete 540 is constructed, these facility are included in the Complete 540 corridor summary Tables 7, 11 and 12.

### 6.1.1 2012 No-Build Alternative Scenario Results

Most segments along existing freeway facilities perform at an acceptable LOS D or better in the AM and PM peak hours. However, on the I-40 corridor, two (2) eastbound and seven (7) westbound segments are at (LOS E) or exceeding (LOS F) peak hour capacity. Figures 7.1 to 7.5 provide a schematic representation of the results for the freeway system in the project study area.

### 6.1.2 2012 Build - DSA 1-5, 13-17 Scenario Results

For Complete 540 DSA operations, all freeway segments are expected to operate at LOS D or better. For the US 70 and US 64 / US 264 corridors, all freeway segments are projected to operate at LOS D or better. For the I-40 corridor, results indicate that corridor operations and segment densities will slightly improve from the No-Build scenario with two (2) I-40 eastbound and five (5) or six (6) I-40 westbound segments near (LOS E) or exceeding (LOS F) peak hour capacity.

### 6.1.3 2012 Build - DSA 6-7 Scenario Results

For Complete 540 DSA operations, all freeway and collector-distributor segments are expected to operate at LOS D or better. For the US 70 and US 64 / US 264 corridors, all freeway segments are projected to operate at LOS D or better. For the I-40 corridor, results indicate that corridor operations and segment densities will slightly improve from the No-

Build scenario with two (2) I-40 eastbound and five (5) or six (6) I-40 westbound segments at (LOS E) or exceeding (LOS F) peak hour capacity. For the I-40 collector-distributor proposed between US 70 Business and Complete 540, all freeway segments are expected to operate at LOS D or better.

### 6.1.4 2012 Build - DSA 8-12 Scenario Results

For Complete 540 DSA operations, all freeway segments are expected to operate at LOS D or better. For the US 70 and US 64 / US 264 corridors, all freeway segments are projected to operate at LOS D or better. For the I-40 corridor, results indicate that corridor operations and segment densities will slightly improve from the No-Build scenario with two (2) I-40 eastbound and six (6) I-40 westbound segments at (LOS E) or exceeding (LOS F) peak hour capacity.

Table 7. 2012 Base Year Complete 540 No-Build \& Build DSA Freeway Operations Summary

| Scenario | Complete 540 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| No-Build | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 1 | 50 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 31 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 2 | 50 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 31 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 3 | 43 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 31 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 4 | 48 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 31 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 5 | 55 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 6* | 46 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 7* | 45 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 8 | 46 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 9 | 46 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 27 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 10 | 43 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 11 | 43 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 27 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 12 | 50 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 13 | 46 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 31 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 14 | 46 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 31 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 15 | 43 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 31 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 16 | 43 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 31 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 17 | 51 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

*DSA 6, 7 includes analysis of collector-distributor segment along Complete 540.

| Scenario | Complete 540 Collector-Distributor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| DSA 6, 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

NCDOT STIP R-2721, R-2828 \& R-2829: Complete 540 Triangle Expressway Southeast Extension
Detailed Study Alternatives - Traffic Analysis Technical Memorandum

Table 8. 2012 Base Year I-40 No-Build \& Build DSA Freeway Operations Summary

| Scenario | I-40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| No-Build | 0 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| DSA 1, 2 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| DSA 3, 4 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| DSA 5 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| DSA 6, 7* | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 8, 9 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| DSA 10, 11 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| DSA 12 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| DSA 13, 14 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| DSA 15, 16 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| DSA 17 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 |

*DSA 6, 7 also contain analysis of collector-distributor segment along l-40.

| Scenario | I-40 Collector-Distributor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| DSA 6, 7 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 9. 2012 Base Year US 70 No-Build \& Build DSA Freeway Operations Summary

| Scenario | US 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| No-Build | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 1-2 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 3-4 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 5 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 6, 7* | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| DSA 8, 9 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 10, 11 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 12 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 13, 14 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 15, 16 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 17 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

*DSA 6, 7 not included since proposed design does not impact US 70.

Table 10. 2012 Base Year US 64 No-Build \& Build DSA Freeway Operations Summary

| Scenario | US 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| No-Build | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 1, 2, 13, 14 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 3, 4, 15, 16 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 5, 17 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 6, 7 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 8, 9 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 10, 11 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 12 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Table 11. 2012 AM Peak Base Year Freeway Operations Corridor Summary - Complete 540 DSA 1, 6 and 8


[^1]Table 12. 2012 PM Peak Base Year Build Freeway Operations Corridor Summary - Complete 540 DSA 1, 6 and 8


[^2]- 540


### 6.2 2012 Base Year Intersection Capacity Analysis Results

The following sections provide descriptions and tabular results for intersection capacity analyses for all project study area intersections. LOS results and additional signalized intersection details for these scenarios are found in the raw Synchro output sheets in Appendix F. The project study area contains six existing (No-Build) and seven Build unsignalized two-way stopcontrolled intersections - these capacity analysis output sheets are found in Appendix G. Appendix $H$ contains the SIDRA analysis output reports for the one existing (No-Build) singlelane roundabout located within the project study area. A tabular results summary for all alternative scenarios is found in Table 13 on the following pages.

Summary figures showing traffic volumes, laneage, and overall intersection LOS for the 2012 No-Build (Existing) scenario can be found in Figures 7.1 to 7.5. Similar summary figures for the 2012 Build scenarios are not provided in this report; however, the summary figures provided for selected 2035 Build scenarios show where additional 2035 LRTP laneage was added to the 2012 Build design laneage. For all Build DSAs, optimized signal cycle lengths were held constant at locations where the interchange forms were identical, to provide a meaningful comparison between the Build DSAs alternatives. The splits for each phase were re-optimized based on the specific Build DSA traffic forecast volumes.

### 6.2.1 $\quad 2012$ No-Build Alternative Scenario Results

For the 2012 No-Build alternative AM and PM peak hour scenarios, 11 out of the 16 analyzed intersections operate at adequate levels of service in the AM and PM peak hours. The two ramp terminal intersections at the interchange of NC 540 and NC 55 Bypass were not analyzed because they currently operate under free-flow conditions with the existing geometric configuration. Intersections that experience deficient overall LOS in at least one peak hour include:

- US 401 and Ten Ten Road in both the AM (LOS E) and PM (LOS F) peak hour, due to high vehicular delays for left-turn movements.
- NC 50 and Cleveland School Road / Stevens Oaks Drive in the AM peak hour (LOS E), due to limited capacity for the southbound left-turn movement from NC 50 to Cleveland School Road.
- Poole Road and Hodge Road in the PM peak hour (LOS F), due to limited capacity for the southbound left-turn movement from Hodge Road to Poole Road.
- US 401 and Dwight Rowland Road in the AM peak hour, due to the northbound leftturn movement from Dwight Rowland Road to US 401 operating at LOS E.
- White Oak Road and Raynor Road in the PM peak hour, due to the southbound shared left and right-turn movement on Raynor Road operating at LOS E.


### 6.2.2 2012 Build - DSA 1-5, 13-17 Scenario Results

For the 2012 Build DSA 1-5, 13-17 AM and PM peak hour scenarios, it was assumed that all existing signalized intersections in the project study area would be re-optimized, to reflect anticipated traffic volume changes that were included in the Complete 540 traffic forecast data. These changes had a positive effect on operations at the NC 50 and Cleveland School Road / Stevens Oaks Drive intersection (DSAs 1-5 only) and the Poole Road and Hodge Road intersection, with AM and PM peak hour LOS improving to LOS C or better. The PM peak hour southbound shared left and right-turn movement LOS at the two-way
stop-controlled intersection of White Oak Road and Raynor Road remained at LOS E in the DSA 1-2, 5, 13-14, and 17 scenarios, with a slight increase in delay from the No-Build. No other intersections, including the new ramp terminal intersections added in the Build DSA 15 and 13-17 scenarios, would be expected to operate at an overall LOS E or LOS F in the 2012 base year.

### 6.2.3 2012 Build DSA 6-7 Alternative Scenario Results

In the 2012 Build DSA 6-7 AM and PM peak hour scenarios, the splits for each phase were re-optimized based on the 2012 Build DSA 6-7 traffic forecast volumes. These updates had a positive effect on operations at the Poole Road and Hodge Road intersection, with AM and PM peak hour LOS improving to LOS B or better. In the 2012 Build DSA 6-7 scenarios, the intersection of Vandora Springs Road and Buffaloe Road was converted from a single-lane roundabout in the No-Build to an unsignalized intersection with stop control on Buffaloe Road, due to the widening of Vandora Springs Road and the relocation of this intersection in the Build design.

At US 401 and Ten Ten Road, both the AM and PM LOS improved from LOS E (AM) and F (PM) in the No-Build to LOS D (AM) and LOS E (PM) in the Build DSA 6-7 analysis, with lengthy delays still expected for traffic on the Ten Ten Road approaches. No other intersections, including the new ramp terminal intersections added in the Build DSA 6-7 scenarios, would be expected to operate at an overall LOS E or LOS F in 2012.

### 6.2.4 2012 Build DSA 8-12 Alternative Scenario Results

In the 2012 Build DSA 8-12 AM and PM peak hour scenarios, the splits for each phase were re-optimized based on the 2012 Build DSA 8-12 traffic forecast volumes. These updates had a positive effect on operations at the Poole Road and Hodge Road intersection and the US 401 and Dwight Rowland Road intersection, with AM and PM peak hour LOS improving to LOS B or better. In the Build DSA 8-12 scenarios, the proposed DSA design severs Dwight Rowland Road into two sections by the construction of NC 540 and vehicles heading north on Dwight Rowland Road are restricted to right turns only at the intersection with NC 401. The proposed alignment requires local traffic to re-route through the existing road network onto US 401 via Meadow Drive south of the proposed Complete 540 alignment. This re-routing reduced existing and future traffic volume estimates along Dwight Rowland Road and increased existing and future volumes on Meadow Drive for DSA 8-12 analyses.

The intersection of US 401 and Meadow Drive was evaluated for conversion from two-way stop control in the No-Build scenario to signalized control in the DSA analyses, due to the worst-case critical movement (northbound shared left/right) operating at LOS F in the 2012 Build DSA 8-12 AM peak hour. Per results from the HCS Peak Hour Signal Warrants Analysis Module (found in Appendix I), this intersection meets the MUTCD peak hour signal warrant threshold in 2012, and therefore is analyzed as a signalized intersection in the 2012 and 2035 Build DSAs 8-12 scenarios. Based on the Synchro signalized intersection capacity analysis (Appendix F), the signalized intersection of US 401 and Meadow Drive is expected to operate at LOS D or better in 2012.

The PM peak hour southbound shared left and right-turn movement LOS at the two-way stop-controlled intersection of White Oak Road and Raynor Road remained at LOS E in the DSA 8-9 and 12 scenarios, with an increase in delay from the No-Build scenario. No other intersections, including the new ramp terminal intersections added in the Build DSA 8-12 scenarios, would be expected to operate at an overall LOS E or LOS F in 2012.

Table 13. 2012 AM \& (PM) Peak Hour No-Build Intersection Capacity Analysis Results Summary


Delay Measured Inteconds Per Vehicle Bovement that has Operational Deficiencies (LOS E or F)

## 7. 2035 DESIGN YEAR CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS

This section presents future anticipated roadway network changes and capacity analysis results for the 2035 design year AM and PM peak hours for freeway facilities and intersections within the Complete 540 project study area.

### 7.1 Network Changes Between 2012 Scenarios and 2035 Scenarios

The following sections present the network changes between the 2012 No-Build and 2035 NoBuild scenarios and the 2012 Build and 2035 Build scenarios.

### 7.1.1 No-Build Scenario Changes

Table 4, previously shown in Section 4.1 of this report provided updated 2035 laneage assumptions for the roadways scheduled for improvement in the 2035 LRTP. This updated laneage was applied to the 2012 No-Build roadway network analysis files to create updated 2035 No-Build scenarios. In addition, Old Stage Road from US 401 to Ten Ten Road was considered to be widened to four lanes to be consistent with the scheduled widening of Vandora Springs Road in 2035. In addition, this section of Old Stage Road is included as a four-lane section in the 2040 MTP.

### 7.1.2 Build DSA Scenario Changes

The updated 2035 LRTP laneage described in Table 4 was also applied to the 2035 Build DSA scenarios.

## Rock Quarry Road Extension

DSA 6 and 7 also include an assumption to widen the new location Rock Quarry Road Extension to a four-lane section to be consistent with the scheduled 2035 LRTP project to widen existing Rock Quarry Road, and since the Extension would provide primary access between the NC 540, Rock Quarry Road and US 70 Business.

R-2635D (Western Wake Freeway and Old Holly Springs-Apex Road Interchange)
Between the base year and the design year, R-2635D, also referred to as Access 540, proposes to convert the existing bridge on Old Holly Springs-Apex Road at Triangle Expressway (Toll NC 540) to a partial cloverleaf interchange and construct auxiliary lanes between US 1 and NC 55 Bypass. The project is currently scheduled to be open to traffic in 2017. R-2635D functional design plans, prepared by HNTB, were reviewed and incorporated into the freeway analysis only. A partial cloverleaf, with loop ramps in the northeast and southeast quadrants, was analyzed in FreeVal by inserting diverge and merge segments into the existing Toll NC 540 freeway network configuration. The 2035 design year No-Build and Build freeway analyses were updated from the 2012 base year to include this interchange adjacent to the Complete 540 western project termini at NC 55 Bypass.

### 7.2 2035 Freeway Segment Analysis Results

This analysis uses the 2035 design year No-Build and Build peak hour traffic volumes and future planned/proposed freeway geometrics to evaluate traffic operations on the Complete 540, NC 540, I-40, US 70, US 64 / US 264 and I-540 uninterrupted flow facilities in the project study area. Like the 2012 scenario evaluations presented in the previous section, this analysis determines individual freeway segment and system-wide density and LOS measures of
effectiveness for No-Build and Build DSA scenarios. Figures 3, 4, 5 and 6 provide a sheet key for the No-Build and Build DSA 1, 6 and 8 freeway segment figures. Figures 8.1 to 8.5 schematically show 2035 design year No-Build laneage and intersection traffic control for roadways in the study area, along with the scheme for freeway segment identification numbers. Figures 9.1 to 9.8, 10.1 to $\mathbf{1 0 . 0}$ and 11.1 to $\mathbf{1 1 . 8}$ schematically show 2035 design year Build laneage, future 2035 LRTP laneage assumptions, volumes, intersection traffic control, freeway segment identification numbers and LOS for DSAs 1, 6 and 8, respectively.

Due to there being 17 DSAs in this project, summary figures are not provided for all DSAs. As a result, DSAs 1, 6 , and 8 were selected as being most representative of the corridor variations and operations in the study area. For 2035 No-Build and Build DSAs, Tables 14, 15, 16 and 17 provide an overall summary and comparison of LOS results for the worst-case AM and PM peak hour LOS for each facility direction for basic freeway sections, merges, diverges and weaves. Detailed segment measures of effectiveness results for the worst-case AM and PM peak hour for DSA's 1, 6 and 8 are presented in Tables 18 and 19 to provide an overall representation of projected operations for all DSAs. Appendix D contains the detailed HCS 2010 FreeVal output files and corridor summary tables for all DSAs. Individual alternative scenario results are highlighted below.

AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes and existing geometrics were entered into the HCS 2010 FreeVal software module. Since Toll NC 540, Complete 540 and I-540 will form a continuous freeway facility corridor once Complete 540 is constructed, these facility are included in the Complete 540 corridor summary Tables 14, 18 and 19.

### 7.2.1 $\quad 2035$ No-Build Alternative Scenario Results

Most segments along existing freeway facilities perform at an acceptable LOS D or better in the AM and PM peak hours. However, on the I-40 corridor, one (1) eastbound and one (1) westbound segment are at (LOS E) peak hour capacity. On the US 64 / US 264 corridor, six (6) eastbound and nine (9) westbound segments are at (LOS E) or exceeding (LOS F) peak hour capacity. Figures 8.1 to 8.5 provide a schematic representation of the results for the freeway system in the project study area.

### 7.2.2 2035 Build - DSA 1-5, 13-17 Scenario Results

For Complete 540 DSA operations, all freeway segments, except one weaving segment in the westbound PM peak, are expected to operate at LOS D or better. For the US 70 corridor, all freeway segments are projected to operate at LOS D or better. For the I-40 corridor, results indicate that corridor operations and segment densities will slightly improve from the No-Build scenario, with all segments expected to operate at LOS D or better. On the US 64 / US 264 corridor, results indicate very similar operations compared to the NoBuild scenario, with seven (7) or eight (8) eastbound and nine (9) westbound segments at (LOS E) or exceeding (LOS F) peak hour capacity. Figures 9.1 to 9.8 provide a schematic representation of the results for the DSA 1-5 and 13-17 freeway system in the project study area.

### 7.2.3 2035 Build - DSA 6-7 Scenario Results

For Complete 540 DSA operations, all freeway and collector-distributor segments, except one weaving segment in the westbound PM peak, are expected to operate at LOS D or better. For the US 70 corridor, all freeway segments are projected to operate at LOS D or better. For the I-40 corridor, results indicate that corridor operations and segment densities may slightly improve from the No-Build scenario with all segments, except one westbound
segment, expected to operate at LOS D or better. For the I-40 collector-distributor proposed between US 70 Business and Complete 540, all freeway segments are expected to operate at LOS D or better. On the US 64 / US 264 corridor, results indicate similar operations compared to the No-Build with nine (9) eastbound and nine (9) westbound segments at (LOS E) or exceeding (LOS F) peak hour capacity. Figures 10.1 to 10.8 provide a schematic representation of the results for the DSA 6-7 freeway system in the project study area.

### 7.2.4 2035 Build - DSA 8-12 Scenario Results

For Complete 540 DSA operations, all freeway segments, except one weaving segment in the westbound PM peak, are expected to operate at LOS D or better. For the US 70 corridor, all freeway segments are projected to operate at LOS D or better. For the I-40 corridor, results indicate that corridor operations and segment densities will slightly improve from the No-Build scenario with all segments expected to operate at LOS D or better. On the US 64 / US 264 corridor, results indicate very similar operations compared to the NoBuild with seven (7) or eight (8) eastbound and nine (9) westbound segments at (LOS E) or exceeding (LOS F) peak hour capacity. Figures 11.1 to 11.8 provide a schematic representation of the results for the DSA 8-12 freeway system in the project study area.

Table 14. 2035 Design Year Complete 540 No-Build \& Build Freeway Operations Summary

| Scenario | Complete 540 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| No-Build | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 1 | 2 | 32 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 39 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 2 | 2 | 32 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 39 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 3 | 1 | 38 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 37 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 4 | 3 | 29 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 37 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 5 | 3 | 37 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 35 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 6* | 0 | 14 | 40 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 7* | 0 | 15 | 39 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 8 | 1 | 31 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 9 | 1 | 31 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 10 | 1 | 28 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 11 | 1 | 28 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 12 | 1 | 34 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 36 | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 13 | 1 | 29 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 39 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 14 | 1 | 29 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 38 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 15 | 2 | 23 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 37 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 16 | 2 | 24 | 35 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 37 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 17 | 2 | 33 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 33 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

*DSA 6, 7 includes analysis of collector-distributor segment along Complete 540.

| Scenario | Complete 540 Collector-Distributor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| DSA 6, 7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 15. 2035 Design Year I-40 No-Build \& Build Freeway Operations Summary

| Scenario | 1-40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| No-Build | 0 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 1, 2 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 3, 4 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 5 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 6, 7* | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 8, 9 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 10, 11 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 12 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 13, 14 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 15, 16 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 17 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

*DSA 6, 7 also contain analysis of collector-distributor segment along I-40.

| Scenario | I-40 Collector-Distributor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| DSA 6, 7 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

Table 16. 2035 Design Year US 70 No-Build \& Build Freeway Operations Summary

| Scenario | US 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| No-Build | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 1-2 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 3-4 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 6, 7* | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| DSA 8, 9 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 10, 11 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 12 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 13, 14 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 15, 16 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 17 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

*DSA 6, 7 not included since proposed design does not impact US 70.

NCDOT STIP R-2721, R-2828 \& R-2829: Complete 540
Triangle Expressway Southeast Extension
Detailed Study Alternatives - Traffic Analysis Technical Memorandum

Table 17. 2035 Design Year US 64
No-Build \& Build Freeway Operations Summary

| Scenario | US 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| No-Build | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 2 |
| DSA 1, 2, 13, 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 |
| DSA 3, 4, 15, 16 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 |
| DSA 5, 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 |
| DSA 6, 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3 |
| DSA 8, 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 |
| DSA 10, 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 |
| DSA 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 |

Table 18. 2035 AM Peak Design Year Build Freeway Operations Corridor Summary - Complete 540 DSA 1, 6 and 8


Cell Shading - Green $=$ LOS A - D, Orange $=$ LOS E, Red $=$ LOS F; N/A - Analysis not applicable for comparable location or segment.

Table 19. 2035 PM Peak Design Year Build Freeway Operations Corridor Summary - Complete 540 DSA 1, 6 and 8


[^3]
### 7.32035 Design Year Intersection Capacity Analysis Results

The following sections provide descriptions and tabular results for intersection capacity analyses for all project study area intersections. LOS results and additional signalized intersection details for these scenarios are found in the raw Synchro output sheets in Appendix F. In the 2035 design year, the project study area is expected to contain five No-Build and four Build DSA unsignalized two-way stop-controlled intersections - these capacity analysis output sheets are found in Appendix G. Appendix H contains the SIDRA analysis output reports for the two-lane roundabout currently located at Vandora Springs Road and Buffaloe Road and analyzed in the 2035 No-Build scenario. The anticipated changes to the study area at-grade intersections between the 2012 and 2035 analysis years are listed below:

- Intersection control changes between 2012 and 2035 No-Build scenarios
o Ramp terminal intersections at the interchange of NC 540 and NC 55 Bypass converted from unsignalized to signalized control.
o Single-lane roundabout at Vandora Springs Road and Buffaloe Road converted to two-lane roundabout with 2035 LRTP widening of Vandora Springs Road.
o White Oak Road was analyzed as a two-lane and four-lane section in 2012 and 2035, respectively, per the LRTP. This intersection is expected to operate at LOS F in the 2035 No-Build scenario as an unsignalized intersection. Per HCS Peak Hour Signal Warrants Analysis module results in Appendix I, this intersection meets the MUTCD peak hour signal warrant threshold in 2035, and therefore was analyzed as a signalized intersection in the 2035 No-Build scenarios.
- Intersection control changes between 2012 and 2035 Build DSA scenarios
o At the future proposed intersection of Rock Quarry Road and Rock Quarry Road Extension, the worst case critical movement (westbound left-turn) is expected to operate at a LOS F by 2035 in the PM peak hour. Per the HCS Peak Hour Signal Warrants Analysis module results in Appendix I, this intersection meets the MUTCD peak hour signal warrant threshold in 2035, and therefore was analyzed as a signalized intersection in the 2035 Build DSAs 6-7 scenarios. This intersection may operate acceptably as an unsignalized intersection in the interim years prior to 2035, so consideration should be given to operating this intersection as unsignalized if constructed and monitor it for future signalization. Based on the capacity analysis results, the intersection of Rock Quarry Road and Rock Quarry Road Extension is expected to operate at LOS B as a signalized intersection in 2035.
o In the 2035 Build DSA 6-7 scenarios, the intersection of Vandora Springs Road and Buffaloe Road was converted from a two-lane roundabout in the No-Build scenario to a signalized intersection, due to the relocation of this intersection in the Build design. Preliminary design files indicated that this intersection would become a three-legged, unsignalized, T-intersection in the Build DSAs 6-7 scenarios, and it was analyzed with these assumptions. Based on the analysis results, the unsignalized intersection of Vandora Springs Road and Buffaloe Road is expected to operate at a LOS F in 2035. Per the HCS Peak Hour Signal Warrants Analysis module results in Appendix I, this intersection meets the MUTCD peak hour signal warrant threshold with 2035 traffic volume projections, and therefore was analyzed as a signalized intersection in the 2035 Build DSAs 6-7 scenarios.
o The White Oak Road and Raynor Road intersection was assume to be converted from two-way stop control to signalized control between the 2012 and 2035 analysis years. This intersection is expected to operate at a LOS F in the 2035 Build DSA scenarios as an unsignalized intersection. Per the HCS Peak Hour Signal Warrants Analysis module results in Appendix I, this intersection meets the MUTCD peak hour signal warrant threshold in 2035, and therefore was analyzed as a signalized intersection in the 2035 Build DSA scenarios. This intersection may operate acceptably as an unsignalized intersection in the interim years prior to 2035. Consideration should be given to operating this intersection as unsignalized and monitor it for future signalization.

A tabular results summary for all 2035 design year alternative scenarios is found in Table 20.
For all Build DSAs, optimized signal cycle lengths were held constant at locations where the interchange forms were identical, to provide a meaningful comparison between the Build DSAs alternatives. The splits for each phase were re-optimized based on the specific Build DSA traffic forecast volumes.

### 7.3.1 $\quad 2035$ No-Build Alternative Scenario Results

For the 2035 No-Build alternative AM and PM peak hour scenarios, 7 out of the 16 analyzed intersections are projected to operate at adequate levels of service in the AM and PM peak hours. Re-optimization of all signal timings was employed in the 2035 No-Build alternative analyses. Specific intersections that experience deficient overall LOS in at least one peak hour include:

- US 401 and Ten Ten Road operates at overall intersection LOS F in both the AM and PM peak hours, due to high vehicular delays for left-turn and through movements.
- US 401 and Dwight Rowland Road operates at LOS F in both the AM and PM peak hours, due to the westbound left-turn movement from US 401 to Dwight Rowland Road operating at LOS F.
- Poole Road and Hodge Road operates at overall intersection LOS F in both the AM and PM peak hours, due to high delays for left-turn and through movements.
- US 401 and Donny Brook Road / McCullers Road operates at LOS F in the AM and LOS E in the PM peak hour, due to high delays for left-turn and US 401 through movements.
- The existing intersection of Vandora Springs Road and Buffaloe Road is currently a single-lane roundabout that operates at LOS A in the 2012 No-Build scenario. Vandora Springs Road was analyzed as a four-lane section in 2035 per the LRTP, while Buffaloe Road remained a two-lane section. Based on the analysis, the twolane roundabout intersection is expected to operate as LOS F in the 2035 No-Build AM peak hour due to high delays for the Buffaloe Road approach.
- Old Stage Road and Vandora Springs Road operates at LOS E in the AM peak hour, due to the northbound Old Stage through movement and southbound Old Stage leftturn movement being over capacity.
- Old Stage Road and Norman Blalock Road is projected to experience LOS E in the AM peak hour, due to the eastbound shared left/through/right movement on Norman Blalock Road operating at LOS E.
- US 401 and Wake Tech Drive / Chandler Ridge Circle operates at LOS E in the AM peak hour, due to limited capacity for the US 401 northbound through movement and the movements entering and exiting the Wake Tech campus.
- Rock Quarry Road and Auburn-Knightdale Road operates at LOS E in the AM peak hour, because of high delays for left-turn movements from Rock Quarry Road and insufficient capacity for the northbound through movement on Auburn-Knightdale Road.

Traffic volumes, laneage, and overall intersection LOS results are also found in Figures 8.1 to 8.5 for the study area intersections in the 2035 No-Build alternative scenario.

### 7.3.2 2035 Build - DSA 1-5, 13-17 Scenario Results

For the 2035 Build DSA 1-5, 13-17 AM and PM peak hour scenarios, it was assumed that all existing signalized intersections in the project study area would be re-optimized, to reflect anticipated traffic volume changes that were included in the Complete 540 traffic forecast data. These volume changes had a positive effect on operations at the Rock Quarry Road and Auburn-Knightdale Road intersection (DSAs 1-2 and 13-14 only), with AM and PM peak hour LOS improving to LOS B versus LOS E in the AM peak in the 2035 No-Build scenario. The updated traffic volumes also slightly improved operations at Poole Road and Hodge Road, but the intersection still experiences LOS E in the AM peak hour. Operations at the intersection of re-routed Donny Brook Road/Chandler Ridge Circle/Wake Tech Drive and US 401 deteriorated from LOS E in the AM and LOS D in the PM in the No-Build to LOS F in both the AM and PM peak hours. The addition of the eastbound Donny Brook Road traffic to the eastbound Chandler Ridge Circle traffic in the Build DSA 1-5 and 13-17 scenarios resulted in increased delay at this intersection. No other intersections, including the ramp terminal intersections added in the Build DSA 1-5 and 13-17 scenarios, would be expected to operate at an overall LOS E or LOS F in the 2035 design year.

Traffic volumes, laneage, and overall intersection LOS results are shown in Figures 9.1 to 9.8 for the study area intersections in the 2035 Build DSA 1 scenario.

### 7.3.3 2035 Build - DSA 6-7 Scenario Results

In the 2035 Build DSA 6-7 AM and PM peak hour scenarios, the splits for each phase were re-optimized based on the 2035 Build DSA 6-7 traffic forecast volumes. These updates slightly improved operations at Poole Road and Hodge Road, but the intersection still experiences LOS E in the AM peak hour.

In the 2035 Build DSA 6-7 scenarios the intersection of Vandora Springs Road and Buffaloe Road was converted from a two-lane roundabout in the No-Build to a signalized intersection due to the relocation of this intersection in the Build. This intersection may operate acceptably as an unsignalized intersection in the interim years prior to 2035. However, consideration should be given to operating this intersection as unsignalized and monitoring for future signalization. Based on the analysis, the intersection of Vandora Springs Road and Buffaloe Road is expected to operate at LOS B as a signalized intersection in 2035.

At US 401 and Ten Ten Road, the overall intersection LOS in the AM and PM peak hours remained at LOS F as compared to the No-Build, with high delays persisting at the Ten Ten Road approaches. Old Stage Road and Vandora Springs Road also continued to operate at LOS E in the AM peak in the Build DSA 6-7 scenarios. Operations for the stop-controlled westbound left-turn movement from Old Baucom Road to Rock Quarry Road deteriorated
from LOS C in the No-Build to LOS E in the Build DSA 6-7 scenarios during the PM peak hour. No other intersections, including the ramp terminal intersections added in the Build DSA 6-7 scenarios, would be expected to operate at an overall LOS E or LOS F in 2035.

Traffic volumes, laneage, and overall intersection LOS results are shown in Figures 10.1 to 10.8 for the study area intersections in the 2035 Build DSA 6 scenario.

### 7.3.4 2035 Build - DSA 8-12 Scenario Results

In the 2035 Build DSA 8-12 AM and PM peak hour scenarios, the splits for each phase were re-optimized based on the 2035 Build DSA 8-12 traffic forecast volumes. These updates slightly improved operations at Poole Road and Hodge Road, but the intersection still experiences LOS E in the AM peak hour.

These updates had a positive effect on operations at the US 401 and Dwight Rowland Road intersection, with AM and PM peak hour LOS improving to LOS C or better. The intersection of US 401 and Meadow Drive was converted from two-way stop control in the 2035 No-Build to signalized control in the 2035 Build due to the 2035 Build volumes satisfying the peak hour signal warrant. These volume changes also had a positive effect on operations at the Rock Quarry Road and Auburn-Knightdale Road intersection (DSAs 8-9 only), with AM and PM peak hour LOS improving to LOS B versus LOS E in the AM peak in the 2035 No-Build scenario. AM peak operations for the eastbound shared left/through/right movement at Old Stage Road and Norman Blalock Road also improved from LOS E in the No-Build to LOS B in the Build. No other intersections, including the ramp terminal intersections added in the Build DSA 8-12 scenarios, would be expected to operate at an overall LOS E or LOS F in 2035.

Traffic volumes, laneage, and overall intersection LOS results are shown in Figures 11.1 to 11.8 for the study area intersections in the 2035 Build DSA 8 scenario.

Table 20. 2035 AM \& (PM) Peak Hour No-Build Intersection Capacity Analysis Results Summary


BOLD/ITALIC = Intersection/Approach/Movement that has Operational Deficiencies (LOS E or F)

## 8. Microsimulation Operations Analysis

Initial 2035 PM peak hour HCS-FreeVal results at the northern/eastern project termini for the southbound Complete 540 weaving segment from US 64/US 264 to Poole Road produced densities that correspond to LOS D or E for Build DSAs 1-17. No other Complete 540 freeway segments resulted in LOS E or F in the 2035 design year. To further investigate and assess expected freeway system performance in this area, a 2035 PM peak hour traffic microsimulation model was created for DSA 3, 4, 15 and 16 (which represents the scenario with the highest expected traffic volumes and traffic density). DSA's 3, 4, 15 and 16 share the same facility design in this vicinity, the same projected traffic volumes, and the same FreeVal operational results. The VISSIM microsimulation software tool (Version 5.40 ) was used for this analysis.

Per HCM 2010 Chapter 6 and Exhibit 6-1, the use of a microsimulation tool (VISSIM) was used to supplement the HCS-FreeVal deterministic procedures and analysis results to help make a more informed decision for the weaving segment between US 64/US 264 and Poole Road. Per Exhibit 6-1, the following traffic phenomenon (ramp merging, merging during congested conditions, generation of vehicles, effect of oversaturation and residual queue at the end of the analysis period) are all present in this weaving segment and are treated differently in deterministic versus microsimulation analysis. The goal of this supplement microsimulation analysis is to better inform project-related design decisions given the HCM/FreeVal weaving segment speeds and densities are just over the LOS E threshold or at LOS D for all DSA's.

### 8.1 2035 Design Year DSA 3, 4, 15 and 16 VISSIM Model

The microsimulation model for the section of southbound Complete 540 between the US 64 / US 264 interchange and the future Poole Road interchange were developed to include the southbound US 64 / US 264 on-ramp, Complete 540 mainline, and Poole Road loop off-ramp segments only.

The Build DSA model laneage configuration matches the functional Complete 540 design developed by Lochner. The design includes a sixlane facility (three lanes each direction), which includes a fourth southbound auxiliary lane on Complete 540 that adds at the US 64 / 264 onramp and drops 1,850 feet downstream at the Poole Road loop off-ramp. The following image details the analysis boundaries, laneage, geometrics, and volumes used in the VISSIM analysis of 2035 PM Build DSA model.


### 8.2 Measures of Effectiveness and Calibration

Since Complete 540 is a future new location freeway facility, the 2035 Design Year Build PM peak hour model was developed and calibrated to match the current Complete 540 design and criteria. MOEs for volume throughput, weaving segment density and weaving segment speed were computed for freeway operations only. No ramp terminal intersection MOEs or arterial corridor MOEs were developed for this model.

The following "calibration" was completed by coding and adjusting the model to reproduce realworld traffic conditions reasonably well to produce realistic results based on a review of similar adjacent facilities, Complete 540 roadway design criteria, and forecast volume throughputs. The following information was collected for the 2040 microsimulation model development. This information was taken from previous work by HNTB, NCDOT or others.

- Demand Data (from Complete 540 traffic forecast volumes - balanced between interchange ramp terminal intersections and adjusted to provide 15 minute peak traffic flows that would emulate a 0.90 peak hour factor)
- Vehicle Mix (from Complete 540 traffic forecast and FreeVal output estimates for Complete 540 mainline and from traffic turning movement count data for US 64/US 264 and Poole Road)
- Geometric Data (number lanes, configuration, speed, design criteria, etc. based on preliminary functional designs)

Additional travel speed data was collected to confirm a 70 mph free-flow speed (plus 5 mph posted per design criteria) is reasonable to analyze for Complete 540.

- Toll NC 540 free flow travel speeds (from NCTA MVD data) See Appendix E.
- I-540 free flow travel speeds (from INRIX data). See Appendix E.

HNTB coordinated with NCDOT staff in the project scoping process to verify the following basic calibration approach as presented below.

- The future year model was calibrated based on 2040 Design Year PM peak period operations for a single peak hour. Calibration was based upon peak hour traffic forecast volumes balanced between interchange ramp terminal intersections along Complete 540 from future US 64/US 264 on-ramp to future Poole Road off-ramp.
- HNTB calibrated the model based upon a review of existing Toll NC 540 and I-540 travel speeds adjacent to Complete 540, design speed criteria, and volume throughput compared to mainline forecast volumes in the weaving segment.
- Calibration targets were to have 20 run MOE averages with different random seeds for the PM peak period. Models were "seeded" for a 15 minute interval prior to actual peak hour operations and MOE data collection.

The following drive behavior parameters adjustments were made to the default VISSIM parameters during the calibration process:

- I-540/Complete 540 vehicle speed distributions taken from default VISSIM profiles for normalized speed curves for 100 kilometers/hour for cars and 90 kilometers/hour for trucks, resulting in freeway speeds in the 65 mph range.
- System Interchange on-ramp speeds coded as 80 kilometers/hour for both cars and trucks, which equates to an approximate 55 mph range of values. The on-ramp traffic speeds were maintained through the weave area for this traffic mix.
- Loop ramp speeds to Poole Road coded for 50 kilometers/hour distribution curve (equating to a $30-35 \mathrm{mph}$ range entering the ramp).
- Model network extended 2,800 feet upstream of weave area along I-540. Initial traffic entry link limited to outer two lanes only to prevent three lane shifts for downweaving vehicles. Through traffic (not exiting at Poole Road) allowed to enter the inner passing lane immediately downstream of the initial entry link.
- Look-back distance for Poole Road exiting traffic set to 3,500 feet to allow adequate distance for lane changing in upstream traffic lanes.
- Wiedemann 99 driver behavior model employed for all freeway links with advanced merging and cooperative lane-changing options activated.
- Safety distance factor (0.60) and waiting time before diffusion (60 seconds) left at default values. These parameters caused some traffic in higher density situations to nearly come to a complete stop before weaving maneuvers, which may be more realistic as densities increase to near capacity situations in the lanes where weaving occurs just prior to the Poole Road exit. A comparison of resulting densities for these outer freeway lanes and the FreeVal data produces reasonable validation of the FreeVal results in comparison with the VISSIM MOE data.


### 8.3 2035 Design Year DSA 3, 4, 15 and 16 Analysis Results

The following section highlights 2035 Design Year DSA 3, 4, 15, 16 analysis results for the Complete 540 southbound freeway weaving section between the existing US 64 / US 264 interchange and the future Poole Road interchange. 20 run averaged VISSIM MOE output was tabulated to determine the microsimulation operations analysis results. To assess the validity of the FreeVal results for the Complete 540 southbound segment immediately downstream of the US 64 / US 264 system interchange, VISSIM runs for the Build DSA design concept were compiled and results compared in Table 21 to FreeVal analysis results.

Table 21. 2035 VISSIM Measures of Effectiveness PM Peak Results

| Segment <br> Performance | Complete 540 DSA 3, 4, 15, $\mathbf{1 6}$ Southbound Weaving Segment |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCS Freeval | VISSIM |
| Volume [veh/hour] | 5,404 | 5,354 |
| Density [veh/mile] | $34.00^{2}$ | $25.58^{1}$ |
| Speed [mph] | 47.0 | 53.6 |

BOLD/ITALIC - Segment Density Exceeds LOS D Thresholds
1 - HCM and VISSIM density and level of service (LOS) results are not directly comparable due to differences in analysis and calculation methods. VISSIM density reported in average density (veh/mi/ln) since VISSIM does not report in ( $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ ).
2 - HCS results in (veh/mi/ln) for comparison only. Corresponding (pc/mi/ln) is 38.30 and LOS E.
As shown in Table 21, the worst-case 2035 Build DSA 3, 4, 15, 16 VISSIM analysis provides operational results that compare to an HCM level of service D or better for the Complete 540 southbound freeway weaving section between the existing US 64 / US 264 interchange and the future Poole Road interchange. Initial FreeVal results for this segment predicted 2035 PM peak hour LOS E for the weaving section. Since FreeVal methodologies are not set up to evaluate this area to the same level of detail as microscopic analysis, a microsimulation model was
developed to test the weaving segment in greater detail and more realistically evaluate this area with demands nearing capacity and higher turbulence. Based on the VISSIM microsimulation results, no peak hour operational issues are expected with any of the design study alternatives for this segment and no revisions to the existing DSA designs are recommended.
The difference between HCS-FreeVal and VISSIM results is due primarily to oversaturation and residual queues per HCS-FreeVal combined with VISSIM's ability to provide more detailed simulation of ramp merging, generation of vehicles lane choice and processing of residual queues.

For example, in reviewing the time period densities for the DSA in question, the first two periods (with V/C < 1.0) match the HCM 2010 Equation 12-22 density calculation = (volume in weaving segment / number lanes) / average speed of all vehicles. In the third period, V/C > 1.0 and density does not match the basic formula and increases substantially due to "queuing" with residual effects in Time Period 4. This shows FreeVal results are heavily impacted by the V/C > 1.0, congestion, queuing and oversaturation. Therefore, the use of a supplemental microsimulation tool was considered to gain a better understanding of the traffic operations and make a more informed decision. Appendix J contains the VISSIM output results.

## 9. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Complete 540 study area traffic capacity analysis was completed to evaluate base year (2012) and design year (2035) peak hour traffic operations for 17 Complete 540 Detailed Study Alternatives and surrounding freeway facilities and nearby intersections within the traffic analysis study area. The capacity analysis report incorporates the ongoing coordination efforts between project planning, design and analysis study teams to produce DSAs that provide sufficient capacity, efficient operations, and acceptable future levels of service. The recommended freeway, arterial, interchange and intersection geometrics and intersection control for Complete 540 DSAs 1, 6 and 8 are presented in Figures 9.1 to 9.8, 10.1 to 10.8 and 11.1 to 11.8, respectively. Recommended and analyzed geometrics for all DSAs are included in the detailed capacity analysis outputs from HCS FreeVal, Synchro and HCS unsignalized intersections in Appendices E, F and G, respectively.

Based on the 2012 base year capacity analysis, the majority of No-Build and Build DSA freeway and intersection facilities are projected to operate at acceptable LOS D or better, with few operational issues.

Based on the 2035 design year capacity analysis, the following conclusions and recommendations are presented for study area facilities and intersections:

## Complete 540 Corridors

All Complete 540 DSA freeway segments, interchange design configurations, and interchange ramp terminal intersections are projected to operate at LOS D or better in the 2035 design year, based on the current functional designs for a Complete 540 six-lane, toll facility. Of the 115 to 137 freeway segments analyzed, depending on the DSA, only one weaving segment between US 64 / US 264 and Poole Road in the westbound PM peak experiences projected operational deficiencies, as shown in Table 22. To further and more accurately evaluate this weaving segment, supplemental VISSIM microsimulation analyses were prepared and show acceptable weaving segment operations of a comparable LOS D or better for the simulation runs, as shown in Table 23.

Of the 29 to 36 study area intersections analyzed at interchange ramp terminals or adjacent Y lines, depending on the DSA, only 1 to 4 intersections are projected to experience operational deficiencies, depending on specific DSA as shown in Table 24. None of the intersections potentially experiencing operational deficiencies are interchange ramp terminal intersections directly impacting Complete 540 mainline freeway operations. The intersections projected to operate at LOS E or F either include unsignalized, minor Y-line intersections or signalized Y -line intersections that incorporate reasonably feasible improvements to optimize intersection operations. Overall, all seventeen (17) DSAs operate with nearly identical freeway and intersection measures of effectiveness and levels of service, even though each DSA includes different volumes, corridor alignments, interchange configurations, interchange access points and impacts to crossing freeway and arterial facilities.

## NC 540 Corridor

Based on the 2035 design year Build DSA analysis results, the existing section of NC 540 from US 1 to NC 55 Bypass is projected to operate at acceptable LOS D or better for all DSAs with construction of Complete 540 and the Old Holly Springs-Apex Road interchange (R-2635D).

## I-540 Corridor

The existing section of I-540 from US 64 / US 264 to US 64 Business is projected to operate at acceptable LOS D or better for all DSAs with construction of Complete 540 and I-540 planned widening to an 8 -lane facility.

## I-40 Corridor

I-40 from US 70 Business to NC 42 is projected to operate at acceptable LOS D or better for all DSAs, with construction of Complete 540 and I-40 planned widening to an 8 -lane facility. DSAs 1-5 and 8-17 propose a five-leg system interchange with I-40 and US 70 and provide acceptable interchange spacing between US 70 and NC 42 . DSAs 6 and 7 connect with l-40 as a four-leg system interchange further to the north and do not provide desirable interchange spacing between the I-40 and US 70 Business interchange. Therefore, DSA 6 and 7 propose collectordistributors on I-40 through the US 70 Business and Complete 540 system interchanges. DSA 6 and 7 also do not provide direct interchange access at US 70 Business due to undesirable interchange spacing from I-40. Rocky Quarry Road Extension is proposed to provide direct access from Complete 540 at the Rock Quarry Road interchange to US 70 Business. The potential impacts of Complete 540 on I-40, US 70, US Business and the system interchange operations should be re-evaluated at the appropriate time for an interchange access request study

## US 70 Corridor

The existing section of US 70 from I-40 to NC 42 is projected to operate at acceptable LOS D or better for all DSAs with construction of Complete 540.

## US 64 I US 264 Corridor

Capacity analysis results indicate that US 64 / 264 is operating near or over capacity with operational deficiencies in the 2035 design year AM and PM peak hours with or without construction of Complete 540. Based on the 2035 design year No-Build DSA analysis results, US 64 / US 264 from Hodge Road to Smithfield Road is projected to operate at LOS E or F for 6 of 11 eastbound segments and 9 of 11 westbound segments as a six-lane freeway facility. In all Build DSAs, similar facility volumes and operational results are projected. Construction of Complete 540 proposes modifying the existing directional system interchange with US 64 / US 264 and I-540 by connecting the forth leg and constructing a flyover and a loop ramp. The system interchange was planned, designed and constructed to accommodate the future completion and connection of the 540 loop. This interchange modification would add one eastbound and one westbound freeway merge on US 64 / US 264. The potential impacts of Complete 540 on US 64 / US 264, I-540 and the system interchange operations should be reevaluated at the appropriate time for an interchange access request study.

Table 22. 2035 Design Year No-Build \& Build Freeway Operations Summary

| Scenario | Complete 540 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E | LOS F |
| No-Build | 3 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 1 | 2 | 32 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 39 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 2 | 2 | 32 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 39 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 3 | 1 | 38 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 37 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 4 | 3 | 29 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 37 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 5 | 3 | 37 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 35 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 6* | 0 | 14 | 40 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 7* | 0 | 15 | 39 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 8 | 1 | 31 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 9 | 1 | 31 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 10 | 1 | 28 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 11 | 1 | 28 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 12 | 1 | 34 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 36 | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| DSA 13 | 1 | 29 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 39 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 14 | 1 | 29 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 38 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 15 | 2 | 23 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 37 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 16 | 2 | 24 | 35 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 37 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 17 | 2 | 33 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 33 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

*DSA 6, 7 includes analysis of collector-distributor segment along Complete 540.
Table 23. 2035 VISSIM Measures of Effectiveness PM Peak Results

| Segment <br> Performance | Complete 540 DSA 3, 4, 15, 16 Southbound Weaving Segment |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCS Freeval | VISSIM |
| Volume [veh/hour] | 5,404 | 5,354 |
| Density [veh/mile] | $\mathbf{3 4 . 0 0 ^ { 2 }}$ | $25.58^{1}$ |
| Speed [mph] | 47.0 | 53.6 |

BOLD/ITALIC - Segment Density Exceeds LOS D Thresholds
1 - VISSIM density reported in average density (veh/mi/ln).
2 - HCS density reported in (veh/mi/ln) for comparison. Corresponding ( $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ ) is 38.30 and LOS E.

Table 24. 2012 \& 2035 No-Build \& Build Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary

| Scenario | Number of Intersections Operating at Given LOS in at Least One AM or PM Peak Hour* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2012 Base Year |  |  |  |  |  | 2035 Design Year |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS } \\ \text { A } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{LOS} \\ \mathrm{~B} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{LOS} \\ \mathrm{C} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS } \\ \text { D } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\mathrm{E}}{\mathrm{LOS}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { LOS } \\ \mathrm{F} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{LOS} \\ \mathrm{~B} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{LOS} \\ \mathrm{C} \end{gathered}$ | LOS | $\underset{\mathrm{E}}{\mathrm{LOS}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{LOS} \\ \mathrm{~F} \end{gathered}$ |
| No-Build | 1 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| DSA 1 | 11 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| DSA 2 | 11 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| DSA 3 | 9 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| DSA 4 | 9 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| DSA 5 | 8 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| DSA 6 | 17 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| DSA 7 | 17 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| DSA 8 | 16 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 9 | 16 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 10 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 11 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 12 | 14 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 13 | 14 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 14 | 14 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 15 | 11 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 16 | 11 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| DSA 17 | 11 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 0 |

*-For signalized intersections, overall intersection LOS. For unsignalized intersections, worst-case critical movement.

## Appendix A - Figures

1) Detailed Study Alternative Corridors
2) Traffic Analysis Study Area
3) No Build Traffic Analysis Figures Sheet Key
4) DSA 1 Traffic Analysis Figures Sheet Key
5) DSA 6 Traffic Analysis Figures Sheet Key
6) DSA 8 Traffic Analysis Figures Sheet Key
7.1 - 7.5) 2012 No-Build Laneage, Volumes, LOS \& ID
8.1 - 8.5) 2035 No-Build Laneage, Volumes, LOS \& ID
9.1 - 9.8) 2035 Build DSA 1 Laneage, Volumes, LOS \& ID
10.1 - 10.8) 2035 Build DSA 6 Laneage, Volumes, LOS \& ID
11.1 - 11.8) 2035 Build DSA 8 Laneage, Volumes, LOS \& ID
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[^0]:    1 - Analyzed 6-lane section at NC 540 interchange and 4-lane section at project limits.
    2 - Analyzed 4-lane section to improve intersection operations and efficiency.

[^1]:    Cell Shading - Green = LOS A - D, Orange = LOS E, Red = LOS F; N/A - Analysis not applicable for comparable location or segment.

[^2]:    

[^3]:    Cell Shading - Green $=$ LOS A - D, Orange $=$ LOS E, Red $=$ LOS F; N/A - Analysis not applicable for comparable location or segment.

