## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 3, 2015
TO: Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
FROM: Seth Asante, MPO Staff
RE: Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations

This memorandum summarizes the results of the analyses and improvement alternatives resulting from the Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations study. The opening sections provide background information and describe the purpose of the study. The selection of study locations and an assessment of the safety and operational problems, as well as a discussion of the potential improvement strategies, follow the background sections. The memorandum's final section presents study recommendations. Also included are technical appendices, which cite the study methods and how the data were applied, including detailed reports about the freeway merge and diverge analyses. If implemented, the report's recommendations would result in improved freeway facilities; they would increase traffic safety, make traffic operations more efficient, and reduce congestion at the bottlenecks.

## 1 <br> BACKGROUND

According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), "Much of recurring congestion is due to physical bottlenecks-potentially correctible points on the highway system where traffic flow is restricted. While many of the nation's bottlenecks can only be addressed through costly major construction projects, there is a significant opportunity for the application of operational and low-cost infrastructure solutions to bring about relief at these chokepoints." ${ }^{1}$ In general, recurring bottlenecks, the subject of this study, are influenced by the design or operation present at the point where the bottleneck begins (e.g., merges, diverges, lane drops, traffic weaving, and abrupt changes in highway alignment).

Previously, Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) staff analyzed several express-highway bottleneck locations in two consecutive studies, Low-Cost Improvements to Bottlenecks Phase I and Phase II, which were very well received by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation

[^0](MassDOT) and the FHWA. ${ }^{2,3}$ Some of the recommendations from those studies already have been executed, and the FHWA has interviewed MPO staff about the successful implementation. The MPO has been conducting these studies to identify low-cost methods to reduce congestion, increase safety, and improve traffic operations in the Boston Region.

## 2 PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purpose of this study is twofold:

- Identify two bottleneck segments or points where low-cost mitigation improvements seem applicable.
- Recommend low-cost mitigation improvements based on analysis of geometric design, traffic volumes and other data, and projected service performance associated with the improvements at each location.


## 3 SELECTION OF STUDY LOCATIONS

The selection of study locations was a two-stage process that included the inventorying and screening of candidate locations. ${ }^{4}$ MPO staff developed an initial list of candidate locations in the MPO region based on the following parameters:

- Staff knowledge of bottleneck locations in the Boston MPO region
- Review of Congestion Management Process (CMP) monitoring data and recent MPO and other planning studies
- Consultations with the MassDOT Highway Division
- Input from MPO members

The inventory process yielded five bottleneck locations for screening:

- Location 1: I-93 southbound between I-95 and Montvale Avenue in Woburn and Stoneham
- Location 2: I-95 southbound at the I-90 Interchange in Weston
- Location 3: I-93 southbound at the lane drop near Sullivan Square in Somerville/Charlestown
- Location 4: Route 2 Concord Rotary in Concord
- Location 5: I-95 northbound at the lane drop at Interchange 37 in Reading, Stoneham, and Wakefield

[^1]
### 3.1 Selection Criteria

MPO staff used the following three criteria to screen the bottleneck locations.

- Does the location qualify as a bottleneck? A repetitive long traffic queue upstream trailing free-flowing traffic downstream usually characterizes the location as a bottleneck. In other words, the location experiences routine and predictable congestion because traffic volume exceeds the available capacity at that location.
- Is a physical design constraint or operational conflict inherent in the location the cause of the bottleneck? Examples of these include:
o Lane drop: one or more travel lanes are lost, requiring traffic to merge
o Weaving area: drivers must merge across one or more lanes in order to access an entry or exit ramp
o Merge area: on-ramp traffic merges with mainline traffic in order to enter the freeway
o Major interchanges: high-volume traffic is directed from one freeway to another
- Can the bottleneck be fixed with low-cost operational and geometric improvements? These would exclude costly long-term solutions such as expansion or widening of the roadway. Examples of low-cost operational and geometric improvements include:
o Using a short section of shoulder as an additional travel lane or for lengthening an acceleration or deceleration lane
o Restriping merge and diverge areas to better serve traffic demand
o Providing all-purpose reversible lanes
o Changing or adding signs and striping


### 3.2 Study Locations

After consulting with MassDOT Highway Division staff, MPO staff selected Locations 1 and 2 for study. The study locations were also presented to the Boston Region MPO for discussions and approval. Through the selection process, MPO staff determined that these two locations likely could be corrected with low-cost mitigation strategies, whereas the other bottleneck locations likely could not be corrected in a low-cost manner. Appendix A contains comments about the study from the MassDOT Highway Division and a memorandum to the MPO that describes the selection process in detail.

## Location 1: I-93 Southbound Between I-95 and Montvale Avenue in Woburn and Stoneham

This section of highway is frequently congested because of merging and diverging activities, and also because of inadequate length of the deceleration lane to Montvale Avenue. During peak periods, I-93 southbound carries as many as 7,700 vehicles per hour, the on-ramp from l-95 northbound carries as many as

1,800 vehicles per hour, and as many as 1,400 vehicles per hour exit to Montvale Avenue at Exit 36. The merging and diverging activities of these vehicles slow down I-93 southbound mainline traffic upstream of the Montvale Avenue interchange and cause many crashes near the diverge to Montvale Avenue. Section 6 of this memorandum contains a detailed description of the bottleneck, including the problems, causes, impacts, improvement alternatives, and recommendations.

## Location 2: I-95 Southbound at the I-90 Interchange in Weston

This bottleneck is located on I-95 southbound at the point where traffic from I-90 and Route 30 merges onto I-95. During peak periods, between 2,300 and 2,900 vehicles per hour exit I-95 southbound to I-90 and Route 30. Farther downstream, between 2,000 and 2,400 vehicles per hour enter I-95 southbound from the same roads. However, the four I-95 southbound lanes in that section are not allocated efficiently to serve demand. As a result, during peak periods, a long traffic queue forms on the I-90 connector ramp heading southbound on I-95.
Section 7 of this memorandum contains a detailed description of the bottleneck, including the problems, causes, impacts, improvement alternatives, and recommendations.

### 3.3 Rationale for Not Selecting Locations for Study

MPO staff did not select Locations 3, 4, and 5 for study. The reasons are described below.

## Location 3: I-93 Southbound at the Lane Drop near Sullivan Square in Somerville/Charlestown

This section of highway is frequently congested because of a lane drop and intensive merging and diverging activities, especially during the AM peak period. During that period, the on-ramp carries between 1,300 and 1,700 vehicles per hour in an auxiliary lane; the off-ramp to Leverett Circle, Exit 26, carries between 1,200 and 1,600 vehicles per hour. ${ }^{5}$ The merging and diverging activities of these vehicles slow down mainline traffic and seriously affect traffic on the upstream section of I-93. The distance between the two ramps is about 2,000 feet long. The reasons for not selecting this location for study include:

- Removing the lane drop would require widening the I-93 bridge over Alfred Lombardi Street to provide a new auxiliary lane for the on-ramp traffic or converting the existing auxiliary lane to an acceleration lane.
- Widening the I-93 Bridge could be expensive.

[^2]- Converting the existing auxiliary lane to an acceleration lane might create a queue backup on the ramp that could affect traffic on Route 38 (Mystic Avenue) and the collector-distributor roads. In addition, there might not be enough space to provide sufficient acceleration distance because of the I93 bridge over Alfred Lombardi Street.


## Location 4: Route 2 Concord Rotary in Concord

This rotary, the intersection of Concord Turnpike (Route 2), Commonwealth Avenue, Barretts Mill Road, and Great Road (Route 119), is frequently congested because of high traffic volume and inadequate capacity during peak periods. The rotary is a challenge to navigate during these periods, and drivers often use local streets to avoid congestion. The MassDOT Highway Division is planning to replace the rotary with an overpass for safer and more efficient operation, and to minimize environmental impacts. The Highway Division also is exploring opportunities to improve neighborhood connections, incorporate the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail and wildlife corridors, improve water and air quality, and enhance the area's design aesthetics to the extent possible. Although this site is a major bottleneck, staff did not select this location for study because

- Low-cost solutions at this location likely would not be feasible. MassDOT and MPO staff have already studied the Route 2 Concord Rotary to examine potential short- and long-term improvement alternatives for the rotary. ${ }^{6,7}$
- The project was removed from the funded portion of the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan in August 2009 and currently is on hold.


## Location 5: l-95 Northbound at the Lane Drop at Interchange 37 in Reading, Stoneham, and Wakefield

This section of highway frequently is congested because of a lane drop and intensive merging and diverging activities, especially during the PM peak period, which slows down mainline traffic. During peak hours, the Exit 37 off-ramps carry as many as 3,200 vehicles per hour, and the Exit 37 on-ramps carry as many as 2,300 vehicles per hour. ${ }^{8}$ Adding an auxiliary lane northbound on I-95 would provide more room for the merging and diverging activities and reduce disturbance to mainline traffic. Staff did not select this location for study because an auxiliary lane would need to be extended for a long distance (about three or

[^3]four interchanges downstream) to reduce congestion and the queue, which could be expensive. In addition, the I-93 and I-95 Interchange project in Reading, Stoneham, and Woburn would address this bottleneck; currently this project is on hold.

## 4 DATA COLLECTION

### 4.1 Traffic Volume Data

The MassDOT Highway Division's Traffic Data Collection Program conducted automatic traffic recorder (ATR) counts for the ramps and freeways at the locations selected for study. The ATR counts are continuous traffic counts for at least 48 hours that are used to determine the average weekday daily traffic of a highway. For Location 1, MPO staff used ATR counts from the MassDOT Highway Division's traffic count database that were conducted in April 2014 and January 2015. For Location 2, MPO staff used actual ATR counts that were conducted in April 2015 for the four I-95 southbound ramps. The ATR count data are included in Appendix B.

### 4.2 Crash Data

MPO staff used crash data from January 2010 through December 2012 from the MassDOT's Registry of Motor Vehicles database to evaluate safety for motorists. Crash data are included in Appendix C.

### 4.3 Speed Data

MPO staff used speed data from spring 2012 and fall 2012 from the MPO's CMP. The CMP maintains average speed data on express-highway systems in the MPO region with use of the INRIX historical traffic speed data archive of real-time traffic.

## 5 LEVEL OF SERVICE CRITERIA FOR FREEWAY MERGE, DIVERGE, AND BASIC SEGMENTS

The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology demonstrates driving conditions on freeways in terms of level-of-service (LOS) ratings from A through F. ${ }^{9}$ The LOS criteria characterize freeway performance measures in terms of density (passenger cars per mile per lane, [pc/mi/ln]). Table 1 shows the LOS criteria for basic freeway and ramp merge/diverge and weaving segments. LOS A represents the best operating conditions (unrestricted operations), while LOS F represents the worst operating conditions (queuing on the freeway and/or ramp). LOS A through LOS D represent acceptable operating conditions. LOS E

[^4]represents operating conditions at capacity. LOS F represents failing conditions (demand exceeds capacity).

TABLE 1
Level of Service Criteria for Basic Freeway, Ramp Merge/Diverge, and Weaving Segments

| -- | Basic Freeway Segment | Ramp Merge/Diverge and <br> Weaving Segments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Level of <br> Service | Density (in passenger cars per <br> mile per lane [pc/mi/ln]) | Density (in passenger cars per mile <br> per lane $[\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}]$ ) |
| A | $\leq 11$ | $\leq 10$ |
| B | $>11-18$ | $>10-20$ |
| C | $>18-26$ | $>20-28$ |
| D | $>26-35$ | $>28-35$ |
| E | $>35-45$ | $>35$ |
| F | $>45$, Demand exceeds capacity | Demand exceeds capacity |

Source: Highway Capacity Manual 2010.

## 6 LOCATION 1: I-93 SOUTHBOUND BETWEEN I-95 AND MONTVALE AVENUE IN WOBURN AND STONEHAM

This bottleneck is located on the I-93 southbound barrel between I-95 and Montvale Avenue. The MassDOT Highway Division's District 4 has jurisdiction of this roadway. Figure 1 shows the location of the bottleneck and the ramp configuration near it (all figures are included at the end of the memorandum). This section, approximately 1.2 miles long, experiences intense interruption of traffic flow because of the merging and diverging maneuvers of high-volume traffic entering and exiting the freeway.

### 6.1 Existing Freeway Characteristics

## Basic Freeway Section

The basic freeway section of I-93 southbound has four 12-foot travel lanes, a 12-to-13-foot right shoulder, and an 11-to-12-foot left shoulder. This section carries up to 7,700 vehicles per hour. The posted speed limit is 65 mph on the $\mathrm{I}-93$ southbound mainline. Freeway exit signs are posted at one-mile and half-mile intervals to guide drivers to Montvale Avenue. Rumble strips have been installed on both sides of the southbound barrel to alert drivers and prevent run-off collisions.

## Entrance Ramp

An entrance ramp is a one-way roadway that allows traffic to enter a freeway from other crossing highways. Sufficient acceleration distance is needed to allow a vehicle to enter the freeway mainline safely and comfortably; drivers on the
entrance ramp need to be able to see a sufficient distance upstream from the entrance to locate the gaps in the traffic stream within which to merge. The entrance ramp from I-95 northbound to I-93 southbound is a one-lane, one-way roadway. It carries as many as 1,800 vehicles per hour during peak hours. The length of the acceleration lane for traffic entering the section from I-95 northbound is approximately 1,600 feet long, and the posted speed limit on the entrance ramp is 30 mph . Based on highway design and entrance ramp curve design speeds, the length of the acceleration lane meets MassDOT's standards. The MassDOT Highway Division's current Project Development and Design Guide specifies a minimum acceleration lane of 1,230 feet for a freeway facility with a design speed of 70 miles per hour, an entrance ramp curve design speed of 35 mph , and a grade of two percent or less.

## Exit Ramp

An exit ramp is a one-way roadway that allows traffic to exit from the freeway and provide access to other crossing highways. Sufficient deceleration distance is needed to allow a vehicle to leave the freeway mainline safely and comfortably. The exit ramp from I-93 southbound to Montvale Avenue is a one-way, one-lane roadway. It carries as many as 1,400 vehicles per hour during peak hours. The length of the deceleration lane for traffic exiting to Montvale Avenue is about 350 feet long, and the posted speed limit on the exit ramp is 30 mph . Based on highway design and exit ramp curve design speeds, the length of the deceleration lane does not meet MassDOT's standards. The MassDOT Highway Division's current Project Development and Design Guide specifies a minimum deceleration length of 490 feet for a freeway facility with a design speed of 70 miles per hour, an exit ramp curve design speed of 35 mph , and a grade of two percent or less.

### 6.2 Problems

The existing bottleneck creates intense interruption of traffic flow during peak travel periods, felt by virtually all drivers in the section. It reduces travel speeds on the freeway mainline to 25 to 45 mph during the AM peak period (6:00 AM to 10:00 AM). In addition, the bottleneck causes many crashes in this area and results in poor operating LOS, especially at the diverge area connecting the exit ramp to Montvale Avenue.

### 6.3 Causes

There are two primary contributing factors to this bottleneck: high volume of traffic and a short deceleration lane.

## High Volume of Traffic

Figures 2 and 3 show the traffic flows during the AM and PM peak periods. Highvolume traffic from I-95 enters I-93 southbound at the upstream of the section, and high-volume traffic exits to Montvale Avenue at the downstream section during the AM peak period. The merging and diverging maneuvers of the entering and exiting vehicles interrupt traffic flow in this section, resulting in a traffic bottleneck.

## Short Deceleration Lane

A short deceleration lane for the high-volume traffic exiting I-93 southbound to Montvale Avenue forces drivers to diverge quickly and does not give them the ample distance needed to allow a vehicle to leave the freeway mainline safely and comfortably. The intense diverging maneuvers slow down traffic, causing recurring congestion upstream from the diverge location.

### 6.4 Impacts

## Crashes

A summary of the crashes in this segment is presented in Table 2. There were 61 crashes in this area between 2010 and 2012 (Appendix C). Figure 4 shows the location and number of crashes. The majority (52 crashes) occurred in the vicinity of the short deceleration lane to Montvale Avenue.

TABLE 2
Crash Summary (2010-2012)
I-93 Southbound Segment between I-95 and Montvale Avenue

| Crash Variable | Number of <br> Crashes |
| :--- | ---: |
| Crash severity | - |
| Fatal injury | 1 |
| Nonfatal injury | 20 |
| Property damage only | 39 |
| Not reported/unknown | 1 |
| Manner of collision | - |
| Angle | 6 |
| Rear-end | 37 |
| Sideswipe, same direction | 9 |
| Single vehicle crash | 9 |
| Road surface conditions | - |
| Dry | 49 |
| Wet | 8 |
| Snow | 3 |


| Other | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Ambient light conditions |  |
| Daylight | 29 |
| Dark: lighted roadway | 28 |
| Dark: nonlighted roadway | 2 |
| Dawn | 1 |
| Dusk | 1 |
| Weather conditions |  |
| Clear | 35 |
| Cloudy | 6 |
| Rain | 5 |
| Snow | 3 |
| Not reported or unknown | 12 |
| Travel period |  |
| Peak | 33 |
| Off-peak | 28 |
| Total crashes | 61 |
| Three-year average (rounded) | 20 |
| Segment crash rate | 0.57 |
| MassDOT Highway Division average crash rate for urban interstate roadways | 0.54 |
| The AM peak period is 6:00 AM to 10:00 AM, and the PM peak period is 3:00 PM to 7:00 PM. Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff. |  |
| The segment crash rate of 0.57 crashes per million vehicle-miles traveled (MVMT) was greater than the MassDOT Highway Division average crash rate for urban interstate highways in Massachusetts, which is 0.54 MVMT . Below is a summary of the crashes in this segment. <br> - Thirty-four percent of the crashes resulted in injury, including one fatal injury. <br> - Sixty-one percent of the crashes were rear-end collisions. <br> - Fifty-four percent of the crashes occurred during the peak travel period. <br> - Fifty-two percent of the crashes occurred outside daylight conditions. <br> - Eighty percent of the crashes occurred under dry roadway conditions. |  |
| Travel Speed |  |
| Figure 5 is a congestion scan that shows the average travel speeds on I-93 southbound at the bottleneck location between I-95 and Montvale Avenue. The bottleneck reduces travel speed to 25 to 45 mph . Many motorists on I-93 southbound move out of the rightmost lane to avoid the high volume of merging and diverging traffic entering and exiting the freeway at this location. |  |

## Level of Service

MPO staff conducted traffic operations analyses consistent with HCM methodologies. Using the data collected, MPO staff built traffic analysis networks for the AM and PM peak hours with the 2010 Highway Capacity Software (HCS) to assess the capacity and quality of traffic flow at the bottleneck area (included in Appendix D). ${ }^{10}$ Table 3 presents the results of the LOS analyses for the existing conditions. The analyses indicate that the merge area upstream of the section operates well at LOS D during the AM and PM peak hours; however, the Exit 36 diverge area downstream of the section near Montvale Avenue operates at LOS E during the AM and PM peak hours (highlighted in yellow color in Table $3)$.

TABLE 3
Freeway Segment Analysis: Existing Conditions I-93 Southbound Segment between I-95 and Montvale Avenue

| Freeway Component | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { Density } \\ \text { (pc/mi/ln) } \end{array}$ | AM <br> Speed <br> (mph) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS* }^{*} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { Density } \\ \text { (pc/mi/ln) } \end{array}$ | PM Speed (mph) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS* }^{*} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015 Existing Conditions | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Merge area: ramp from I-95 northbound | 27.3 | 54.3 | C | 30.0 | 51.9 | D |
| Basic freeway segment: between the ramps | 32.7 | 60.4 | D | 36.0 | 58.2 | E |
| Diverge area: <br> Exit 36, Montvale Avenue | 36.2 | 50.4 | E | 40.4 | 51.2 | E |

*LOS A through LOS D represent acceptable operating conditions; LOS E represents operating conditions at capacity; and LOS F represents failing conditions (demand exceeds capacity). $\mathrm{mph}=$ miles per hour. $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}=$ passenger cars per mile per lane
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

### 6.5 Improvement Alternatives

MPO staff developed two improvement alternatives to address the bottleneck:

- Alternative 1: Lengthen the deceleration lane at the Exit 36 diverge area
- Alternative 2: Create an auxiliary lane for merging and diverging traffic The alternatives were analyzed using projected year 2025 traffic volumes. MPO staff estimated a five percent total background growth from 2015 to 2025.


## Alternative 1: Lengthen the Deceleration Lane at the Exit 36 Diverge Area

The existing deceleration lane is short; it does not meet MassDOT's standards and contributes to poor traffic operations and a high number of crashes. MPO staff recommends lengthening the deceleration lane at Exit 36.

[^5]Figure 6 shows the improvements recommended in Alternative 1.

- Use a portion of the existing right shoulder to lengthen the deceleration lane from 350 feet to 1200 feet. The improvement would upgrade the deceleration lane to meet MassDOT's standards and provide drivers with ample distance to exit the freeway to Montvale Avenue safely and comfortably.
- Relocate signs or install new guide signs to direct drivers to Montvale Avenue.
- Modify pavement markings to delineate the deceleration lane from travel lanes.


## Alternative 2: Create an Auxiliary Lane for Merging and Diverging Traffic

An auxiliary lane is defined as the portion of the roadway adjoining the traveled freeway for speed change, merging, diverging, weaving, and other purposes supplementary to through-traffic movement. Alternative 2 would transform the right shoulder from the entrance ramp to the exit ramp into an auxiliary lane for merging or diverging traffic maneuvers and would provide sufficient distance to accommodate speed changes and weaving maneuvers. The auxiliary lane would also upgrade the short deceleration lane to meet MassDOT's standards.

Figure 7 (Sections 1, 2, and 3) shows the improvements recommended in Alternative 2.

- Use the existing right shoulder to create an auxiliary lane.
- Create emergency pullover or stopping areas on the southbound barrel to address incidents and safety concerns related to the use of the shoulder as a travel lane.
- Relocate existing guide signs or install new guide signs and pavement markings to direct drivers to merge onto the mainline or diverge to exit onto Montvale Avenue.
- Modify pavement markings to delineate the auxiliary lane from the mainline travel lanes.


### 6.6 Effectiveness and Cost of the Improvements

Alternatives 1 and 2 were analyzed as freeway merge/diverge and basic freeway segments. Table 4 presents the results of the 2025 future LOS analyses for Alternatives 1 and 2. Alternative 1 results in LOS E at the mainline basic freeway segment (highlighted in yellow in Table 4). Analysis indicates that Alternative 2 would improve traffic operations at the bottleneck to LOS D or better during peak periods (compared to LOS E with no action). Alternative 2 is expected to
increase AM peak period average travel speed to 50 to 55 mph (compared to 25 to 45 mph with no action) and reduce crashes by as much as 30 percent. ${ }^{11}$

Improvement Alternative 1 is estimated to cost between \$200,000 and \$250,000 to construct. Improvement Alternative 2 is estimated to cost between $\$ 500,000$ and $\$ 750,000$ to construct.

TABLE 4
Freeway Segment Analysis: Improvement Alternatives I-93 Southbound Segment between I-95 and Montvale Avenue

| Freeway Component | AM Density (pc/mi/ln) | AM Speed (mph) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS* }^{2} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { Density } \\ \text { (pc/mi/ln) } \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS* }^{2} \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alternative 1: 2025 Future |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conditions | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Merge area: <br> ramp from l-95 northbound | 17.4 | 58.2 | B | 30.8 | 51.0 | D |
| Basic freeway segment: between the ramps | 35.3 | 58.6 | E | 39.5 | 55.8 | E |
| Diverge area: <br> Exit 36 Montvale Avenue | 27.7 | 50.1 | C | 31.0 | 51.2 | D |
| Alternative 2: 2025 Future |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conditions | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Merge area: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ramp from l-95 northbound | 17.4 | 58.2 | B | 30.8 | 51.0 | D |
| Basic freeway segment: between the ramps | 24.9 | 64.4 | C | 26.9 | 63.6 | D |
| Diverge area: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Exit 36, Montvale Avenue | 27.7 | 50.1 | C | 30.9 | 51.2 | D |

*LOS A through LOS D represent acceptable operating conditions; LOS E represents operating conditions at capacity; and LOS F represents failing conditions (demand exceeds capacity). $\mathrm{mph}=$ miles per hour. $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}=$ passenger cars per mile per lane
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

### 6.7 Recommendations

MPO staff recommends Alternative 2 because it improves operational efficiency and safety by removing entering and exiting traffic from the mainline travel lanes to the auxiliary lane. Alternative 1 forces traffic to merge onto the mainline as well as diverge from the mainline to exit the freeway, which interrupts traffic flow.

There is space within the existing right-of-way to construct Alternative 2. The right shoulder appears to have a consistent 12-to-13-foot space, which is wide enough to accommodate a full-travel lane (auxiliary lane). In addition, there is

[^6]space to construct an emergency pullover/stopping area, which would not be expensive to build. Alternative 2 would mirror the recently constructed northbound auxiliary lane and emergency pullover area.

Alternative 2 would require a Design Exception Report (DER) for the less-thanminimal right shoulder (i.e., a 12 -foot auxiliary lane and a 2 -foot offset [no shoulder] to the guardrail). The DER could be easily produced by MassDOT Highway District 4, similar to the DER submitted and approved for the I-93 northbound auxiliary lane.

## 7 LOCATION 2: I-95 SOUTHBOUND AT THE I-90 INTERCHANGE IN WESTON

There are two bottleneck locations on the I-95 southbound barrel at the I-90 Interchange in Weston. The interchange and roadways are under the jurisdiction of MassDOT Highway Division's District 6 . Figure 8 shows the locations of the bottlenecks and the ramp configurations near them. The affected section, about one mile long, extends from Exit 25 (I-90) to the Recreation Road overpass.

### 7.1 Existing Freeway Characteristics

## Basic Freeway Section

The basic freeway section has four 12-foot travel lanes, a 2-to-3-foot right shoulder, and an 11-to-12-foot left shoulder. During peak hours, I-95 southbound carries as many as 7,500 vehicles per hour upstream of the section under study. ${ }^{12}$ The posted speed limit is 55 mph . Exit signs are posted at one-mile, one-half-mile, and one-quarter-mile intervals to guide motorists exiting the freeway to I-90 and Route 30. Rumble strips have been installed on both sides of the southbound barrel to alert drivers and prevent run-off collisions. In June 2015, MassDOT Highway District 6 implemented signs and pavement markings in the study area.

Although, the posted speed limit on I-95 southbound is 55 mph , the 85thpercentile speed on the freeway is usually around 70 mph . Based on the 85thpercentile speed, MPO staff used a design speed of 70 mph to evaluate the minimum length of the acceleration and deceleration lanes described below.

## Exit Ramps

Exit ramps are one-way roadways that allow traffic to exit from the freeway and provide access to other crossing highways. Sufficient deceleration distance is needed to allow a vehicle to leave the freeway mainline safely and comfortably.

[^7]At Exit 25, the exit ramp to I-90 is a one-way, one-lane roadway on the freeway that widens to two lanes on the connecting ramp roadway. It carries as many as 2,300 vehicles per hour during peak hours. The length of the deceleration lane is about 350 feet long. Based on the highway design and exit ramp curve design speeds, the length of the deceleration lane does not meet MassDOT's standards. The posted speed limit on the exit ramp curve to l-90 is 25 mph .

At Exit 24, the exit ramp to Route 30 is a one-way, one-lane roadway that carries as many as 900 vehicles per hour during peak hours. The advisory speed limit on the exit ramp curve to Route 30 is 25 mph . The length of the deceleration lane for the traffic exiting to Route 30 is about 500 feet long. Based on the highway design and exit ramp curve design speeds, the length of the deceleration lane meets MassDOT's standards. However, the sharp hairpin curve would require slower speeds and enhanced signs to warn and guide drivers through the curve. The MassDOT Highway Division's current Project Development and Design Guide specifies a minimum deceleration length of 520 feet for a freeway facility with a design speed of 70 mph , an exit ramp curve design speed of 30 mph , and a grade of two percent or less.

## Entrance Ramps

Entrance ramps are one-way roadways that allow traffic to enter a freeway from other crossing highways. Sufficient acceleration distance is needed to allow a vehicle to enter the freeway mainline safely and comfortably; drivers on the entrance ramp need to be able to see a sufficient distance upstream from the entrance to locate the gaps in the traffic stream within which to merge. The entrance ramp from I-90 to I-95 southbound carries up to 2,000 vehicles per hour during peak periods that merge onto l-95 southbound at the bottleneck. The length of the existing acceleration lane on I-95 southbound for the traffic entering the freeway from I-90 is approximately 450 feet long. Based on the highway design and entrance ramp curve design speeds, the length of the acceleration lanes does not meet MassDOT's standards.

The entrance ramp from Route 30 to I-95 southbound carries up to 600 vehicles per hour during peak periods. The length of the existing acceleration lane on I-95 southbound for the traffic entering the freeway from Route 30 is approximately 400 feet long. Based on the highway design and entrance ramp curve design speeds, the length of the acceleration lanes does not meet MassDOT's standards.

Interstate 95, also called Route 128, was constructed in the 1950s to design standards of the time. It has been reconstructed along various portions over time to address some design deficiencies associated with updated standards. The

MassDOT Highway Division's current Project Development and Design Guide specifies a minimum acceleration length of 1,230 feet for a freeway facility with a design speed of 70 miles per hour, an entrance ramp curve design speed of 35 mph , and a grade of two percent or less. Because of space limitations (i.e., short spacing between the ramps, bridges, and overhead roadways and railroads), there is no room at the interchange to lengthen both acceleration lanes.

### 7.2 Problems

The existing bottlenecks, along with substandard acceleration and deceleration lanes, result in a long traffic queue on the I-90 connector during AM and PM peak periods when high volumes of traffic merge onto l-95 southbound. This queue affects I-90 traffic on the connector heading to I-95 northbound as well.

### 7.3 Causes

MPO staff identified four factors that contribute to form the bottlenecks:

- High-volume traffic from I-90 that merges onto I-95 southbound
- Short acceleration lane for the I-90 traffic merging onto I-95 southbound
- Short deceleration lane for the I-95 traffic exiting to I-90
- Lane imbalance in the section


## High-Volume Traffic

Figures 9 and 10 show the traffic flows during the AM and PM peak periods. As many as 2,000 vehicles per hour enter I-95 southbound from I-90 during the peak period. These entry volumes are quite high for a single-lane entrance ramp given the high volume of traffic on I-95 southbound with which it has to merge. The intense merging maneuvers interrupt traffic for all drivers and cause a bottleneck. Many motorists on I-95 southbound move out of the rightmost lane to avoid the merge with high-volume traffic entering the freeway.

## Short Acceleration Lane

The acceleration lane for the high-volume traffic merging onto l-95 southbound from I-90 is inadequate and does not meet MassDOT's standards. It forces drivers to merge quickly, causing intense merging and queuing on the I-90 entrance ramp. Presently, there is no room to lengthen the acceleration lane because of the bridges downstream of the section. In addition, the problem of forced merging at this location is exacerbated by the close proximity of the Route 30 and I-90 entrance ramps.

## Short Deceleration Lane

The length of the deceleration lane at Exit 25 for the high-volume traffic exiting to I-90 is inadequate; it forces drivers to diverge quickly and does not give them
ample distance needed to allow a vehicle to leave the freeway mainline safely and comfortably. The intense diverge and lane-change maneuvers cause traffic interruption and wide variability in traffic speeds, resulting in many crashes.

## Lane Imbalance

Travel lanes in the study area are not in balance with the volume of traffic entering and exiting this section. At Exit 25 and Exit 24, approximately 2,300 to 2,900 vehicles per hour exit the freeway to I-90 and Route 30 . The exit traffic flow rate exceeds the capacity of a full travel lane. Downstream of Exit 24, up to 2,400 vehicles per hour enter the freeway from the same roads. Likewise, the entry traffic flow rate is equivalent to the capacity of the full travel lane. Therefore, maintaining four continuous lanes in the study area creates a lane imbalance, which also results in intense merging and bottlenecks at the diverge and merge points.

### 7.4 Impacts

## Crashes

Figure 11 shows the location and number of crashes in the study area. A summary of the crashes is also presented in Table 5. There were 77 crashes in this section between 2010 and 2012 (Appendix C). The majority, 53 of the crashes, occurred in the vicinity of the diverge area at Exit 25 . MPO staff believe that many of the rear-end and sideswipe crashes were caused by drivers slowing down to exit the freeway to I-90 or by drivers changing lanes. It appears that the short deceleration lane at this location may be contributing to poor traffic operations and the high number of crashes. There were only five recorded crashes near the bottleneck location where traffic from I-90 merges onto I-95 southbound.

The average crash rate of the freeway segment was 1.06 crashes per MVMT, which was significantly higher than the average of 0.54 crashes per MVMT for urban interstate highways in Massachusetts. Below is a summary of the crashes in this segment.

- Thirty-nine percent of the crashes resulted in injury.
- Sixty-eight percent of the crashes were rear-end collisions.
- Eighty-three percent of the crashes occurred under dry roadway conditions.
- Thirty percent of the crashes occurred outside daylight conditions.
- Sixty-six percent of the crashes occurred at peak travel periods.

TABLE 5
Crash Summary (2010-2012) I-95 Southbound Segment between Exit 25 and Recreation Road

| Crash Variable | Number of Crashes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crash severity | - |
| Fatal injury | 0 |
| Nonfatal injury | 30 |
| Property damage only | 40 |
| Not reported/unknown | 7 |
| Manner of collision | - |
| Angle | 4 |
| Rear-end | 52 |
| Sideswipe, same direction | 6 |
| Single vehicle crash | 15 |
| Road Surface conditions | - |
| Dry | 64 |
| Wet | 11 |
| Snow | 1 |
| Other | 1 |
| Ambient light conditions | - |
| Daylight | 54 |
| Dark: lighted roadway | 5 |
| Dark: nonlighted roadway | 10 |
| Dawn | 2 |
| Dusk | 6 |
| Weather conditions | - |
| Clear | 50 |
| Cloudy | 8 |
| Rain | 8 |
| Snow | 1 |
| Fog/smog/smoke | 1 |
| Not reported/unknown | 9 |
| Travel period | - |
| Peak | 51 |
| Off-peak | 26 |
| Total crashes | 77 |
| Three-year average (rounded) | 26 |
| Segment crash rate | 1.06 |
| MassDOT Highway Division average crash rate for urban interstate roadways | 0.54 |

* The AM peak period is 6:00 AM to 10:00 AM, and the PM peak period is 3:00 PM to 7:00 PM. Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.


## Travel Speed

The bottleneck affects travel on I-95 southbound and on the entrance ramp from $\mathrm{I}-90$. Figure 12 is a congestion scan that shows the average travel speeds on I95 southbound in the study area. The bottleneck reduces travel speed to 35 to 45 mph . A traffic queue resulting from the bottleneck forms on the I-90 entrance ramp, which extends onto the I-90 connector as well as onto I-95 southbound.

## Level of Service

Using the data collected, MPO staff analyzed the AM and PM peak hours with the 2010 HCS to assess the capacity and quality of traffic flow at the bottleneck area (included in Appendix D). ${ }^{13}$ Table 6 presents the results of the existing freeway merge/diverge analyses. Analyses indicate that traffic entering l-95 southbound from I-90 operates at LOS E during peak hours due to intense merging. The merging and diverging activities in the section interrupt and slow down traffic on the mainline and entrance ramps. In addition, analyses show that the traffic exiting from the freeway to l-90 upstream of the section operates well at LOS F during peak hours.

TABLE 6
Freeway Segment Analysis: Existing Conditions I-95 Southbound Segment between Exit 25 and Recreation Road

| Freeway | AM <br> Density <br> (pc/mi/ln) | AM <br> Speed <br> $(\mathrm{mph})$ | AM <br> LOS* $^{*}$ | PM <br> Density <br> (pc/mi/ln) | PM <br> Speed <br> $(\mathbf{m p h})$ | PM <br> LOS* $^{*}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2015 Existing Conditions <br> Diverge segment: | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Exit 25, I-90 | 39.5 | 45.5 | F | 43.7 | 45.0 | F |
| Diverge segment: | 27.1 | 46.6 | C | 24.5 | 47.0 | C |
| Exit 24, Route 30 <br> Merge segment: | 12.6 | 50.9 | B | 23.4 | 50.4 | C |
| Entrance ramp from Route 30 <br> Merge segment: <br> Entrance ramp from I-90 | 37.1 | 46.5 | E | 35.9 | 47.2 | E |

*LOS A through LOS D represent acceptable operating conditions; LOS E represents operating conditions at capacity; and LOS F represents failing conditions (demand exceeds capacity).
$\mathrm{mph}=$ miles per hour. $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}=$ passenger cars per mile per lane
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

[^8]
### 7.5 Improvement Alternatives

MPO staff developed the following improvements to increase safety and address the bottleneck:

- Convert rightmost lane at Exit 25 to an "Exit Only" lane.
- Consider the possibility of using a portion of the shoulder on I-95 southbound at Exit 25 to create a two-lane exit ramp (i.e., two lanes on the freeway diverge area to connect to the existing two-lane connector). If a full two-lane exit ramp is not feasible, an alternative would be a shared through and exit lane in addition to the Exit Only lane.
- Restripe lanes to serve traffic demand better at the bottleneck.
- Installation of a highly visible curve sign or chevron warning signs on the exit ramp to Route 30.


## Convert Rightmost Lane at Exit 25 to an "Exit Only" Lane

The objectives of the improvement at this location are to reduce traffic interruption and increase safety at the Exit 25 diverge area. The conversion would extend the deceleration lane to meet MassDOT's standards and provide drivers with ample distance to exit the freeway to I-90 safely and comfortably. In addition, it would improve traffic operation at the diverge area and reduce the high number of crashes at this location.

MPO staff suggests that the MassDOT Highway Division looks into the possibility of using a section of the right shoulder on I-95 southbound at Exit 25 to create a full two-lane exit-ramp (i.e., two lanes on the freeway diverge area to connect to the existing two-lane exit ramp connector as illustrated in Figure 13 [Section 1]). A full two-lane exit ramp would improve safety and operations significantly. This improvement would require relocation of signs or installation of new guide signs to direct drivers to I-90 and modifying of pavement markings to delineate the "Exit Only" lane from the mainline travel lanes.

It is possible that a full two-lane exit is not feasible because of the following reasons:

- The need for additional overhead signage (including placement of brandnew overhead full-span sign support structures)
- The desire to discourage drivers from making the dangerous but oftenobserved move from the I-95 southbound center lanes to the left lane of the exit ramp by removing the second lane on the exit ramp
- Removal of the shoulder may raise safety concerns for maintenance operations using the access drive from River Road
An alternative to resolve these issues would be a shared through and exit lane in addition to the Exit Only lane as shown in Figure 14.


## Restripe Lanes to Serve Traffic Demand Better at the Bottleneck (I-95 Southbound Subtract-a-Lane at the l-90 Interchange)

The objective of this improvement is to restripe the southbound lanes at the bottleneck locations to serve traffic demand better. Figure 13 (Sections 1 and 2) shows the recommended improvements. After Exit 25, I-95 southbound would have three travel lanes instead of the current four lanes. The high-volume traffic entering I-95 southbound from I-90 would pick up the extra lane to head southbound on I-95. The modifications would provide the I-90 traffic merging onto I-95 southbound with an auxiliary lane, which would also address the issue of the inadequate acceleration lane at the merge area. Because of the high volume of traffic that exits the freeway at Exits 25 and 24 to I-90 and Route 30, respectively, subtracting a lane would not affect travel on I-95 southbound.

In addition to the new auxiliary lane for traffic from I-90 to merge onto I-95 southbound, MPO staff also proposes the following improvements:

- Relocate existing signs or install new guide signs to direct drivers into appropriate lanes to exit the freeways or proceed through the section.
- Modify pavement markings to define the acceleration, deceleration, and auxiliary lanes from the mainline travel lanes.


### 7.6 Effectiveness and Cost of the Improvements

The improvements were analyzed as freeway merge/diverge and basic freeway segments. Ramp LOS analysis for 2025, presented in Table 7 indicates that the improvements would improve traffic operations at the bottleneck.

- At the location where traffic from I-90 merges onto l-95 southbound, the LOS would improve to LOS D from LOS E during PM peak hours. During the AM peak hours, there is slightly improved traffic operation, but it is not enough to change the LOS from LOS E.
- At Exit 25, where traffic exits to I-90, the LOS would improve to LOS B from LOS F during the AM and PM peak periods.
- The improvements are expected to reduce crashes by as much as 30 percent. ${ }^{14}$

The improvements are estimated to cost approximately $\$ 50,000$ to construct.

[^9]TABLE 7
Freeway Segment Analysis: Improvement Alternatives I-95 Southbound Segment between Exit 25 and Recreation Road

| Freeway Component |  | AM Speed (mph) | $\begin{gathered} \text { AM } \\ \text { LOS* }^{*} \end{gathered}$ | PM Density (pc/mi/ln) |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PM } \\ \text { LOS* }^{*} \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2025 With Improvements: TwoLane Exit and Restripe Lanes to |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Serve Traffic Demand Better | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Diverge segment: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Exit 25, I-90 | 12.2 | 45.5 | B | 15.5 | 45.7 | B |
| Diverge segment: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Exit 24, Route 30 | 33.0 | 48.3 | D | 32.1 | 47.0 | D |
| Merge segment: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entrance ramp from Route 30 | 30.6 | 49.2 | D | 32.1 | 48.8 | D |
| Merge segment: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entrance ramp from I-90 | 35.9 | 54.4 | E | 34.5 | 54.8 | D |

*LOS A through LOS D represent acceptable operating conditions; LOS E represents operating conditions at capacity; and LOS F represents failing conditions (demand exceeds capacity). $\mathrm{mph}=$ miles per hour. $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}=$ passenger cars per mile per lane
Source: Central Transportation Planning Staff.

### 7.7 Recommendations

MPO staff recommend two improvements for the I-90 interchange: designating an "Exit Only" lane at Exit 25, and subtracting a lane between Exit 25 and the entrance ramp from I-90. The proposed improvements would require approval from FHWA. MassDOT Highway District 4 office could easily produce the necessary documentation, which would be similar to the documentation that was submitted and approved for the I-95 northbound subtract-a-lane project at the I-90 interchange.

The I-95 southbound subtract-a-lane improvement project at the I-90 interchange is expected to benefit from the I-95 Add-a-Lane project, which would remove a downstream bottleneck (lane drop) on I-95 southbound just north of Route 9 in Wellesley. The I-95 Add-a-Lane project includes bridge and roadway reconstruction, namely the installation of an additional 12-foot travel lane and 10foot shoulder in each direction; this project is scheduled to be completed in spring 2019. Therefore, executing or planning the above-described improvements, which would benefit from the l-95 Add-a-Lane project, is very important.

Currently, as a result of bridge maintenance work on I-95 southbound in the vicinity of the study area, the MassDOT Highway Division has implemented some form of these improvements as a traffic management plan for the work zone.

## 8 CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

MPO staff, working in conjunction with the MassDOT Highway staff, identified, developed, and evaluated improvements for two bottleneck locations in the MPO region. The study provides the MassDOT Highway Division with an opportunity to begin identifying the needs at the two bottleneck locations and to start planning design and engineering efforts. If implemented, these low-cost, short-term improvements would increase traffic safety, make traffic operations more efficient, and reduce congestion at the bottlenecks. The study aligns with the MPO goals of reducing congestion and increasing safety on the region's highway system.

The MassDOT Highway Division is responsible for implementing the improvements recommended for the two bottleneck locations. The next steps are for the MassDOT Highway Division to examine the design of the improvement alternatives and work with the FHWA to advance the projects. Transportation decision-making is complex and is influenced by factors such as financial limitations and agency programmatic commitments. Project development is the process that takes a transportation improvement plan from concept to construction. Appendix E includes an overview of the MassDOT Highway Division's project development process.
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## APPENDIX A

## 1. Review Comments

2. Selection Process

## 1. Review Comments

## Seth Asante

| From: | Raphael, Connie (DOT) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, November 04, 2015 11:11 AM |
| To: | Seth Asante |
| Subject: | RE: Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations |

Hi Seth,

The District has reviewed the revised memo. Overall you put together a good explanation and plan for moving forward. Here are some comments.

Location 1: I-93 SB between I-95 and Montvale Ave appears to be the only one that could be implemented short-term, low-cost. Alternative 2, providing an auxiliary lane for the entire length between interchanges, is the better solution. The shoulder area appears to be wide enough to accommodate full-time travel and the emergency turnout would not be overly expensive to build. It would also match up well with the auxiliary lane on I-93 NB between the same interchanges. This solution would mirror the recently constructed northbound auxiliary lane and emergency pull off. The Design Exception Report required for the less than minimum right shoulder could be easily produced as it is similar to the DER submitted and approved for the northbound auxiliary lane.

Thanks Seth

Connie Raphael
District Four Planning Coordinator
MassDOT - Highway Division
519 Appleton Street
Arlington, MA 02476
781-641-8468

From: Seth Asante [mailto:sasante@ctps.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2015 11:17 AM
To: Raphael, Connie (DOT)
Subject: Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations

Hi Connie,

The attachment is a revised memo with Figures 2 and 9 legends corrected to AM hours.

Thanks,
Seth

Seth A. Asante | Chief Transportation Planner
CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING STAFF
857.702.3644 | sasante@ctps.org
www.ctps.org/bostonmpo


From:<br>Sent:<br>To:<br>Cc:<br>Subject:<br>Attachments:<br>Lipton, Amitai (DOT)<br>Thursday, November 05, 2015 12:25 PM<br>Seth Asante (sasante@ctps.org)<br>Boudreau, Neil (DOT); Kulen, Raj (DOT); Pervez, Hameed (DOT)<br>RE: Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations<br>20150114 Memo Heller to Leavenworth w-appendices.pdf; 20151007 Memo Heller to<br>Leavenworth - scanned signed by DHD.pdf

Hi Seth,

This is a very thorough analysis of the bottleneck at I-95 SB at I-90 in Weston. I'd like to second Raj's suggestion that it may be worthwhile to send your memo to FHWA ASAP (in draft version), as they are in the middle of evaluating our request to make the modifications permanent.

I do have a few minor notes/suggestions for your consideration:
Please note District 6 implemented the sign and pavement marking modifications in June 2015. Were the field observations and traffic volume measurements conducted before or after the modifications were implemented? In Table 5 (page 18), the existing conditions are labeled as "2015", and I was curious if these were counts actually conducted in 2015, or if they were older counts with a growth rate applied?

There seems to be a little inconsistency regarding speeds and terminology in certain parts of pages 14-15. The existing geometry was evaluated in reference to either a 65 mph (exit ramp to Route 30 ) or 70 mph (entrance ramps) design speed on I-95. While the posted speed limit on I-95 is 55 mph , and the original speed regulation for this roadway was 60 mph , the 85 th-percentile speeds are usually around $70-72 \mathrm{mph}$. Do you know why design speeds of $65-70 \mathrm{mph}$ were chosen for this report?

On the exit ramp to Route 30, the sign is actually an "advisory speed," not a "speed limit." Given how sharp the hairpin curve is, an even lower speed of 15 or 20 mph may be more appropriate than the posted " 25 mph ". Perhaps we can install a few supplemental high-visibility curve or chevron warning signs at some point.

On page 14 , where the exit ramp from I-95 SB to I-90 is discussed, I feel the running speed on the ramp is fairly close to that of the I-95 mainline, and the horizontal curve has a fairly large radius at the exit gore, so most likely very little deceleration distance is needed.

On page 16, in the Lane Imbalance section, I would note that the entering and exiting volumes ( $2300-2900 \mathrm{vph}$ ) actually exceed the capacity of a full travel lane, making the imbalance even more severe.

That brings me to page 19 and a discussion of the exit to l-90, whether it should be a two-lane ramp vs. a one-lane ramp. We did discuss the pros and cons of each alternative, and we ended up deciding on a one-lane ramp. Some of the reasons we chose not to pursue this alternative were:

- The need for additional overhead signage (including replacement of brand-new overhead full-span sign support structures);
- Desire to discourage drivers from making the dangerous but oft-observed move from the I-95 SB center lanes to the left lane of the exit ramp by removing the second lane on the exit ramp; and
- Removal of shoulder raised safety concerns for maintenance operations using access drive from River Road (seen on Figure 13 Section 1 at the start of the 5th lane).

Costs: I'm still waiting to see the final invoices for the work we did, but my ballpark estimate for the signage (overhead and ground-mounted) is $\$ 10-15,000$ and for the pavement markings it's $\$ 3-5,000$. We still need to install final markings, reset 2 signs on permanent posts, and re-install pavement markers and rumble strips, but I think a ballpark estimate of $\$ 25-50,000$ for all the work is reasonable.

I think Figure 2 also has AM/PM swapped like Figure 9 did.
As we discussed on Wednesday, I am attaching for your information the memos that District 6 prepared for this project. The first memo was sent to FHWA on $1 / 22 / 2015$ and approved by them on $2 / 13 / 2015$. The second memo, requesting permanent approval for the modifications, was signed by District 6 DHD on 10/7/2015 for transmission to the Chief's office and then FHWA. Please consider the second memo a "draft" until we receive confirmation that it's been approved.

Thank you very much, I look forward to seeing the final report!
Amitai

From: Kulen, Raj (DOT)
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 12:16
To: Seth Asante (sasante@ctps.org)
Cc: Boudreau, Neil (DOT); Lipton, Amitai (DOT); hameed.pervez@state.ma.us
Subject: FW: Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations
Hi Seth,
This is intersecting. We have already implemented the I-93-SB lane configuration this summer as part of bridge deck work as a test and collected travel time data, now we are waiting for FHWA final approval for permanent marking.

Neil, this is good if you want to send this to FHWA as well.

Raj

From: Seth Asante [mailto:sasante@ctps.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 11:29 AM
To: Kulen, Raj (DOT)
Subject: Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations
Hi Raj,
The attached technical memorandum—Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations is available for review.

MPO staff selected two locations for this study:

## Location 1: I-93 southbound between I-95 and Montvale Avenue in Woburn and Stoneham

Location 2: I-95 southbound at the I-90 Interchange in Weston
The result of the study for Location 2, which is in MassDOT Highway Division's District 6, is presented in Section 7 of the memorandum.

Please review the attached documents and provide any comments or questions you may have by November 10, 2015.

Thank you,
Seth

Seth A. Asante | Chief Transportation Planner
CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING STAFF
857.702.3644 | sasante@ctps.org
www.ctps.org/bostonmpo


## Seth Asante

| From: | Patel, Hasmukh (DOT) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, October 30, 2015 4:17 PM |
| To: | Seth Asante (sasante@ctps.org) |
| Cc: | Wood, Stanley (DOT); Jasmin, Matthew (DOT) |
| Subject: | FW: Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations Study |
| Attachments: | 2015-09-15 Low-Cost Bottlenecks MEM SA 1.pdf; Appendix A-E.pdf |

Hi Seth,

I have reviewed the draft document for the subject study and have following comments.

I concur with the selection of following two locations for the study.
Location 1: I-93 Southbound between I-95 \& Montvale Ave in Stoneham \& Woburn
Location 3: I-95 Southbound at I-90 Interchange in Weston

## Location 1: Location 1: I-93 Southbound between I-95 \& Montvale Ave in Stoneham \& Woburn

- Preferred Alternative 2 - Create Auxiliary Lane for Merging \& Diverging Traffic

This alternative would require roadway widening. Existing right shoulder is $10 \mathrm{ft}+-$. Auxiliary lane would require
$12^{\prime}$ wide lane and at least $6^{\prime}$ shoulder. Anything less than $6^{\prime}$ wide shoulder will require design exception approval. Also, if we go with $12^{\prime}$ wide auxiliary lane, and 2' offset (no shoulder) to guard rail, it will require design exception approval. It will also require emergency pool over area.

- Cost of $\$ 200,000-\$ 300,000$ seems low. Consider $\$ 500,000$


## Location 3: I-95 Southbound at I-90 Interchange in Weston

- Concur with the improvements suggested at this interchange. No additional comments.

Hardy

From: Seth Asante [mailto:sasante@ctps.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 12:41 PM
To: Patel, Hasmukh (DOT)
Subject: Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations Study
Hello Hardy,
As we discussed in our recent telephone conversation, I have attached a draft document of the Boston Region MPO's Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations study for review. The document has not been reviewed by the Highway Districts yet.
Please review and comment-I will address your comments before I forward it to Districts 4 and 6 for further review.
I will appreciate it if you can give me comments by Tuesday September 29, 2015.

Thanks,
Seth

Seth A. Asante | Chief Transportation Planner CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING STAFF
857.702.3644 | sasante@ctps.org
www.ctps.org/bostonmpo




2. Selection Process

## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 2, 2015
TO: Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) FROM: Seth Asante, MPO Staff

## RE: Low-Cost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations Selection of Study Locations

## 1 BACKGROUND

This memorandum presents the results of Task 2 of the work program for LowCost Improvements to Express-Highway Bottleneck Locations: FFY 2015. ${ }^{1}$ MPO staff indicated in Task 2—screen bottleneck locations and select locations for analysis-that we will present the results to the MPO for discussion.

According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), "Much of recurring congestion is due to physical bottlenecks—potentially correctible points on the highway system where traffic flow is restricted. While many of the nation's bottlenecks can only be addressed through costly major construction projects, there is a significant opportunity for the application of operational and low-cost infrastructure solutions to bring about relief at these chokepoints." ${ }^{2}$

In the past, MPO staff analyzed several express-highway bottleneck locations in two consecutive studies, Low-Cost Improvements to Bottlenecks Phase I and Phase II, which were very well received by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) and FHWA. ${ }^{3,4}$ Previous study locations included sections of I-95 in Weston and Burlington and sections of Route 3 in Braintree.

[^10]Some of the recommendations from those studies have been executed, such as the I-95 northbound subtract-a-lane at Interchange 24 in Weston; and FHWA has interviewed MPO staff about their successful implementation.

The cause and duration of highway bottlenecks vary. In general, recurring bottlenecks, the subject of this work program, are influenced by the design or operation present at the point where the bottleneck begins, for example: merges, diverges, lane drops, traffic weaving, abrupt changes in highway alignment, lowclearance structures, lane narrowing, intended disruption of traffic for management purposes, and less-than-optimal express-highway design. This memorandum presents the process used to select the bottleneck study locations. MPO staff will submit this proposal to the MPO for discussion and approval.

## 2 SELECTION OF STUDY LOCATIONS

Selection of study locations was a two-stage process that comprised inventorying and screening candidate locations.

### 2.1 Inventorying Candidate Locations

MPO staff developed an initial list of candidate locations in the MPO region based on the following parameters:

- Staff knowledge of bottleneck locations in the Boston MPO region
- Review of congestion management process (CMP) monitoring data and recent MPO and other planning studies
- Consultations with MassDOT Highway Division
- Input from MPO members

The inventory process yielded five bottleneck locations for screening:

1. I-93 southbound between I-95 and Montvale Avenue in Stoneham and Woburn
2. I-93 southbound at the lane drop near Sullivan Square in Somerville/Charlestown
3. I-95 southbound at I-90 Interchange in Weston
4. Route 2 Concord Rotary
5. I-95 northbound, lane drop at interchange 37 in Reading, Stoneham, and Wakefield

### 2.2 Screening Candidate Locations

MPO staff selected two bottleneck locations for analysis. After consulting with MassDOT Highway Division, staff determined that these two locations likely could be corrected with low-cost mitigation strategies, whereas the other bottlenecks likely could not be correctible in a low-cost manner. MPO staff used the following criteria to screen the bottleneck locations:

- Does the location qualify as a bottleneck? A long traffic queue upstream trailing free-flowing traffic downstream usually characterizes the location as a bottleneck. In addition, the upstream congestion must be recurringin other words, the location experiences routine and predictable congestion because traffic volume exceeds the available capacity at that location.
- Is a physical design constraint or operational conflict inherent in the location the cause of the bottleneck? Examples of these are:
o Lane drop-one or more travel lanes are lost, requiring traffic to merge
o Weaving area—drivers must merge across one or more lanes in order to access an entry or exit ramp
o Merge area—on-ramp traffic merges with mainline traffic in order to enter the freeway
o Major interchanges-high-volume traffic is directed from one freeway to another
o Horizontal curves-abrupt changes in highway alignment force drivers to slow down because of safety concerns
- Can the bottleneck be fixed with low-cost operational and geometric improvements? These would exclude costly long-term solutions such as expansion and major transit investments that alter driver mode choice. Examples of low-cost operational and geometric improvements are:
o Using a short section of shoulder as an additional travel lane, an auxiliary lane, or for lengthening an acceleration or deceleration lane
o Restriping merge and diverge areas to better serve traffic demand
o Providing better traveler information to allow drivers to respond to temporary changes in lane assignment, such as using a shoulder as an additional travel lane during peak periods
o Providing all-purpose reversible lanes
o Changing or adding signs and striping

Based on the screening criteria and consultations with MassDOT Highway Division officials, MPO staff selected Locations 1 and 3 for study. Below are staff's rationale for not selecting Locations 2, 4, and 5:

## Location 2: I-93 Southbound at the Lane Drop near Sullivan Square in Somerville/Charlestown

This section of highway is frequently congested because of a lane drop and intensive merging and diverging activities, especially during the AM peak period. During that period, the on-ramp carries between 1,300-and-1,700 vehicles per hour in an auxiliary lane; and the off-ramp to Leverett Circle, Exit 26, carries between 1,200-and-1,600 vehicles per hour. ${ }^{5}$ The merging and diverging activities of these vehicles slow down mainline traffic and seriously affect traffic on the upstream section on I-93. The distance between the two ramps is about 0.4 miles long. The reasons for not selecting this location are:

- Removing the lane drop would require widening the I-93 bridge over Alfred Lombardi Street to provide a new auxiliary lane for the on-ramp traffic or converting the existing auxiliary lane to an acceleration lane.
- Widening the I-93 Bridge could be expensive.
- Converting the existing auxiliary lane to an acceleration lane might create a queue backup on the ramp that might affect traffic on Route 38 (Mystic Avenue) and the collector-distributor roads. In addition, there might not be enough space to provide sufficient acceleration distance because of the I93 bridge over Alfred Lombardi Bridge.


## Location 4: Route 2 Concord Rotary

This rotary, the intersection of Concord Turnpike (Route 2), Commonwealth Avenue, Barretts Mill Road, and Great Road (Route 119) is frequently congested because of high traffic volume and inadequate capacity during the AM and PM peak periods. The rotary is a challenge to navigate during these periods, and drivers often use local streets to avoid congestion. MassDOT Highway Division is planning to replace the rotary with an overpass for safer and more efficient operation, and to minimize environmental impacts. The Highway Division also is exploring opportunities to improve neighborhood connections, incorporate the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail and wildlife corridors, improve water and air quality, and enhance the area's design aesthetics to the extent possible.

Although this site is a major bottleneck, staff did not select this location because:

- Low-cost solutions at this location likely would not be feasible. MassDOT and MPO staff already studied the Route 2 Concord Rotary

[^11]to examine potential short- and long-term improvement alternatives for the rotary. ${ }^{6,7}$

- The project was removed from the funded portion of the MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) in August 2009 and currently is on hold.


## Location 5: I-95 Northbound, Lane Drop at Interchange 37 in Reading, Stoneham, and Wakefield

This section of highway frequently is congested because of a lane drop and intensive merging and diverging activities, especially during the PM peak period, which slows down mainline traffic. During that time, the Exit 37 off-ramps carry about 3,200 vehicles per hour and the Exit 37 on-ramps carry about 2,300 vehicles per hour. ${ }^{8}$ Adding an auxiliary lane northbound on I-95 would provide more room for the merging and diverging activities and reduce disturbance to mainline traffic. Staff did not select this location because an auxiliary lane would need to be extended for a long distance (about three-to-four interchanges downstream) to reduce congestion and queue, which could be expensive.

## 3 SELECTED BOTTLENECK LOCATIONS FOR STUDY

## Location 1: I-93 Southbound Between I-95 and Montvale Avenue in Stoneham and Woburn

This section of highway, about two miles long, frequently is congested because of merging and diverging activities, especially during the AM and PM peak periods. The southbound off- and on-ramps connect to and from Montvale Avenue. During peak periods, l-93 southbound carries about 8,000 vehicles per hour; the on-ramp from l-95 northbound carries about 2,000 vehicles per hour; and about 900 vehicles per hour exit to Montvale Avenue at Exit 36. In addition, about 800 vehicles per hour enter I-93 southbound from Montvale Avenue during the same period. ${ }^{9}$ The merging and diverging activities of these vehicles slow down I-93 southbound mainline traffic upstream of the Montvale Avenue interchange. In addition, these activities affect traffic entering l-93 southbound from I-95 northbound.

[^12]
## Location 3: I-95 Southbound at I-90 Interchange in Weston

This bottleneck is located on I-95 southbound at the point where traffic from I-90 and Route 30 merges onto I-95. During peak periods, between 2,000-to-2,600 vehicles per hour exit I-95 southbound to I-90 and Route 30. Further downstream about the same volume of traffic enters I-95 from the same roads. However, the four I-95 southbound lanes in that section are not allocated efficiently to serve demand. As a result, during peak periods a long traffic queue forms on the I-90 and Route 30 connector ramps heading southbound on I-95.

## 4 <br> SUMMARY

By identifying and evaluating a comprehensive list of potential improvements at the two locations, MPO staff will rely on their technical expertise and judgment regarding the nature of bottlenecks. MPO staff will seek input from MassDOT Highway Division staff that are familiar with the region's express-highway system operations.

This study addresses the MPO's goal of reducing congestion and increasing safety on the region's highway system. MPO staff will submit this proposal to the MPO for discussion and approval. If the MPO approves this selection, staff will meet with officials from MassDOT and discuss the study specifics, conduct field visits, collect data, and perform various analyses.

SAA/saa

## APPENDIX B

## Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) Count Data

## LOCATION 1

I-93 Southbound Between I-95 and Montvale Avenue in Woburn and Stoneham


Transportation Data Management System


## Directions:

| AADT (?) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | AADT | DHV-30 | K \% | D \% | PA | BC | Src |
|  | 2013 | 86,756 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2007 | 92,586 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Travel Demand Model



| VOLUME TREND (?) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Year | Annual Growth |
| 2014 | $7 \%$ |
| 2013 | $-3 \%$ |
| 2010 | $0 \%$ |
| 2009 | $-2 \%$ |
| 2008 | $4 \%$ |

## SPEED

## Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | 4098_SB |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'I Class | 1 |
| Located On | INTERSTATE 93 |
| SOUTH OF | RTE.I- 95(128) |
| Direction | SB |
| Community | WOBURN |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Mon 1/5/2015 |
| End Date | Tue 1/6/2015 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction | SB |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source |  |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Tube Class |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| Time | Hourly <br> Count |
| $\mathbf{0 : 0 0 - 1 : 0 0}$ | 434 |
| $\mathbf{1 : 0 0 - 2 : 0 0}$ | 275 |
| $\mathbf{2 : 0 0 - 3 : 0 0}$ | 273 |
| $\mathbf{3 : 0 0 - 4 : 0 0}$ | 510 |
| $\mathbf{4 : 0 0 - 5 : 0 0}$ | 1,617 |
| $\mathbf{5 : 0 0 - 6 : 0 0}$ | 6,466 |
| $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 - 7 : 0 0}$ | 6,654 |
| $\mathbf{7 : 0 0 - 8 : 0 0}$ | 5,213 |
| $\mathbf{8 : 0 0 - 9 : 0 0}$ | 4,877 |
| $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 - 1 0 : 0 0}$ | 4,994 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 : 0 0 - 1 1 : 0 0}$ | 5,003 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 : 0 0 - 1 2 : 0 0}$ | 4,824 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 - 1 3 : 0 0}$ | 4,601 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 : 0 0 - 1 4 : 0 0}$ | 4,674 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0 - 1 5 : 0 0}$ | 5,211 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 : 0 0 - 1 6 : 0 0}$ | 5,398 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 : 0 0 - 1 7 : 0 0}$ | 6,134 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0 - 1 8 : 0 0}$ | 7,619 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 : 0 0 - 1 9 : 0 0}$ | 6,382 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 : 0 0 - 2 0 : 0 0}$ | 3,848 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0 - 2 1 : 0 0}$ | 2,650 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 : 0 0 - 2 2 : 0 0}$ | 2,104 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 : 0 0 - 2 3 : 0 0}$ | 1,605 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 : 0 0 - 2 4 : 0 0}$ | 1,042 |
| Total | 92,408 |
| AM Peak | $06: 00-07: 00$ |
| PM Peak | $17: 00-18: 00$ |
|  | 7,619 |

## Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | 4098_SB |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'I Class | 1 |
| Located On | INTERSTATE 93 |
| SOUTH OF | RTE.I- 95(128) |
| Direction | SB |
| Community | WOBURN |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Tue 1/6/2015 |
| End Date | Wed 1/7/2015 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00$ AM |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction | SB |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source |  |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Tube Class |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| Time | Hourly <br> Count |
| $\mathbf{0 : 0 0 - 1 : 0 0}$ | 469 |
| 1:00-2:00 | 323 |
| $\mathbf{2 : 0 0 - 3 : 0 0}$ | 279 |
| $\mathbf{3 : 0 0 - 4 : 0 0}$ | 472 |
| 4:00-5:00 | 1,550 |
| $\mathbf{5 : 0 0 - 6 : 0 0}$ | 6,518 |
| $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 - 7 : 0 0}$ | 7,008 |
| $\mathbf{7 : 0 0 - 8 : 0 0}$ | 5,134 |
| $\mathbf{8 : 0 0 - 9 : 0 0}$ | 4,790 |
| $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 - 1 0 : 0 0}$ | 5,220 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 : 0 0 - 1 1 : 0 0}$ | 5,110 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 : 0 0 - 1 2 : 0 0}$ | 4,698 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 - 1 3 : 0 0}$ | 4,737 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 : 0 0 - 1 4 : 0 0}$ | 4,557 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0 - 1 5 : 0 0}$ | 4,925 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 : 0 0 - 1 6 : 0 0}$ | 5,046 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 : 0 0 - 1 7 : 0 0}$ | 5,596 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0 - 1 8 : 0 0}$ | 7,085 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 : 0 0 - 1 9 : 0 0}$ | 6,137 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 : 0 0 - 2 0 : 0 0}$ | 4,169 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0 - 2 1 : 0 0}$ | 2,839 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 : 0 0 - 2 2 : 0 0}$ | 2,177 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 : 0 0 - 2 3 : 0 0}$ | 1,675 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 : 0 0 - 2 4 : 0 0}$ | 1,099 |
| Total | 91,613 |
| AM Peak | $06: 00-07: 00$ |
| PM Peak | $\mathbf{1 7}: 00-18: 00$ |
| 7,085 |  |

Classification Report

| Location ID | 4098_SB | Located On | INTERSTATE 93 | Community | WOBURN |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Counted By | TCDS_Combined | SOUTH OF | RTE.I- 95(128) | County | MIDDLESEX |
| Start Date | Tue 1/6/2015 | Loc On Alias |  | Module |  |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00$ AM | Direction | SB | Agency | MHD |
| Source | Syst_Combine | Sensor | Tube Class |  |  |
| Axle Factor | 0.976 | Count Status | Accepted |  |  |


| FHWA-Scheme F Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start <br> Time | Motor cycle | Car | Pick up | Bus | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2A } \\ & \text { SU } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3A } \\ & \text { SU } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline>3 A \\ \text { SU } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <5 A \\ & 2 U \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 A \\ & 2 U \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline>5 A \\ 2 U \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <6 A \\ & >2 U \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \mathrm{~A} \\ >2 \mathrm{U} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & >6 \mathrm{~A} \\ & >2 \mathrm{U} \end{aligned}$ | 14 | 15 | TOTAL |
| 12:00 AM | 0 | 430 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 469 |
| 1:00 AM | 0 | 278 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 323 |
| 2:00 AM | 0 | 219 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 279 |
| 3:00 AM | 0 | 378 | 12 | 5 | 12 | 18 | 0 | 8 | 36 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 472 |
| 4:00 AM | 0 | 1346 | 90 | 5 | 31 | 12 | 0 | 17 | 47 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1550 |
| 5:00 AM | 12 | 5923 | 404 | 15 | 39 | 26 | 0 | 28 | 67 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6518 |
| 6:00 AM | 14 | 6698 | 173 | 20 | 29 | 24 | 1 | 16 | 31 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7008 |
| 7:00 AM | 7 | 4708 | 245 | 28 | 54 | 23 | 6 | 13 | 43 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5134 |
| 8:00 AM | 1 | 4342 | 257 | 14 | 59 | 28 | 3 | 17 | 63 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4790 |
| 9:00 AM | 4 | 4687 | 262 | 24 | 80 | 29 | 6 | 21 | 99 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5220 |
| 10:00 AM | 8 | 4550 | 267 | 20 | 84 | 31 | 5 | 28 | 106 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5110 |
| 11:00 AM | 9 | 4180 | 267 | 15 | 62 | 45 | 4 | 33 | 73 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4698 |
| 12:00 PM | 8 | 4275 | 231 | 19 | 65 | 33 | 2 | 19 | 73 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4737 |
| 1:00 PM | 7 | 4106 | 247 | 15 | 50 | 30 | 3 | 25 | 68 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4557 |
| 2:00 PM | 9 | 4523 | 241 | 18 | 49 | 26 | 2 | 19 | 35 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4925 |
| 3:00 PM | 1 | 4710 | 216 | 16 | 42 | 19 | 0 | 13 | 27 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5046 |
| 4:00 PM | 2 | 5316 | 186 | 18 | 41 | 13 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5596 |
| 5:00 PM | 2 | 6830 | 174 | 20 | 31 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7085 |
| 6:00 PM | 1 | 5929 | 125 | 19 | 27 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6137 |
| 7:00 PM | 0 | 3988 | 97 | 9 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 38 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4169 |
| 8:00 PM | 0 | 2695 | 74 | 7 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 30 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2839 |
| 9:00 PM | 0 | 2081 | 53 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2177 |
| 10:00 PM | 1 | 1566 | 65 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 27 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1675 |
| 11:00 PM | 0 | 1027 | 32 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1099 |
| TOTAL | 86 | 84785 | 3735 | 305 | 827 | 400 | 33 | 322 | 1006 | 109 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91613 |

Classification Report

| Location ID | 4098_SB | Located On | INTERSTATE 93 | Community | WOBURN |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Counted By | TCDS_Combined | SOUTH OF | RTE.I- 95(128) | County | MIDDLESEX |
| Start Date | Mon 1/5/2015 | Loc On Alias |  | Module |  |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00$ AM | Direction | SB | Agency | MHD |
| Source | Syst_Combine | Sensor | Tube Class |  |  |
| Axle Factor | 0.977 | Count Status | Accepted |  |  |


| FHWA-Scheme F Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start <br> Time | Motor cycle | Car | Pick up | Bus | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2A } \\ & \text { SU } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3A } \\ & \text { SU } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline>3 A \\ \text { SU } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <5 A \\ & 2 U \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 A \\ & 2 U \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline>5 A \\ 2 U \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <6 A \\ & >2 U \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 A \\ >2 U \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & >6 \mathrm{~A} \\ & >2 \mathrm{U} \end{aligned}$ | 14 | 15 | TOTAL |
| 12:00 AM | 0 | 375 | 26 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 434 |
| 1:00 AM | 0 | 219 | 21 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275 |
| 2:00 AM | 1 | 222 | 20 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 273 |
| 3:00 AM | 0 | 381 | 53 | 6 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 5 | 29 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 510 |
| 4:00 AM | 5 | 1302 | 199 | 8 | 28 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 42 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1617 |
| 5:00 AM | 4 | 5418 | 869 | 19 | 44 | 26 | 0 | 21 | 61 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6466 |
| 6:00 AM | 8 | 6058 | 457 | 19 | 43 | 21 | 2 | 13 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6654 |
| 7:00 AM | 8 | 4619 | 449 | 28 | 37 | 19 | 6 | 12 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5213 |
| 8:00 AM | 4 | 4228 | 457 | 16 | 51 | 22 | 5 | 23 | 68 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4877 |
| 9:00 AM | 2 | 4313 | 446 | 22 | 65 | 32 | 7 | 21 | 79 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4994 |
| 10:00 AM | 5 | 4227 | 511 | 22 | 70 | 36 | 2 | 31 | 96 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5003 |
| 11:00 AM | 8 | 4059 | 512 | 16 | 65 | 34 | 4 | 22 | 97 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4824 |
| 12:00 PM | 6 | 3821 | 544 | 23 | 67 | 25 | 4 | 20 | 85 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4601 |
| 1:00 PM | 8 | 3954 | 477 | 21 | 71 | 35 | 6 | 12 | 83 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4674 |
| 2:00 PM | 4 | 4507 | 498 | 18 | 70 | 30 | 1 | 19 | 60 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5211 |
| 3:00 PM | 4 | 4818 | 448 | 18 | 47 | 19 | 0 | 10 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5398 |
| 4:00 PM | 2 | 5651 | 383 | 15 | 36 | 13 | 0 | 5 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6134 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 7258 | 280 | 22 | 28 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7619 |
| 6:00 PM | 7 | 6059 | 237 | 16 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6382 |
| 7:00 PM | 3 | 3671 | 104 | 11 | 18 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3848 |
| 8:00 PM | 1 | 2522 | 68 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 27 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2650 |
| 9:00 PM | 1 | 2004 | 48 | 5 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2104 |
| 10:00 PM | 1 | 1517 | 44 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1605 |
| 11:00 PM | 0 | 979 | 23 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1042 |
| TOTAL | 83 | 82182 | 7174 | 331 | 823 | 387 | 37 | 306 | 1010 | 62 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 92408 |

Classification Report

| Location ID | 4098_SB | Located On | INTERSTATE 93 | Community | WOBURN |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Counted By | TCDS_Combined | SOUTH OF | RTE.I- 95(128) | County | MIDDLESEX |
| Start Date | Mon 12/22/2014 | Loc On Alias |  | Module |  |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00$ AM | Direction | SB | Agency | MHD |
| Source | Syst_Combine | Sensor | Tube Class |  |  |
| Axle Factor | 0.975 | Count Status | Accepted |  |  |


| FHWA-Scheme F Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start <br> Time | Motor cycle | Car | Pick up | Bus | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2A } \\ & \text { SU } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3A } \\ & \text { SU } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline>3 A \\ \text { SU } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <5 A \\ & 2 U \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5A } \\ & 2 U \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline>5 A \\ 2 U \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <6 A \\ & >2 U \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 6 A \\ >2 U \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & >6 \mathrm{~A} \\ & >2 \mathrm{U} \end{aligned}$ | 14 | 15 | TOTAL |
| 12:00 AM | 0 | 493 | 22 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 549 |
| 1:00 AM | 0 | 280 | 14 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 334 |
| 2:00 AM | 2 | 241 | 26 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 24 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 319 |
| 3:00 AM | 3 | 372 | 42 | 6 | 17 | 16 | 0 | 10 | 34 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 506 |
| 4:00 AM | 2 | 1123 | 178 | 8 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 19 | 60 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1439 |
| 5:00 AM | 6 | 5190 | 1044 | 17 | 56 | 26 | 1 | 19 | 63 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6430 |
| 6:00 AM | 14 | 5873 | 564 | 25 | 51 | 31 | 0 | 17 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6603 |
| 7:00 AM | 4 | 4531 | 543 | 23 | 62 | 28 | 6 | 18 | 51 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5268 |
| 8:00 AM | 5 | 4358 | 530 | 17 | 71 | 25 | 3 | 22 | 72 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5108 |
| 9:00 AM | 7 | 4763 | 594 | 25 | 81 | 34 | 8 | 28 | 109 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5661 |
| 10:00 AM | 0 | 4967 | 629 | 19 | 86 | 26 | 4 | 38 | 105 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5878 |
| 11:00 AM | 1 | 4765 | 582 | 19 | 82 | 45 | 6 | 23 | 109 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5639 |
| 12:00 PM | 4 | 4598 | 555 | 12 | 60 | 43 | 6 | 14 | 91 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5390 |
| 1:00 PM | 4 | 4505 | 500 | 22 | 80 | 34 | 2 | 17 | 72 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5239 |
| 2:00 PM | 7 | 5008 | 504 | 17 | 61 | 34 | 4 | 19 | 50 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5711 |
| 3:00 PM | 1 | 4848 | 505 | 20 | 60 | 18 | 1 | 9 | 25 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5490 |
| 4:00 PM | 1 | 4850 | 381 | 16 | 53 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5337 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 5460 | 346 | 15 | 39 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5902 |
| 6:00 PM | 4 | 5118 | 258 | 14 | 39 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 29 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5475 |
| 7:00 PM | 1 | 3766 | 209 | 12 | 20 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4048 |
| 8:00 PM | 3 | 2880 | 162 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3110 |
| 9:00 PM | 1 | 2423 | 143 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 35 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2628 |
| 10:00 PM | 0 | 2070 | 123 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2243 |
| 11:00 PM | 0 | 1296 | 68 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1399 |
| TOTAL | 71 | 83778 | 8522 | 314 | 988 | 439 | 42 | 325 | 1128 | 81 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 95706 |

Classification Report

| Location ID | 4098_SB | Located On | INTERSTATE 93 | Community | WOBURN |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Counted By | TCDS_Combined | SOUTH OF | RTE.I- 95(128) | County | MIDDLESEX |
| Start Date | Fri 12/19/2014 | Loc On Alias |  | Module |  |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00$ AM | Direction | SB | Agency | MHD |
| Source | Syst_Combine | Sensor | Tube Class |  |  |
| Axle Factor | 0.98 | Count Status | Accepted |  |  |


| FHWA-Scheme F Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start <br> Time | Motor cycle | Car | Pick up | Bus | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2A } \\ & \text { SU } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3A } \\ & \text { SU } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & >3 A \\ & \text { SU } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <5 A \\ & 2 U \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 A \\ & 2 U \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} >5 \mathrm{~A} \\ 2 \mathrm{U} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <6 \mathrm{~A} \\ & >2 \mathrm{U} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \mathrm{~A} \\ >2 \mathrm{U} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & >6 \mathrm{~A} \\ & >2 \mathrm{U} \end{aligned}$ | 14 | 15 | TOTAL |
| 12:00 AM | 1 | 751 | 36 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 832 |
| 1:00 AM | 1 | 391 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 446 |
| 2:00 AM | 5 | 281 | 25 | 1 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 364 |
| 3:00 AM | 2 | 422 | 51 | 2 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 552 |
| 4:00 AM | 3 | 1179 | 203 | 14 | 27 | 14 | 0 | 39 | 48 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1531 |
| 5:00 AM | 13 | 5241 | 1019 | 20 | 38 | 32 | 1 | 37 | 54 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6459 |
| 6:00 AM | 10 | 5579 | 597 | 27 | 49 | 31 | 3 | 23 | 32 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6355 |
| 7:00 AM | 14 | 4608 | 483 | 24 | 58 | 25 | 8 | 17 | 54 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5298 |
| 8:00 AM | 9 | 4424 | 475 | 29 | 62 | 26 | 6 | 17 | 50 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5105 |
| 9:00 AM | 13 | 4660 | 533 | 27 | 80 | 35 | 4 | 39 | 79 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5476 |
| 10:00 AM | 6 | 4849 | 552 | 21 | 63 | 54 | 4 | 36 | 76 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5669 |
| 11:00 AM | 14 | 4973 | 560 | 21 | 71 | 37 | 11 | 42 | 88 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5823 |
| 12:00 PM | 12 | 4716 | 535 | 15 | 73 | 40 | 9 | 32 | 68 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5503 |
| 1:00 PM | 6 | 4786 | 530 | 20 | 51 | 32 | 5 | 20 | 38 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5494 |
| 2:00 PM | 11 | 5513 | 536 | 22 | 53 | 31 | 4 | 23 | 42 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6238 |
| 3:00 PM | 3 | 5741 | 497 | 22 | 47 | 14 | 1 | 12 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6362 |
| 4:00 PM | 4 | 6160 | 427 | 13 | 35 | 13 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6675 |
| 5:00 PM | 7 | 6933 | 301 | 18 | 27 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7312 |
| 6:00 PM | 4 | 6061 | 259 | 20 | 29 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6395 |
| 7:00 PM | 2 | 4361 | 234 | 13 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4664 |
| 8:00 PM | 5 | 3304 | 155 | 10 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3515 |
| 9:00 PM | 1 | 2855 | 139 | 6 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3039 |
| 10:00 PM | 0 | 2586 | 125 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 20 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2752 |
| 11:00 PM | 0 | 2046 | 98 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2182 |
| TOTAL | 146 | 92420 | 8392 | 362 | 858 | 445 | 56 | 433 | 836 | 73 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 104041 |

## Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | R12697 |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'I Class | - |
| Located On | I-95 |
|  | Exit 37A I-93 South Boston |
| Direction | RAMP |
| Community | Woburn |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Thu 4/10/2014 |
| End Date | Fri 4/11/2014 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction |  |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source | 000000000590 |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Tube |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| Time | Hourly <br> Count |
| $\mathbf{0 : 0 0 - 1 : 0 0}$ | 199 |
| $\mathbf{1 : 0 0 - 2 : 0 0}$ | 124 |
| $\mathbf{2 : 0 0 - 3 : 0 0}$ | 115 |
| $\mathbf{3 : 0 0 - 4 : 0 0}$ | 177 |
| $\mathbf{4 : 0 0 - 5 : 0 0}$ | 363 |
| $\mathbf{5 : 0 0 - 6 : 0 0}$ | 1,344 |
| $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 - 7 : 0 0}$ | 1,316 |
| $\mathbf{7 : 0 0 - 8 : 0 0}$ | 958 |
| $\mathbf{8 : 0 0 - 9 : 0 0}$ | 1,010 |
| $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 - 1 0 : 0 0}$ | 1,377 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 : 0 0 - 1 1 : 0 0}$ | 1,604 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 : 0 0 - 1 2 : 0 0}$ | 1,552 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 - 1 3 : 0 0}$ | 1,606 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 : 0 0 - 1 4 : 0 0}$ | 1,676 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0 - 1 5 : 0 0}$ | 1,823 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 : 0 0 - 1 6 : 0 0}$ | 1,769 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 : 0 0 - 1 7 : 0 0}$ | 1,492 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0 - 1 8 : 0 0}$ | 1,538 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 : 0 0 - 1 9 : 0 0}$ | 1,669 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 : 0 0 - 2 0 : 0 0}$ | 1,541 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0 - 2 1 : 0 0}$ | 1,207 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 : 0 0 - 2 2 : 0 0}$ | 1,095 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 : 0 0 - 2 3 : 0 0}$ | 780 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 : 0 0 - 2 4 : 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Total | 26,740 |
| AM Peak | $10: 00-11: 00$ |
| $\mathbf{P M}$ Peak | $14: 00-15: 00$ |
|  | 1,823 |

## Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | R12697 |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'I Class | - |
| Located On | I-95 |
|  | Exit 37A I-93 South Boston |
| Direction | RAMP |
| Community | Woburn |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Tue 4/8/2014 |
| End Date | Wed 4/9/2014 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00$ AM |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction |  |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source | 000000000590 |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Tube |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| Time | Hourly <br> Count |
| $\mathbf{0 : 0 0 - 1 : 0 0}$ | 178 |
| $\mathbf{1 : 0 0 - 2 : 0 0}$ | 103 |
| $\mathbf{2 : 0 0 - 3 : 0 0}$ | 92 |
| $\mathbf{3 : 0 0 - 4 : 0 0}$ | 141 |
| $\mathbf{4 : 0 0 - 5 : 0 0}$ | 376 |
| $\mathbf{5 : 0 0 - 6 : 0 0}$ | 1,322 |
| $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 - 7 : 0 0}$ | 1,228 |
| $\mathbf{7 : 0 0 - 8 : 0 0}$ | 890 |
| $\mathbf{8 : 0 0 - 9 : 0 0}$ | 767 |
| $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 - 1 0 : 0 0}$ | 1,127 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 : 0 0 - 1 1 : 0 0}$ | 1,497 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 : 0 0 - 1 2 : 0 0}$ | 1,447 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 - 1 3 : 0 0}$ | 1,520 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 : 0 0 - 1 4 : 0 0}$ | 1,604 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0 - 1 5 : 0 0}$ | 1,768 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 : 0 0 - 1 6 : 0 0}$ | 1,877 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 : 0 0 - 1 7 : 0 0}$ | 1,837 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0 - 1 8 : 0 0}$ | 1,781 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 : 0 0 - 1 9 : 0 0}$ | 1,882 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 : 0 0 - 2 0 : 0 0}$ | 1,402 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0 - 2 1 : 0 0}$ | 1,084 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 : 0 0 - 2 2 : 0 0}$ | 946 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 : 0 0 - 2 3 : 0 0}$ | 623 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 : 0 0 - 2 4 : 0 0}$ | 305 |
| Total | 25,797 |
| AM Peak | $10: 00-11: 00$ |
| PM Peak | 1,497 |
|  | $18: 00-19: 00$ |
| 1,882 |  |

## Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | R12697 |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'I Class | - |
| Located On | I-95 |
|  | Exit 37A I-93 South Boston |
| Direction | RAMP |
| Community | Woburn |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Wed 4/9/2014 |
| End Date | Thu 4/10/2014 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00$ AM |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction |  |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source | 000000000590 |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Tube |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| Time | Hourly <br> Count |
| $\mathbf{0 : 0 0 - 1 : 0 0}$ | 164 |
| $\mathbf{1 : 0 0 - 2 : 0 0}$ | 99 |
| $\mathbf{2 : 0 0 - 3 : 0 0}$ | 80 |
| $\mathbf{3 : 0 0 - 4 : 0 0}$ | 143 |
| $\mathbf{4 : 0 0 - 5 : 0 0}$ | 350 |
| $\mathbf{5 : 0 0 - 6 : 0 0}$ | 1,379 |
| $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 - 7 : 0 0}$ | 1,371 |
| $\mathbf{7 : 0 0 - 8 : 0 0}$ | 986 |
| $\mathbf{8 : 0 0 - 9 : 0 0}$ | 977 |
| $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 - 1 0 : 0 0}$ | 1,256 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 : 0 0 - 1 1 : 0 0}$ | 1,595 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 : 0 0 - 1 2 : 0 0}$ | 1,566 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 - 1 3 : 0 0}$ | 1,596 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 : 0 0 - 1 4 : 0 0}$ | 1,769 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0 - 1 5 : 0 0}$ | 1,895 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 : 0 0 - 1 6 : 0 0}$ | 1,883 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 : 0 0 - 1 7 : 0 0}$ | 1,834 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0 - 1 8 : 0 0}$ | 1,724 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 : 0 0 - 1 9 : 0 0}$ | 1,781 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 : 0 0 - 2 0 : 0 0}$ | 1,431 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0 - 2 1 : 0 0}$ | 1,123 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 : 0 0 - 2 2 : 0 0}$ | 969 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 : 0 0 - 2 3 : 0 0}$ | 668 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 : 0 0 - 2 4 : 0 0}$ | 361 |
| Total | 27,000 |
| AM Peak | $10: 00-11: 00$ |
| PM Peak | $14: 595$ |
|  | 1,895 |

## Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | R12697 |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'I Class | - |
| Located On | I-95 |
|  | Exit 37A I-93 South Boston |
| Direction | RAMP |
| Community | Woburn |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Thu 4/10/2014 |
| End Date | Fri 4/11/2014 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction |  |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source | 000000000590 |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Tube |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| Time | Hourly <br> Count |
| $\mathbf{0 : 0 0 - 1 : 0 0}$ | 199 |
| $\mathbf{1 : 0 0 - 2 : 0 0}$ | 124 |
| $\mathbf{2 : 0 0 - 3 : 0 0}$ | 115 |
| $\mathbf{3 : 0 0 - 4 : 0 0}$ | 177 |
| $\mathbf{4 : 0 0 - 5 : 0 0}$ | 363 |
| $\mathbf{5 : 0 0 - 6 : 0 0}$ | 1,344 |
| $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 - 7 : 0 0}$ | 1,316 |
| $\mathbf{7 : 0 0 - 8 : 0 0}$ | 958 |
| $\mathbf{8 : 0 0 - 9 : 0 0}$ | 1,010 |
| $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 - 1 0 : 0 0}$ | 1,377 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 : 0 0 - 1 1 : 0 0}$ | 1,604 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 : 0 0 - 1 2 : 0 0}$ | 1,552 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 - 1 3 : 0 0}$ | 1,606 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 : 0 0 - 1 4 : 0 0}$ | 1,676 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0 - 1 5 : 0 0}$ | 1,823 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 : 0 0 - 1 6 : 0 0}$ | 1,769 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 : 0 0 - 1 7 : 0 0}$ | 1,492 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0 - 1 8 : 0 0}$ | 1,538 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 : 0 0 - 1 9 : 0 0}$ | 1,669 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 : 0 0 - 2 0 : 0 0}$ | 1,541 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0 - 2 1 : 0 0}$ | 1,207 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 : 0 0 - 2 2 : 0 0}$ | 1,095 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 : 0 0 - 2 3 : 0 0}$ | 780 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 : 0 0 - 2 4 : 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Total | 26,740 |
| AM Peak | $10: 00-11: 00$ |
| $\mathbf{P M}$ Peak | $14: 00-15: 00$ |
|  | 1,823 |

Transportation Data Management System
Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | 4098_SB |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'I Class | 1 |
| Located On | INTERSTATE 93 |
| SOUTH OF | RTE.I- 95(128) |
| Direction | SB |
| Community | WOBURN |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Thu 1/22/2015 |
| End Date | Fri 1/23/2015 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00$ AM |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction | SB |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source |  |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Loop |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| Time | Hourly <br> Count |
| $\mathbf{0 : 0 0 - 1 : 0 0}$ | 481 |
| $\mathbf{1 : 0 0 - 2 : 0 0}$ | 317 |
| $\mathbf{2 : 0 0 - 3 : 0 0}$ | 295 |
| $\mathbf{3 : 0 0 - 4 : 0 0}$ | 544 |
| $\mathbf{4 : 0 0 - 5 : 0 0}$ | 1,550 |
| $\mathbf{5 : 0 0 - 6 : 0 0}$ | 6,542 |
| $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 - 7 : 0 0}$ | 6,791 |
| $\mathbf{7 : 0 0 - 8 : 0 0}$ | 5,291 |
| $\mathbf{8 : 0 0 - 9 : 0 0}$ | 4,886 |
| $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 - 1 0 : 0 0}$ | 5,556 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 : 0 0 - 1 1 : 0 0}$ | 5,355 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 : 0 0 - 1 2 : 0 0}$ | 4,984 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 - 1 3 : 0 0}$ | 5,122 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 : 0 0 - 1 4 : 0 0}$ | 5,016 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0 - 1 5 : 0 0}$ | 5,721 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 : 0 0 - 1 6 : 0 0}$ | 5,806 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 : 0 0 - 1 7 : 0 0}$ | 6,662 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0 - 1 8 : 0 0}$ | 7,654 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 : 0 0 - 1 9 : 0 0}$ | 6,592 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 : 0 0 - 2 0 : 0 0}$ | 4,399 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0 - 2 1 : 0 0}$ | 3,240 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 : 0 0 - 2 2 : 0 0}$ | 2,523 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 : 0 0 - 2 3 : 0 0}$ | 2,007 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 : 0 0 - 2 4 : 0 0}$ | 1,209 |
| Total | 98,543 |
| AADT | 95,390 |
| AM Peak | $06: 00-07: 00$ |
| PM Peak | $17: 00-18: 00$ |
| 7,654 |  |

Transportation Data Management System
Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | 4098_SB |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'I Class | 1 |
| Located On | INTERSTATE 93 |
| SOUTH OF | RTE.I- 95(128) |
| Direction | SB |
| Community | WOBURN |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Wed 1/21/2015 |
| End Date | Thu 1/22/2015 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00$ AM |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction | SB |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source |  |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Loop |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| Time | Hourly <br> Count |
| $\mathbf{0 : 0 0 - 1 : 0 0}$ | 497 |
| $\mathbf{1 : 0 0 - 2 : 0 0}$ | 303 |
| $\mathbf{2 : 0 0 - 3 : 0 0}$ | 290 |
| $\mathbf{3 : 0 0 - 4 : 0 0}$ | 442 |
| 4:00-5:00 | 1,516 |
| $\mathbf{5 : 0 0 - 6 : 0 0}$ | 6,582 |
| $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 - 7 : 0 0}$ | 6,987 |
| $\mathbf{7 : 0 0 - 8 : 0 0}$ | 5,140 |
| $\mathbf{8 : 0 0 - 9 : 0 0}$ | 4,537 |
| $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 - 1 0 : 0 0}$ | 5,338 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 : 0 0 - 1 1 : 0 0}$ | 5,112 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 : 0 0 - 1 2 : 0 0}$ | 5,034 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 - 1 3 : 0 0}$ | 5,056 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 : 0 0 - 1 4 : 0 0}$ | 4,932 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0 - 1 5 : 0 0}$ | 5,433 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 : 0 0 - 1 6 : 0 0}$ | 5,736 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 : 0 0 - 1 7 : 0 0}$ | 6,330 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0 - 1 8 : 0 0}$ | 7,501 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 : 0 0 - 1 9 : 0 0}$ | 6,474 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 : 0 0 - 2 0 : 0 0}$ | 4,153 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0 - 2 1 : 0 0}$ | 2,970 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 : 0 0 - 2 2 : 0 0}$ | 2,539 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 : 0 0 - 2 3 : 0 0}$ | 1,759 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 : 0 0 - 2 4 : 0 0}$ | 1,074 |
| Total | 95,735 |
| AADT | 98,416 |
| AM Peak | $06: 00-07: 00$ |
| PM Peak | $17: 00-18: 00$ |
| 7,501 |  |

Transportation Data Management System
Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | 4098_SB |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'I Class | 1 |
| Located On | INTERSTATE 93 |
| SOUTH OF | RTE.I- 95(128) |
| Direction | SB |
| Community | WOBURN |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Thu 1/15/2015 |
| End Date | Fri 1/16/2015 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00$ AM |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction | SB |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source |  |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Loop |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| Time | Hourly <br> Count |
| $\mathbf{0 : 0 0 - 1 : 0 0}$ | 537 |
| $\mathbf{1 : 0 0 - 2 : 0 0}$ | 330 |
| $\mathbf{2 : 0 0 - 3 : 0 0}$ | 323 |
| 3:00-4:00 | 491 |
| 4:00-5:00 | 1,570 |
| $\mathbf{5 : 0 0 - 6 : 0 0}$ | 6,132 |
| $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 - 7}: 00$ | 6,840 |
| $\mathbf{7 : 0 0 - 8 : 0 0}$ | 5,009 |
| $\mathbf{8 : 0 0 - 9 : 0 0}$ | 4,134 |
| $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 - 1 0 : 0 0}$ | 4,799 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 : 0 0 - 1 1 : 0 0}$ | 4,849 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 : 0 0 - 1 2 : 0 0}$ | 4,881 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 - 1 3 : 0 0}$ | 4,986 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 : 0 0 - 1 4 : 0 0}$ | 4,975 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0 - 1 5 : 0 0}$ | 5,495 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 : 0 0 - 1 6 : 0 0}$ | 5,622 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 : 0 0 - 1 7 : 0 0}$ | 6,146 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0 - 1 8 : 0 0}$ | 6,465 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 : 0 0 - 1 9 : 0 0}$ | 6,650 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 : 0 0 - 2 0 : 0 0}$ | 4,276 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0 - 2 1 : 0 0}$ | 3,046 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 : 0 0 - 2 2 : 0 0}$ | 2,588 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 : 0 0 - 2 3 : 0 0}$ | 2,031 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 : 0 0 - 2 4 : 0 0}$ | 1,206 |
| Total | 93,381 |
| AADT | 90,393 |
| AM Peak | $06: 00-07: 00$ |
| PM Peak | $18: 00-19: 00$ |
| 6,650 |  |

Transportation Data Management System
Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | 4098_SB |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'I Class | 1 |
| Located On | INTERSTATE 93 |
| SOUTH OF | RTE.I- 95(128) |
| Direction | SB |
| Community | WOBURN |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Wed 1/21/2015 |
| End Date | Thu 1/22/2015 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00$ AM |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction | SB |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source |  |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Loop |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| Time | Hourly <br> Count |
| $\mathbf{0 : 0 0 - 1 : 0 0}$ | 497 |
| $\mathbf{1 : 0 0 - 2 : 0 0}$ | 303 |
| $\mathbf{2 : 0 0 - 3 : 0 0}$ | 290 |
| $\mathbf{3 : 0 0 - 4 : 0 0}$ | 442 |
| 4:00-5:00 | 1,516 |
| $\mathbf{5 : 0 0 - 6 : 0 0}$ | 6,582 |
| $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 - 7 : 0 0}$ | 6,987 |
| $\mathbf{7 : 0 0 - 8 : 0 0}$ | 5,140 |
| $\mathbf{8 : 0 0 - 9 : 0 0}$ | 4,537 |
| $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 - 1 0 : 0 0}$ | 5,338 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 : 0 0 - 1 1 : 0 0}$ | 5,112 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 : 0 0 - 1 2 : 0 0}$ | 5,034 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 - 1 3 : 0 0}$ | 5,056 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 : 0 0 - 1 4 : 0 0}$ | 4,932 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0 - 1 5 : 0 0}$ | 5,433 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 : 0 0 - 1 6 : 0 0}$ | 5,736 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 : 0 0 - 1 7 : 0 0}$ | 6,330 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0 - 1 8 : 0 0}$ | 7,501 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 : 0 0 - 1 9 : 0 0}$ | 6,474 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 : 0 0 - 2 0 : 0 0}$ | 4,153 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0 - 2 1 : 0 0}$ | 2,970 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 : 0 0 - 2 2 : 0 0}$ | 2,539 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 : 0 0 - 2 3 : 0 0}$ | 1,759 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 : 0 0 - 2 4 : 0 0}$ | 1,074 |
| Total | 95,735 |
| AADT | 98,416 |
| AM Peak | $06: 00-07: 00$ |
| PM Peak | $17: 00-18: 00$ |
| 7,501 |  |

Transportation Data Management System
Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | 4098_SB |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'I Class | 1 |
| Located On | INTERSTATE 93 |
| SOUTH OF | RTE.I- 95(128) |
| Direction | SB |
| Community | WOBURN |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Tue 1/13/2015 |
| End Date | Wed 1/14/2015 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00$ AM |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction | SB |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source |  |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Loop |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| Time | Hourly <br> Count |
| $\mathbf{0}: 00-1: 00$ | 509 |
| 1:00-2:00 | 322 |
| 2:00-3:00 | 307 |
| 3:00-4:00 | 493 |
| 4:00-5:00 | 1,598 |
| 5:00-6:00 | 6,608 |
| $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 - 7 : 0 0}$ | 6,443 |
| $\mathbf{7 : 0 0 - 8 : 0 0}$ | 5,269 |
| $\mathbf{8 : 0 0 - 9 : 0 0}$ | 4,748 |
| $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 - 1 0 : 0 0}$ | 5,457 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 : 0 0 - 1 1 : 0 0}$ | 5,419 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 : 0 0 - 1 2 : 0 0}$ | 4,934 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 - 1 3 : 0 0}$ | 5,022 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 : 0 0 - 1 4 : 0 0}$ | 4,763 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0 - 1 5 : 0 0}$ | 5,226 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 : 0 0 - 1 6 : 0 0}$ | 5,648 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 : 0 0 - 1 7 : 0 0}$ | 6,440 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0 - 1 8 : 0 0}$ | 7,298 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 : 0 0 - 1 9 : 0 0}$ | 6,550 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 : 0 0 - 2 0 : 0 0}$ | 4,236 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0 - 2 1 : 0 0}$ | 3,158 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 : 0 0 - 2 2 : 0 0}$ | 2,382 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 : 0 0 - 2 3 : 0 0}$ | 1,809 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 : 0 0 - 2 4 : 0 0}$ | 1,068 |
| Total | 95,707 |
| AADT | 100,205 |
| AM Peak | $05: 00-06: 00$ |
| PM Peak | $17: 00-18: 00$ |
|  | 7,298 |

Transportation Data Management System
Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | R12177 |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'l Class | 1 |
| Located On | I-93 |
|  | Exit 36 Montvale Ave Stoneham <br>  <br> Woburn |
| Direction | RAMP |
| Community | Woburn |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Wed 4/30/2014 |
| End Date | Thu 5/1/2014 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction |  |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source | 000000000761 |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Tube |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Time | Hourly Count |
| (1) 0:00-1:00 | 65 |
| 1:00-2:00 | 40 |
| 2:00-3:00 | 23 |
| 3:00-4:00 | 47 |
| 4:00-5:00 | 112 |
| 5:00-6:00 | 440 |
| 6:00-7:00 | 545 |
| 7:00-8:00 | 1,373 |
| 8:00-9:00 | 1,237 |
| 9:00-10:00 | 1,077 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 867 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 737 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 770 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 791 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 838 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 777 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 849 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1,011 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 747 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 517 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 416 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 320 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 250 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 121 |
| Total | 13,970 |
| AADT | 12,208 |
| AM Peak | $\begin{array}{r} 07: 00-08: 00 \\ 1,373 \end{array}$ |
| PM Peak | $\begin{array}{r} 17: 00-18: 00 \\ 1,011 \end{array}$ |

Transportation Data Management System
Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | R12177 |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'I Class | 1 |
| Located On | I-93 |
|  | Exit 36 Montvale Ave Stoneham <br> Woburn |
| Direction | RAMP |
| Community | Woburn |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Tue 4/29/2014 |
| End Date | Wed 4/30/2014 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction |  |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source | 000000000761 |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Tube |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Time | Hourly Count |
| (1) 0:00-1:00 | 54 |
| 1:00-2:00 | 31 |
| 2:00-3:00 | 38 |
| 3:00-4:00 | 48 |
| 4:00-5:00 | 106 |
| 5:00-6:00 | 456 |
| 6:00-7:00 | 596 |
| 7:00-8:00 | 1,368 |
| 8:00-9:00 | 1,006 |
| 9:00-10:00 | 912 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 814 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 735 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 779 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 795 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 832 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 837 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 871 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1,036 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 727 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 506 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 356 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 276 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 209 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 115 |
| Total | 13,503 |
| AADT | 11,982 |
| AM Peak | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 07: 00-08: 00 \\ 1,368 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| PM Peak | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 17: 00-18: 00 \\ 1,036 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |

Transportation Data Management System
Volume Count Report

| LOCATION INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Location ID | R12177 |
| Type | SPOT |
| Fnct'I Class | 1 |
| Located On | I-93 |
|  | Exit 36 Montvale Ave Stoneham <br> Woburn |
| Direction | RAMP |
| Community | Woburn |
| MPO ID |  |
| HPMS ID |  |
| Agency | MHD |


| COUNT DATA INFO |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Count Status | Accepted |
| Start Date | Mon 4/28/2014 |
| End Date | Tue 4/29/2014 |
| Start Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| End Time | $12: 00: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| Direction |  |
| Notes |  |
| Count Source | 000000000761 |
| Weather |  |
| Study |  |
| Speed Limit |  |
| Description |  |
| Sensor Type | Tube |


| INTERVAL:60-MIN |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| Time | Hourly <br> Count |
| $\mathbf{0 : 0 0 - 1 : 0 0}$ | 48 |
| 1:00-2:00 | 30 |
| $\mathbf{2 : 0 0 - 3 : 0 0}$ | 37 |
| 3:00-4:00 | 46 |
| 4:00-5:00 | 117 |
| $\mathbf{5 : 0 0 - 6 : 0 0}$ | 412 |
| $\mathbf{6 : 0 0 - 7 : 0 0}$ | 529 |
| $\mathbf{7 : 0 0 - 8 : 0 0}$ | 1,132 |
| $\mathbf{8 : 0 0 - 9 : 0 0}$ | 997 |
| $\mathbf{9 : 0 0 - 1 0 : 0 0}$ | 884 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 : 0 0 - 1 1 : 0 0}$ | 712 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 : 0 0 - 1 2 : 0 0}$ | 705 |
| $\mathbf{1 2 : 0 0 - 1 3 : 0 0}$ | 691 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 : 0 0 - 1 4 : 0 0}$ | 698 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0 - 1 5 : 0 0}$ | 804 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 : 0 0 - 1 6 : 0 0}$ | 844 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 : 0 0 - 1 7 : 0 0}$ | 769 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0 - 1 8 : 0 0}$ | 958 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 : 0 0 - 1 9 : 0 0}$ | 670 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 : 0 0 - 2 0 : 0 0}$ | 483 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 : 0 0 - 2 1 : 0 0}$ | 275 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 : 0 0 - 2 2 : 0 0}$ | 270 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 : 0 0 - 2 3 : 0 0}$ | 192 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 : 0 0 - 2 4 : 0 0}$ | 90 |
| Total | 12,393 |
| AADT | 11,345 |
| AM Peak | $07: 00-08: 00$ |
| PM Peak | $17: 00-18: 00$ |
| 958 |  |

## LOCATION 2

## I-95 Southbound at the I-90 Interchange in Weston

## I-95 Southbound Ramps at I-90 Interchange Automatic Traffic Recorder (ATR) Locations



Massachusetts Highway Department
WEEKLY SUMMARY FOR LANE 1
Starting: 4/28/2015

## STA. 1

Bite Reference: 150110000624 Site ID: 000000000100 Location: EXIT 25 RAMP FROM I-95 SB TO I-90 Direction:


## Massachusetts Highway Department <br> WEEKLY SUMMARY FOR LANE I

Starting: 4/28/2015

$$
\text { STA. } 2
$$

iite Reference: 150110000862 iite ID: 000000000200 ocation: EXIT 24 RAMP EROM I-95 SB TO RTE 30 irection:

| TIME | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{MON} \\ 4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TUE } \\ 28 \end{array}$ | WED $29$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { THO } \\ 30 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { FRI } \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { WKDAY } \\ \text { AVG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SAT } \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SUN } \\ 3 \end{array}$ | WEEK AVG | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01:00 | 16 | 25 | 33 | 15 | 26 | 23 | 30 | 47 | 27 | 192 |
| 02:00 | 12 | 19 | 17 | 12 | 10 | 14 | 29 | 53 | 21 | 152 |
| 03:00 | 9 | 13 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 10 | 18 | 28 | 13 | 96 |
| 04:00 | 8 | 6 | 17 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 11 | 8 | 62 |
| 05:00 | 24 | 30 | 31 | $2 \theta$ | 18 | 26 | 11 | 8 | 21 | 150 |
| 06:00 | 114 | 143 | 137 | 122 | 109 | 125 | 36 | 27 | 98 | 688 |
| 07:00 | 509 | 671 | 541 | 490 | 521 | 546 | 134 | 61 | 418 | 2927 |
| 08:00 | 766 | 1115 | 901 | 816 | 778 | 875 | 215 | 100 | 670 | 4691 |
| 09:00 | 590 | 755 | 788 | 690 | 652 | 695 | 242 | 135 | 550 | 3852 |
| 10:00 | 591 | 690 | 636 | 642 | 462 | 604 | 293 | 209 | 503 | 3523 |
| 11:00 | 397 | 492 | 481 | 471 | 429 | 454 | 369 | 298 | 419 | 2937 |
| 12:00 | 357 | 440 | 427 | 388 | 356 | 393 | 363 | 345 | 382 | 2676 |
| 13:00 | 353 | 431 | 459 | 527 | 448 | 443 | 388 | 387 | 427 | 2993 |
| 14:00 | 351 | 435 | 430 | 451 | 456 | 424 | 420 | 389 | 418 | 2932 |
| 15:00 | 459 | 472 | 458 | 468 | 554 | 482 | 395 | 420 | 460 | 3226 |
| 16:00 | 554 | 593 | 546 | 473 | 415 | 516 | 470 | 401 | 493 | 3452 |
| 17:00 | 491 | 592 | 651 | 479 | 515 | 545 | 384 | 417 | 504 | 3529 |
| 18:00 | 605 | 736 | 887 | 732 | 746 | 741 | 446 | 399 | 650 | 4551 |
| 19:00 | 615 | 684 | 670 | 595 | 493 | 611 | 369 | 320 | 535 | 3746 |
| 20:00 | 325 | 347 | 378 | 339 | 281 | 334 | 274 | 251 | 313 | 2195 |
| 21:00 | 233 | 250 | 255 | 223 | 192 | 230 | 192 | 141 | 212 | 1486 |
| 22:00 |  | 166 | 178 | 141 | 155 | 160 | 201 | 149 | 165 | 990 |
| 23:00 |  | 95 | 106 | 100 | 132 | 108 | 148 | 83 | 110 | 664 |
| 24:00 |  | 48 | 52 | 53 | 72 | 56 | 76 | 35 | 56 | 336 |
| COTALS | 7379 | 9248 | 9088 | 8276 | 7833 | 8424 | 5508 | 4714 | 7473 | 52046 |
| f AVG WKDY | 87,5 | 109.7 | 107, 1 | 98.2 | 92.9 |  | 65.3 | 55.9 |  |  |
| \% AVG WEER | 98.7 | 123.7 | 121.6 | 110.7 | 104.8 |  | 73.7 | 63 |  |  |
| a ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Times | 08:00 | 08:00 | 08:00 | 08;00 | 08:00 | 08:00 | 11:00 | 12;00 | 08:00 |  |
| TM Peaks | 766 | 1115 | 901 | 816 | 778 | 875 | 369 | 345 | 670 |  |
| 2M Times | 19:00 | 18:00 | 18:00 | 18:00 | 18:00 | 18:00 | 16:00 | 15:00 | $18: 00$ |  |
| PM Peaks | 615 | 736 | 887 | 732 | .746 | 741 | 470 | 420 | 650 |  |

## STA. 3

| Site Reference: 150110000467 | File: V300,prn |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site ID: 000000000300 | City: WESTON |
| socation: ON-RAMP FROM RTE. 30 TO I-95 SB | County: VOL | Sirection:



Massachusetts Highway Department
WEEKLY SUMMARY FOR LANE 1
Starting: 4/28/2015

$$
\text { STA. } 4
$$

| Site Reference: 150110000625 | Eile: $\nabla 400$. pIn |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site ID: 000000000400 | City: WESTON |
| Location: ON-RAMP EROM I-90 TO I-95 SB | County: vOL | Location: ON-RAMP EROM I-90 TO I-95 SB Direction:



```
MassDOT Highway Division
            WEEKLY SUMMARY
    Starting:4/28/2015
                STA,I
```

File: V100.prn
City: WESTON
County: VOL
Eage: 1

Site Reference: I50110000624
Site ID: 000000000100
Location: EXIT 25 RAMP EROM I-95 SB TO I-90 Direction: ROAD TOTAL

| TIME MON | TUE | WED | THU | ERI | SAT | 20 | 2 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



| 00:15 | 53 | 400 | 64 | 445 | 64 | 390 | 45 | 453 | 75 | 497 | 89 | 438 | 75 | 390 | 465 | 3013 | 66 | 430 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:30 | 58 | 372 | 47 | 429 | 43 | 470 | 39 | 488 | 70 | 527 | 69 | 448 | 64 | 434 | 390 | 3168 | 55 | 452 |
| 00:45 | 33 | 354 | 54 | 430 | 45 | 382 | 64 | 393 | 63 | 526 | 70 | 538 | 74 | 429 | 403 | 3052 | 57 | 436 |
| 01:00 | 40 | 374 | 54 | 414 | 40 | 395 | 42 | 432 | 37 | 482 | 49 | 472 | 55 | 470 | 317 | 3039 | 45 | 434 |
| 01:15 | 27 | 351 | 46 | 389 | 67 | 407 | 40 | 456 | 56 | 468 | 64 | 481 | 87 | 453 | 387 | 3005 | 55 | 429 |
| 01:30 | 28 | 439 | 51 | 410 | 33 | 374 | 22 | 458 | 57 | 475 | 41 | 426 | 111 | 474 | 343 | 3056 | 49 | 436 |
| 01:45 | 35 | 352 | 39 | 397 | 39 | 403 | 27 | 451 | 42 | 498 | 32 | 407 | 61 | 409 | 275 | 2917 | 39 | 416 |
| 02;00 | 28 | 366 | 29 | 428 | 29 | 420 | 31 | 509 | 43 | 537 | 39 | 427 | 61 | 410 | 260 | 3097 | 37 | 442 |
| 02:15 | 12 | 424 | 31 | 435 | 45 | 490 | 27 | 546 | 31 | 532 | 40 | 408 | 52 | 478 | 238 | 3313 | 34 | 473 |
| 02:30 | 16 | 410 | 15 | 505 | 13 | 500 | 26 | 541 | 43 | 596 | 50 | 417 | 30 | 482 | 193 | 3451 | 27 | 493 |
| 02:45 | 23 | 503 | 30 | 512 | 44 | 541 | 40 | 563 | 29 | 544 | 43 | 463 | 26 | 445 | 235 | 3571 | 33 | 510 |
| 03:00 | 33 | 54.4 | 41 | 521 | 26 | 603 | 44 | 591 | 29 | \$18 | 27 | 421 | 27 | 414 | 227 | 3612 | 32 | 516 |
| 03:15 | 22 | 557 | 32 | 561 | 31 | 612 | 22 | 583 | 54 | 513 | 30 | 430 | 17 | 413 | 208 | 3669 | 29 | 524 |
| 03:30 | 31 | 544 | 46 | 569 | 28 | 638 | 32 | 540 | 47 | 505 | 30 | 408 | 24 | 449 | 238 | 3653 | 34 | 521 |
| 03:45 | 32 | 488 | 48 | 585 | 42 | 609 | 28 | 565 | 42 | 535 | 25 | 446 | 28 | 431 | 245 | 3659 | 35 | 522 |
| 04:00 | 27 | 585 | 47 | 590 | 49 | 550 | 67 | 532 | 46 | 537 | 38 | 411 | 20 | 439 | 294 | 3644 | 42 | 520 |
| 04:15 | 52 | 589 | 49 | 603 | 48 | 655 | 57 | 515 | 61 | 548 | 44 | 433 | 18 | 434 | 329 | 3777 | 47 | 539 |
| 04:30 | 64 | 557 | 69 | 522 | 67 | 579 | 63 | 559 | 58 | 531 | 45 | 410 | 25 | 433 | 391 | 3591 | 55 | 513 |
| 04: 45 | 69 | 471 | 75 | 574 | 70 | 581 | 80 | 581 | 77 | 463 | 73 | 372 | 39 | 481 | 483 | 3523 | 69 | 503 |
| 05;00 | 106 | 412 | 89 | 554 | 99 | 647 | 102 | 613 | 125 | 547 | 51 | 368 | 23 | 402 | 595 | 3543 | 85 | 506 |
| 05:15 | 114 | 487 | 122 | 583 | 129 | 661 | 99 | 561 | 101 | 502 | 75 | 361 | 35 | 407 | 675 | 3562 | 96 | 508 |
| 05:30 | 174 | 461 | 166 | 452 | 162 | 557 | 159 | 531 | 133 | 497 | 89 | 424 | 47 | 364 | 930 | 3286 | 132 | 469 |
| 05:45 | 236 | 450 | 247 | 556 | 258 | 570 | 243 | 491 | 262 | 587 | 87 | 463 | 54 | 365 | 1387 | 3482 | 198 | 497 |
| 06:00 | 298 | 487 | 342 | 549 | 325 | 617 | 314 | 552 | 330 | 446 | 125 | 381 | 52 | 405 | 1786 | 3437 | 255 | 491 |
| 06:15 | 449 | 538 | 482 | 567 | 419 | 578 | 444 | 483 | 394 | 430 | 107 | 425 | 74 | 352 | 2369 | 3373 | 338 | 481 |
| 06:30 | 479 | 554 | 527 | 550 | 519 | 496 | 528 | 588 | 424 | 398 | 145 | 401 | 92 | 418 | 2714 | 3405 | 387 | 486 |
| 06:45 | 473 | 556 | 544 | 541 | 406 | 500 | 447 | 591 | 448 | 397 | 197 | 451 | 170 | 358 | 2685 | 3394 | 383 | 484 |
| 07:00 | 479 | 453 | 503 | 499 | 399 | 463 | 450 | 434 | 475 | 412 | 188 | 336 | 130 | 315 | 2624 | 2912 | 374 | 416 |
| 07:15 | 505 | 382 | 480 | 449 | 386 | 398 | 404 | 438 | 460 | 416 | 195 | 305 | 105 | 285 | 2535 | 2673 | 362 | 381 |
| 07:30 | 608 | 314 | 399 | 372 | 433 | 367 | 437 | 391 | 451 | 391 | 254 | 328 | 137 | 276 | 2719 | 2439 | 388 | 348 |
| 07:45 | 458 | 307 | 400 | 313 | 373 | 331 | 382 | 303 | 503 | 343 | 295 | 283 | 178 | 250 | 2589 | 2130 | 369 | 304 |
| 08:00 | 379 | 259 | 352 | 297 | 442 | 263 | 381 | 269 | 420 | 345 | 269 | 251 | 184 | 228 | 2427 | 1912 | 346 | 273 |
| 08:15 | 370 | 239 | 370 | 274 | 413 | 284 | 432 | 274 | 500 | 276 | 292 | 267 | 187 | 216 | 2564 | 1830 | 366 | 261 |
| 08:30 | 351 | 229 | 306 | 256 | 372 | 258 | 409 | 296 | 457 | 253 | 361 | 229 | 188 | 250 | 2444 | 1771 | 349 | 253 |
| 08:45 | 316 | 214 | 339 | 214 | 397 | 326 | 400 | 251 | 497 | 251 | 392 | 233 | 211 | 210 | 2552 | 1699 | 364 | 242 |
| 09:00 | 341 | 255 | 337 | 214 | 386 | 254 | 409 | 237 | 516 | 215 | 323 | 231 | 236 | 210 | 2548 | 1616 | 364 | 230 |
| 09:15 | 305 |  | 367 | 215 | 378 | 258 | 435 | 222 | 432 | 191 | 346 | 239 | 270 | 159 | 2533 | 1284 | 361 | 214 |
| 09:30 | 382 |  | 396 | 236 | 398 | 208 | 449 | 241 | 493 | 210 | 411 | 234 | 326 | 165 | 2855 | 1294 | 407 | 215 |
| 09:45 | 432 |  | 422 | 215 | 458 | 231 | 462 | 182 | 433 | 209 | 426 | 204 | 345 | 142 | 2978 | 1183 | 425 | 197 |
| 10:00 | 503 |  | 469 | 171 | 479 | 193 | 457 | 214 | 510 | 192 | 408 | 210 | 344 | 152 | 3170 | 1132 | 452 | 188 |
| 10:15 | 529 |  | 453 | 187 | 436 | 171 | 461 | 147 | 479 | 171 | 470 | 172 | 370 | 124 | 3198 | 972 | 456 | 162 |
| 10:30 | 432 |  | 371 | 155 | 439 | 162 | 419 | 153 | 429 | 198 | 491 | 164 | 366 | 95 | 2947 | 927 | 421 | 154 |
| 10:45 | 446 |  | 396 | 131 | 431 | 140 | 432 | 151 | 436 | 165 | 483 | 151 | 426 | 93 | 3050 | 831 | 435 | 138 |
| 11:00 | 393 |  | 416 | 107 | 428 | 144 | 421 | 109 | 445 | 144 | 468 | 120 | 464 | 77 | 3035 | 701 | 433 | 116 |
| 11:15 | 425 |  | 386 | 95 | 372 | 81 | 406 | 118 | 514 | 136 | 442 | 127 | 423 | 58 | 2968 | 615 | 424 | 102 |
| 11:30 | 411 |  | 419 | 97 | 409 | 106 | 464 | 103 | 486 | 143 | 470 | 125 | 452 | 63 | 3111 | 637 | 444 | 106 |
| 11:45 | 394 |  | 407 | 84 | 417 | 93 | 421 | 94 | 482 | 113 | 441 | 93 | 399 | 61 | 2961 | 538 | 423 | 89 |
| 12:00 | 393 |  | 432 | 74 | 407 | 65 | 433 | 60 | 476 | 103 | 482 | 95 | 493 | 56 | 3116 | 453 | 445 | 75 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| TOTALS | 27141 | 30132 | 30814 | 30949 | 31584 | 25608 | 22599 | 198827 |  |
| AM Times | $6: 45$ | $6: 15$ | $9: 45$ | $6: 15$ | $8: 15$ | $10: 15$ | $11: 15$ | $10: 00$ | $10: 00$ |
| AM Peaks | 2065 | 2056 | 1812 | 1869 | 1970 | 1912 | 1767 | 12365 | 1764 |
| PM Times | $15: 45$ | $15: 30$ | $16: 30$ | $16: 30$ | $14: 00$ | $12: 30$ | $12: 45$ | $15: 30$ | $15: 30$ |
| PM Peaks | 2219 | 2347 | 2468 | 2314 | 2209 | 1939 | 1826 | 14733 | 2102 |



| TOTALS | 7379 | 9248 | 9088 | 8276 | 7833 | 5508 | 4714 | 52046 | 7441 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| AM Times | $7: 00$ | $7: 00$ | $7: 15$ | $7: 00$ | $7: 00$ | $10: 30$ | $11: 00$ | $7: 00$ | $7: 00$ |
| AM Peaks | 777 | 1136 | 901 | 818 | 783 | 370 | 350 | 4700 | 669 |
| PM Times | $18: 00$ | $17: 45$ | $17: 30$ | $17: 30$ | $17: 30$ | $15: 15$ | $12: 45$ | $17: 30$ | $17: 30$ |
| PM Peaks | 646 | 810 | 935 | 747 | 747 | 470 | 422 | 4678 | 666 |

# MassDOT Highway Division <br> WEEKLY SUMMARY <br> Starting:4/28/2015 

Page: 1

## STA. 3

Site Reference: 150110000467 Site ID: 00000000300
LOcation: ON-RAMP FROM RTE, 30 TO I-95 SB Direction: ROAD TOTAL

| TIME MON | TUE | WED | THU | ERI TOT | 1 | 30 | 29 | 3 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



| 00:15 | 9 | 93 | 11 | 91 | 18 | 112 | 10 | 111 | 14 | 100 | 21 | 102 | 17 | 101 | 100 | 710 | 14 | 101 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:30 | 5 | 96 | 4 | 131 | 4 | 104 | 9 | 114 | 8 | 109 | 9 | 117 | 16 | 125 | 55 | 796 | 7 | 113 |
| 00:45 | 10 | 104 | 11 | 97 | 10 | 101 | 7 | 128 | 12 | 121 | 15 | 96 | 12 | 112 | 77 | 759 | 11 | 108 |
| 01:00 | 7 | 116 | 4 | 121 | 8 | 97 | 7 | 103 | 6 | 114 | 11 | 117 | 17 | 101 | 60 | 769 | 8 | 109 |
| 01:15 | 4 | 93 | 4 | 115 | 15 | 106 | 11 | 109 | 12 | 121 | 14 | 88 | 32 | 103 | 92 | 735 | 13 | 105 |
| 01:30 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 105 | 6 | 118 | 3 | 113 | 11 | 122 | 3 | 103 | 27 | 90 | 59 | 751 | 8 | 107 |
| 01:45 | 1 | 102 | 5 | 117 | 5 | 122 | 4 | 126 | 4 | 120 | 7 | 96 | 17 | 108 | 43 | 791 | 6 | 113 |
| 02:00 | 2 | 102 | 5 | 98 | 7 | 107 | 4 | 114 | 8 | 99 | 6 | 92 | 5 | B8 | 37 | 700 | 5 | 100 |
| 02:15 | 4 | 104 | 2 | 105 | 4 | 106 | 11 | 104 | 4 | 133 | 7 | 104 | 8 | 110 | 40 | 766 | 5 | 109 |
| 02:30 | 5 | 128 | 6 | 117 | 2 | 140 | 5 | 140 | 6 | 146 | 6 | 102 | 6 | 102 | 36 | 875 | 5 | 125 |
| 02:45 | 3 | 117 | 1 | 126 | 5 | 126 | 6 | 140 | 6 | 117 | 6 | 99 | 7 | 79 | 34 | 804 | 4 | 114 |
| 03:00 | 3 | 117 | 6 | 113 | 8 | 98 | 5 | 121 | 6 | 109 | 1 | 102 | 5 | 85 | 34 | 745 | 4 | 106 |
| 03:15 | 4 | 134 | 6 | 118 | 6 | 126 | 4 | 119 | 4 | 123 | 2 | 97 | 4 | 91 | 30 | 808 | 4 | 115 |
| 03:30 | 9 | 106 | 6 | 140 | B | 139 | 4 | 112 | 5 | 108 | 2 | 103 | 5 | 89 | 39 | 797 | 5 | 113 |
| 03:45 | 4 | 107 | 8 | 123 | 1 | 101 | 3 | 100 | 8 | 109 | 5 | 97 | 3 | 87 | 32 | 724 | 4 | 103 |
| 04:00 | 4 | 114 | 6 | 113 | 6 | 101 | 2 | 124 | 10 | 124 | 4 | 90 | 4 | 101 | 36 | 767 | 5 | 109 |
| 04:15 | 2 | 132 | 0 | 139 | 9 | 131 | 2 | 127 | 2 | 104 | 6 | 76 | 2 | 74 | 23 | 783 | 3 | 111 |
| 04:30 | 3 | 111 | 8 | 133 | 7 | 123 | 2 | 140 | 6 | 131 | 10 | 91 | 3 | 94 | 39 | 823 | 5 | 117 |
| 04:45 | 15 | 104 | 4 | 136 | 10 | 142 | 14 | 133 | 7 | 135 | 2 | 80 | 5 | 74 | 57 | 804 | 8 | 114 |
| 05:00 | 13 | 75 | 12 | 131 | 11 | 161 | 14 | 143 | 12 | 126 | 4 | 97 | 4 | 67 | 70 | 800 | 10 | 114 |
| 05:15 | 18 | 116 | 16 | 159 | 13 | 140 | 19 | 145 | 15 | 131 | 9 | 81 | 10 | 79 | 100 | 851 | 14 | 121 |
| 05:30 | 20 | 125 | 15 | 145 | 14 | 141 | 14 | 136 | 14 | 120 | 9 | 100 | 5 | 65 | 91 | 832 | 13 | 118 |
| 05:45 | 27 | 137 | 45 | 123 | 37 | 112 | 41 | 106 | 36 | 119 | 13 | 95 | 6 | 78 | 205 | 770 | 29 | 110 |
| 06:00 | 28 | 140 | 36 | 97 | 41 | 122 | 33 | 103 | 34 | 127 | 15 | 96 | 13 | 69 | 200 | 754 | 28 | 107 |
| 06:15 | 63 | 134 | 51 | 108 | 61 | 111 | 44 | 112 | 54 | 116 | 22 | 74 | 18 | 50 | 313 | 705 | 44 | 100 |
| 06:30 | 58 | 101 | 59 | 109 | 65 | 130 | 74 | 125 | 65 | 97 | 25 | 64 | 21 | 66 | 367 | 692 | 52 | 98 |
| 06:45 | 98 | 106 | 117 | 127 | 95 | 113 | 112 | 125 | 118 | 106 | 35 | 71 | 26 | 45 | 601 | 693 | 85 | 99 |
| 07:00 | 110 | 95 | 103 | 83 | 116 | 98 | 99 | 104 | 98 | 77 | 38 | 74 | 24 | 53 | 588 | 584 | 84 | 83 |
| 07:15 | 118 | 93 | 130 | 102 | 137 | 85 | 127 | 86 | 135 | 88 | 49 | 81 | 44 | 66 | 740 | 601 | 105 | 85 |
| 07:30 | 122 | 76 | 128 | 93 | 121 | 77 | 127 | 92 | 121 | 77 | 68 | 79 | 43 | 51 | 730 | 545 | 104 | 77 |
| 07:45 | 135 | 67 | 140 | 73 | 142 | 80 | 146 | 76. | 149 | 64 | 72 | 60 | 41 | 55 | 825 | 475 | 117 | 67 |
| 08:00 | 131 | 64 | 146 | 83 | 141 | 58 | 157 | 95 | 138 | 54 | 63 | 58 | 42 | 46 | 818 | 458 | 116 | 65 |
| 08:15 | 143 | 56 | 153 | 88 | 146 | 91 | 132 | 76 | 139 | 57 | 76 | 47 | 63 | 43 | 852 | 458 | 121 | 65 |
| 08:30 | 152 | 58 | 120 | 62 | 127 | 55 | 149 | 60 | 152 | 54 | 84 | 62 | 48 | 37 | 832 | 388 | 118 | 55 |
| 08:45 | 135 | 46 | 145 | 61 | 151 | 50 | 133 | 51 | 142 | 55 | 91 | 44 | 60 | 38 | 857 | 345 | 122 | 49 |
| 09:00 | 127 | 51 | 143 | 60 | 122 | 47 | 130 | 41 | 133 | 44 | 90 | 34 | 48 | 34 | 793 | 311 | 113 | 44 |
| 09:15 | 113 |  | 130 | 84 | 123 | 48 | 124 | 59 | 140 | 44 | 80 | 61 | 66 | 37 | 776 | 333 | 110 | 55 |
| 09:30 | 106 |  | 114 | 82 | 124 | 64 | 128 | 51 | 120 | 40 | 100 | 52 | 74 | 57 | 766 | 346 | 109 | 57 |
| 09:45 | 112 |  | 106 | 56 | 130 | 53 | 117 | 35 | 109 | 28 | 108 | 63 | 77 | 29 | 759 | 264 | 108 | 44 |
| 10:00 | 98 |  | 94 | 31 | 103 | 41 | 108 | 33 | 89 | 42 | 105 | 48 | 79 | 30 | 676 | 225 | 96 | 37 |
| 10:15 | 105 |  | 92 | 35 | 107 | 31 | 110 | 23 | 97 | 38 | 104 | 39 | 72 | 21 | 687 | 187 | 98 | 31 |
| 10:30 | 93 |  | 93 | 33 | 117 | 27 | 92 | 30 | 107 | 69 | 103 | 49 | 101 | 21 | 706 | 229 | 100 | 38 |
| 10:45 | 101 |  | 102 | 27 | 105 | 22 | 104 | 22 | 108 | 44 | 116 | 60 | 86 | 23 | 722 | 198 | 103 | 33 |
| 11:00 | 113 |  | 97 | 32 | 92 | 18 | 108 | 35 | 114 | 43 | 116 | 47 | 68 | 16 | 708 | 191 | 101 | 31 |
| 11:15 | 87 |  | 97 | 35 | 96 | 31 | 96 | 25 | 100 | 39 | 104 | 43 | 86 | 24 | 666 | 197 | 95 | 32 |
| 11:30 | 103 |  | 86 | 16 | 81 | 14 | 92 | 14. | 103 | 35 | 110 | 19 | 94 | 14 | 669 | 112 | 95 | 18 |
| 11:45 | 102 |  | 107 | 19 | 108 | 20 | 123 | 22 | 106 | 33 | 106 | 30 | 99 | 11 | 751 | 135 | 107 | 22 |
| 12:00 | 97 |  | 95 | 12 | 115 | 15 | 97 | 15 | 109 | 30 | 99 | 20 | 109 | 3 | 721 | 95 | 103 | 15 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| TOTALS | 6448 | 7276 | 7235 | 7281 | 7238 | 5751 | 4764 | 45993 | 6586 |
| AM Times | $7: 45$ | $7: 30$ | $8: 00$ | $7: 45$ | $7: 45$ | $10: 45$ | $11: 15$ | $8: 00$ | $8: 00$ |
| AM Reaks | 561 | 567 | 565 | 584 | 578 | 446 | 388 | 3359 | 477 |
| PM Times | $17: 30$ | $16: 45$ | $16: 45$ | $16: 30$ | $16: 30$ | $12: 15$ | $12: 30$ | $16: 45$ | $16: 45$ |
| PM Reaks | 536 | 571 | 584 | 561 | 523 | 432 | 441 | 3287 | 467 |

# Massdot Highway Division <br> WEEKLY SUMMARY <br> Starting:4/28/2015 

Page: 1

## STA.q

File: V400.prn
City: WESTON
county: VOL

Site Reference: 150110000625
Site ID: 000000000400
Location: ON-RAMP FROM I-90 TO I-95 SB Direction: ROAD TOTAL


| 00:15 | 53 | 337 | 47 | 246 | 43 | 321 | 69 | 317 | 80 | 293 | 83 | 427 | 70 | 346 | 445 | 2287 | 63 | 326 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:30 | 46 | 279 | 32 | 316 | 54 | 310 | 45 | 313 | 70 | 317 | 73 | 416 | 70 | 287 | 390 | 2238 | 55 | 319 |
| 00:45 | 35 | 302 | 40 | 368 | 45 | 352 | 50 | 310 | 76 | 358 | 56 | 383 | 64 | 358 | 366 | 2431 | 52 | 347 |
| 01:00 | 37 | 326 | 45 | 341 | 66 | 348 | 51 | 342 | 77 | 373 | 64 | 412 | 59 | 365 | 399 | 2507 | 57 | 358 |
| 01:15 | 40 | 310 | 27 | 286 | 36 | 341 | 35 | 274 | 48 | 354 | 63 | 365 | 64 | 349 | 313 | 2279 | 44 | 325 |
| 01:30 | 37 | 311 | 28 | 323 | 26 | 346 | 44 | 310 | 44 | 353 | 46 | 352 | 84 | 371 | 309 | 2366 | 44 | 338 |
| 01:45 | 30 | 326 | 21 | 300 | 26 | 424 | 33 | 300 | 32 | 403 | 36 | 386 | 62 | 367 | 240 | 2506 | 34 | 358 |
| 02:00 | 28 | 308 | 32 | 338 | 18 | 364 | 27 | 379 | 35 | 402 | 45 | 359 | 66 | 331 | 251 | 2481 | 35 | 354 |
| 02:15 | 20 | 342 | 31 | 370 | 21 | 353 | 24 | 355 | 37 | 411 | 41 | 386 | 64 | 340 | 238 | 2557 | 34 | 365 |
| 02:30 | 20 | 381 | 25 | 410 | 20 | 422 | 17 | 377 | 26 | 407 | 28 | 386 | 29 | 385 | 165 | 2768 | 23 | 395 |
| 02:45 | 19 | 382 | 16 | 384 | 15 | 427 | 25 | 478 | 28 | 374 | 34 | 419 | 31 | 361 | 168 | 2825 | 24 | 403 |
| 03:00 | 18 | 389 | 18 | 399 | 7 | 386 | 10 | 360 | 16 | 379 | 24 | 373 | 27 | 378 | 120 | 2664 | 17 | 380 |
| 03:15 | 18 | 368 | 11 | 388 | 11 | 374 | 24 | 364 | 28 | 382 | 16 | 347 | 16 | 342 | 124 | 2565 | 17 | 366 |
| 03:30 | 23 | 290 | 27 | 419 | 17 | 376 | 23 | 383 | 18 | 322 | 25 | 349 | 24 | 393 | 157 | 2532 | 22 | 361 |
| 03:45 | 23 | 344 | 21 | 361 | 31 | 357 | 21 | 348 | 24 | 365 | 18 | 372 | 13 | 406 | 151 | 2553 | 21 | 364 |
| 04:00 | 27 | 368 | 21 | 398 | 27 | 343 | 29 | 351 | 34 | 359 | 28 | 373 | 12 | 385 | 178 | 2577 | 25 | 368 |
| 04:15 | 25 | 327 | 26 | 358 | 40 | 353 | 28 | 344 | 36 | 360 | 16 | 378 | 12 | 331 | 183 | 2451 | 26 | 350 |
| 04:30 | 26 | 296 | 44 | 358 | 29 | 325 | 38 | 322 | 30 | 301 | 26 | 353 | 11 | 355 | 204 | 2310 | 29 | 330 |
| 04:45 | 43 | 259 | 65 | 323 | 49 | 347 | 43 | 334 | 45 | 333 | 12 | 350 | 12 | 334 | 269 | 2280 | 38 | 325 |
| 05:00 | 54 | 303 | 57 | 350 | 55 | 351 | 68 | 333 | 61 | 328 | 25 | 353 | 10 | 380 | 330 | 2398 | 47 | 342 |
| 05:15 | 65 | 309 | 70 | 329 | 77 | 310 | 65 | 346 | 83 | 325 | 25 | 345 | 16 | 347 | 401 | 2311 | 57 | 330 |
| 05:30 | 115 | 334 | 99 | 324 | 118 | 338 | 115 | 336 | 105 | 340 | 40 | 348 | 16 | 362 | 608 | 2382 | 86 | 340 |
| 05:45 | 162 | 336 | 154 | 354 | 168 | 351 | 164 | 328 | 166 | 338 | 54 | 360 | 27 | 340 | 895 | 2407 | 127 | 343 |
| 06:00 | 226 | 366 | 229 | 356 | 237 | 411 | 218 | 336 | 221 | 363 | 56 | 284 | 48 | 357 | 1235 | 2473 | 176 | 353 |
| 06:15 | 247 | 327 | 285 | 399 | 276 | 334 | 319 | 331 | 264 | 379 | 73 | 283 | 42 | 306 | 1506 | 2359 | 215 | 337 |
| 06:30 | 236 | 356 | 271 | 302 | 287 | 310 | 282 | 382 | 287 | 383 | 119 | 255 | 59 | 318 | 1541 | 2306 | 220 | 329 |
| 06:45 | 294 | 319 | 298 | 291 | 332 | 342 | 290 | 350 | 347 | 388 | 111 | 293 | 95 | 272 | 1767 | 2255 | 252 | 322 |
| 07:00 | 303 | 251 | 344 | 350 | 353 | 337 | 374 | 356 | 378 | 341 | 129 | 249 | 84 | 244 | 1965 | 2128 | 280 | 304 |
| 07:15 | 372 | 268 | 413 | 344 | 428 | 338 | 394 | 303 | 395 | 347 | 148 | 237 | 85 | 272 | 2235 | 2109 | 319 | 301 |
| 07:30 | 407 | 241 | 452 | 308 | 449 | 256 | 444 | 254 | 453 | 316 | 156 | 228 | 92 | 267 | 2453 | 1870 | 350 | 267 |
| 07:45 | 445 | 272 | 489 | 276 | 486 | 251 | 491 | 235 | 484 | 282 | 149 | 227 | 140 | 219 | 2684 | 1762 | 383 | 251 |
| 08:00 | 512 | 187 | 542 | 200 | 498 | 207 | 545 | 255 | 463 | 253 | 219 | 225 | 123 | 228 | 2902 | 1555 | 414 | 222 |
| 08:15 | 440 | 176 | 495 | 193 | 458 | 195 | 419 | 207 | 373 | 210 | 200 | 171 | 118 | 197 | 2503 | 1349 | 357 | 192 |
| 08:30 | 460 | 180 | 502 | 178 | 451 | 202 | 440 | 207 | 556 | 193 | 213 | 193 | 162 | 210 | 2784 | 1363 | 397 | 194 |
| 08:45 | 409 | 172 | 392 | 194 | 425 | 178 | 479 | 165 | 479 | 178 | 295 | 166 | 136 | 177 | 2615 | 1230 | 373 | 175 |
| 09:00 | 465 | 147 | 460 | 166 | 426 | 173 | 433 | 169 | 425 | 182 | 279 | 170 | 156 | 184 | 2644 | 1191 | 377 | 170 |
| 09:15 | 457 |  | 415 | 130 | 450 | 182 | 533 | 170 | 411 | 158 | 24.9 | 178 | 176 | 169 | 2691 | 987 | 384 | 164 |
| 09:30 | 461 |  | 489 | 158 | 472 | 185 | 480 | 184 | 412 | 195 | 302 | 193 | 170 | 158 | 2786 | 1073 | 398 | 178 |
| 09:45 | 432 |  | 477 | 168 | 444 | 207 | 442 | 197 | 360 | 197 | 286 | 183 | 219 | 156 | 2660 | 1108 | 380 | 184 |
| 10:00 | 369 |  | 407 | 102 | 449 | 153 | 396 | 153 | 392 | 168 | 340 | 159 | 240 | 134 | 2593 | 869 | 370 | 144 |
| 10:15 | 346 |  | 324 | 108 | 264 | 184 | 362 | 166 | 347 | 181 | 356 | 186 | 249 | 110 | 2248 | 935 | 321 | 155 |
| 10:30 | 295 |  | 351 | 103 | 298 | 130 | 346 | 118 | 364 | 152 | 326 | 182 | 290 | 131 | 2270 | 816 | 324 | 136 |
| 10:45 | 326 |  | 339 | 125 | 311 | 110 | 356 | 133 | 364 | 150 | 360 | 175 | 318 | 116 | 2374 | 809 | 339 | 134 |
| 11:00 | 306 |  | 354 | 93 | 313 | 102 | 366 | 104 | 373 | 153 | 386 | 183 | 324 | 84 | 2422 | 719 | 346 | 119 |
| 11:15 | 268 |  | 300 | 100 | 281 | 86 | 339 | 111 | 313 | 127 | 402 | 155 | 293 | 89 | 2196 | 668 | 313 | 111 |
| 11:30 | 289 |  | 313 | 79 | 294 | 73 | 326 | 79 | 327 | 109 | 467 | 131 | 383 | 94 | 2399 | 565 | 342 | 94 |
| 11:45 | 317 |  | 303 | 63 | 290 | 85 | 334 | 88 | 367 | 111 | 421 | 89 | 321 | 67 | 2353 | 503 | 336 | 83 |
| 12:00 | 303 |  | 304 | 65 | 329 | 54 | 334 | 90 | 340 | 108 | 398 | 98 | 336 | 56 | 2344 | 471 | 334 | 78 |


|  | 20738 | 23399 | 23604 | 23837 | 24495 | 20803 | 18346 | 155222 | 22361 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| TOTALS | $7: 45$ | $7: 45$ | $7: 45$ | $8: 45$ | $7: 45$ | $11: 15$ | $11: 15$ | $7: 45$ | $7: 45$ |
| AM Times | $7: 457$ | 2028 | 1893 | 1925 | 1876 | 1688 | 1333 | 10873 | 1551 |
| AM Peaks | 1857 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PM Times | $14: 30$ | $14: 45$ | $14: 30$ | $14: 00$ | $13: 45$ | $12: 15$ | $15: 15$ | $14: 30$ | $14: 30$ |
| PM Peaks | 1520 | 1590 | 1609 | 1589 | 1623 | 1638 | 1526 | 10822 | 1544 |

## APPENDIX C

## Crash Data

## LOCATION 1

I-93 Southbound Between I-95 and Montvale Avenue in Woburn and Stoneham

| Count | Crash Number | Crash Crash Time | Crash Date | Crash Severity | Number of Vehicles | Total Nonfatal Injury | Total Fatal Injury | Manner of Collision | Road Surface | Ambient Light Condition | Weather Condition | Vehicle Traveled Direction | Roadway | Location |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2645141 | 2010 2:05 PM | 23-Sep-2010 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Not Reported | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 22555994 | 2010 8:00 AM | 18-Jan-2010 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Snow | Daylight | Not Reported | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 2567185 | 2010 4:55 PM | 12-Feb-2010 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 2590453 | 2010 8:57 AM | 23-Mar-2010 | Property damage only ( n | 3 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Cloudy/Rain | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 2591433 | 2010 8:59 AM | 15-Apr-2010 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 / M | VALE AVENUE |
|  | 62598097 | 2010 4:16 AM | 16-May-2010 | Property damage only ( n | 1 | 0 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 72614147 | 2010 8:30 PM | 22-Jun-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 1 | 1 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Other | Dark - lighted roadway | Not Reported | V1:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 2670945 | 2010 11:26 PM | 14-Dec-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 4 | 1 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Cloudy | V1:Southbound / V2:Not reported / VER | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 2649274 | 2010 7:57 AM | 30-Sep-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 4 | 2 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 102653156 | 2010 11:44 PM | 18-Oct-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 1 | 1 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 112662901 | 2010 6:15 PM | 08-Nov-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Angle | Dry | Dark - roadway not lighted | Clear/Rain | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 122663635 | 2010 9:25 AM | 22-Nov-2010 | Property damage only ( n | 4 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Not Reported | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 3666188 | 2010 11:16 AM | 01-Dec-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 1 | 1 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Wet | Daylight | Not Reported | V1:Southbound | RAMP-MO | ALE AVE |
|  | 142700876 | 2011 7:40 AM | 17-Feb-2011 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Not Reported | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 52703014 | 2011 5:53 PM | 03-Mar-2011 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 |
|  | 162728282 | 2011 11:38 PM | 20-May-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 1 | 1 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | $17 \quad 2744167$ | 2011 12:30 PM | 24-Jul-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 2 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 182778968 | 2011 10:28 PM | 05-Oct-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 4 | 2 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 |
|  | 192812191 | 2011 5:33 PM | 29-Nov-2011 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Cloudy | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 202709812 | 2011 9:45 PM | 24-Mar-2011 | Property damage only ( n | 1 | 0 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Snow | V1:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
| 2 | 212709816 | 2011 8:45 PM | 25-Mar-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 3 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
| 22 | $22 \quad 2718150$ | 2011 3:31 PM | 01-Apr-2011 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Rain | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound |  |  |
| 23 | 232700863 | 2011 9:30 AM | 20-Jan-2011 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
| 24 | $24 \quad 2702746$ | 2011 1:59 AM | 13-Feb-2011 | Property damage only ( n | 1 | 0 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Cloudy | V1:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
| 25 | $25 \quad 2716293$ | 2011 8:25 PM | 20-Apr-2011 | Property damage only ( n | 4 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 262721013 | 2011 7:15 PM | 24-Apr-2011 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dusk | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | $27 \quad 2719038$ | 2011 9:00 AM | 26-Apr-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 3 | 1 | 0 | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 2727262 | 2011 9:10 PM | 08-May-2011 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 292782648 | 2011 6:30 AM | 07-Oct-2011 | Property damage only ( n | 3 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 935 |
|  | 302814845 | 2011 11:27 AM | 31-Oct-2011 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Westbound |  |  |
|  | 312941666 | 2011 11:15 PM | 02-Dec-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Not Reported | V1:Southbound/ V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 323226326 | 2012 6:30 PM | 01-Aug-2012 | Non-fatal injury | 3 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
| 33 | $33 \quad 3243304$ | 2012 00:00 AM | 15-Aug-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 |
|  | $34 \quad 3248871$ | 2012 6:36 AM | 22-Aug-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 4 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 |
| 35 | $35 \quad 3278879$ | 2012 9:48 AM | 16-Oct-2012 | Non-fatal injury | 3 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 | Exit 36 on Rte 93 |
|  | 363252668 | 2012 7:44 AM | 14-Sep-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound/ V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 372951592 | 2012 7:30 PM | 27-Feb-2012 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Not Reported | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | $38 \quad 3321446$ | 2012 6:16 AM | 13-Dec-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Not Reported | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 392853093 | 2012 6:00 PM | 05-Jan-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 402872386 | 2012 6:52 AM | 13-Jan-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 412894055 | 2012 5:45 PM | 27-Jan-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Wet | Dark - lighted roadway | Rain | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | $42 \quad 2894059$ | 2012 7:25 AM | 01-Feb-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 3 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Not Reported | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 432914850 | 2012 6:20 PM | 09-Feb-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Not Reported | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 442937668 | 2012 7:50 PM | 01-Mar-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 4 | 0 | 0 | Angle | Snow | Dark - lighted roadway | Snow | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
| 45 | $45 \quad 2976134$ | 2012 8:00 AM | 19-Mar-2012 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
| 46 | $46 \quad 3018135$ | 2012 8:27 AM | 03-Apr-2012 | Property damage only ( n |  | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | $47 \quad 3019528$ | 2012 3:30 AM | 09-Apr-2012 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
| 48 | $48 \quad 3207184$ | 2012 6:21 AM | 23-Jul-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Wet | Daylight | Cloudy/Rain | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 493245395 | 2012 00:00 AM | 24-Aug-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 1 | 0 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | $50 \quad 3266539$ | 2012 7:44 AM | 20-Sep-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 513278621 | 2012 8:35 PM | 14-Oct-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Angle | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Cloudy | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 523286145 | 2012 2:11 PM | 22-Oct-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound |  |  |
|  | $53 \quad 3282338$ | 2012 6:10 PM | 24-Oct-2012 | Non-fatal injury | 5 | 2 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - roadway not lighted | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3: | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 543285757 | 2012 5:59 AM | 01-Nov-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dawn | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |


| Count |  | Crash Number | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Crash } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | Crash Time | Crash Date | Crash Severity | Number of Vehicles | Total Nonfatal Injury | Total Fatal Injury | Manner of Collision | Road Surface | Ambient Light Condition | Weather Condition | Vehicle Traveled Direction | Roadway | Location |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 55 | 3290936 | 2012 | 6:25 AM | 14-Nov-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 56 | 3293154 | 2012 | 6:12 AM | 19-Nov-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 57 | 3325690 | 2012 | 2:03 AM | 30-Dec-2012 | Non-fatal injury | 1 | 1 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Snow | Dark - lighted roadway | Snow | V1:Southbound | Rte 93 S | Exit 36 on Rte 93 S |
|  | 58 | 3378131* |  | 3:26 AM | 01-Apr-2012 | Fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 1 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound | RTE 95 |  |
|  | 59 | 3378030* | 2012 | 4:19 AM | 01-Apr-2012 | Property damage only ( n | 3 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / | RTE 95 |  |
|  | 60 | 3123331* | 2012 | 8:35 AM | 06-Jun-2012 | Not Reported | 4 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / | S/ OF RT 1 |  |
|  | 61 | 3154571* | 2012 | 8:15 AM | 15-Jun-2012 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Not Reported | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound |  | Exit 37 on Rte 935 |

## LOCATION 2

## I-95 Southbound at the I-90 Interchange in Weston

| Count | Crash Number |  | Crash year Crash Time | Crash Date | Crash Severity | Number of Vehicles | Total Nonfatal | Total Fatal Injury | Manner of Collision | Road Surface | Ambient Light | Weather Condition | Vehicle Traveled Direction | dway | Location |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2641964 | 2010 7:45 AM | 24-Aug-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 1 | 1 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Wet | Davilight | Cloudy/Rain | V1:Southbound R | Rte 95 s | Exit 24 on Rte 95 S |
|  | 2 | 2606670 | 2010 4:05 PM | 01-Jun-2010 | Property damage only (n) | 3 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Davilight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 95 |
|  | 3 | 2610642 | 2010 6:31 PM | 15-Jun-2010 | Property damage only (n) | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Not Reported | V1:Southbound/v2:Southbound Re | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 4 | 2618905 | 2010 3:32 PM | 18-Jun-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 3 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Soutt Re | Rte 95s | Exit 25 on Rte 95s |
|  | 5 | 2612071 | 2010 9:52 AM | 21-Jun-2010 | Property damage only (n) | 1 | 0 | 0 | Single veticle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 6 | 2634065 | 2010 5:10 PM | 19-Aug-2010 | Property damage only (n) | 3 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dayight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 7 | 2595266 | 2010 4:55 PM | 19-Mar-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | clear | V1:Southbound / v2:Southbound Re | Rte 95 S | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 8 | 2592131 | 2010 9:20 AM | 24-Mar-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound Rte | Rte 955 | RAMP-RT 90 TO RT 95 SB |
|  | 9 | 2620862 | 2010 3:20 PM | 06-Ju-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 1 | 1 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound | Rte 955 | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 10 | 2624720 | 2010 2:27 PM | 23-ul-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | V1:Southbound/v2:Southbound R | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 11 | 2638740 | 2010 3:28 PM | 26-Aug-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 4 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Not Reported | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 12 | 2647835 | 2010 7:05 AM | 04-Cct-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Cloudy/Rain | V1:Southbound/v2:Southbound Re | Rte $95 \mathrm{~s} /$ /te 30 | RAMP-RT 30 TO RT 95 SB |
|  | 13 | 2745183 | 2010 4:5 PM | 14-Cct-2010 | Property damage only (n) | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound Re | Rte 95 | Exit 25 on Rte 95 |
|  | 14 | 2656562 | 2010 12:40 PM | 01-Nov-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 1 | 1 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound | Rte 95 s | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 15 | 2663166 | 2010 3:50 PM | 05-Nov-2010 | Property damage only (n) | 4 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 16 | 267682 | 2010 5:51 PM | 07-Dec-2010 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark - roadway not lighted | Not Reported | V1:Southbound/v2:Southbound R | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 17 | 2749846 | 2011 12:03 PM | 04-Aug-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 1 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 18 | 2765897 | 2011 6:24AM | 21-Sep-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 2 | 0 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dawn | Fog, smog, smoke | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound R | Rte 95 | Exit 24 on Rte 95 |
|  | 19 | 2835781 | 2011 4:00 PM | 09-Dec-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dusk | clear | V1:Southbound/v2:Southbound Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 20 | 2680997 | 2011 4:58 PM | 11-Jan-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 3 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dusk | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 21 | 2702374 | 2011 10:15 AM | 22-Feb-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 2 | 0 | 0 | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound/v2:Southbound R | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 22 | 2755755 | $201111: 25 \mathrm{AM}$ | 26-Feb-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 1 | 1 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound | Rte 955 | RAMP-RT 90 TO RT 95 SB |
|  | 23 | 270994 | 2011 4:29 PM | 18-Mar-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 4 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / /3:5out Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 95 s |
|  | 24 | 2727714 | 2011 3:52 PM | 25-Mar-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 2 | 0 | 0 | Angle | Dry | Daylight | Not Reported | V1:Southbound/v2:Southbound Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 25 | 2728134 | 2011 4:11 PM | 02-May-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 3 | 1 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Daylight | clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / /3:5out Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 26 | 2727785 | 2011 4:14PM | 06-May-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 3 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 27 | 2728138 | 2011 4:30 PM | 13-May-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound/v2:Southbound R | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 28 | 2737919 | 2011 6:00 PM | 20-Jun-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound/v2:Southbound R | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 29 | 278684 | 2011 7:40 PM | 22-Jun-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 3 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dusk | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 30 | 2738606 | 2011 3:39 PM | 28-Jun-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 3 | 2 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 31 | 2749813 | 2011 4:45 PM | 14-Jul-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daviight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound R | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 95s |
|  | 32 | 279884 | 2011 5:15 PM | 20-Ju-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 3 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / /3:5out Re | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 33 | 2751662 | 2011 4:25 PM | 21-Jul-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 3 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Not Reported | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / / 3 :Sout Re | Rte 955 | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 34 | 2750709 | 2011 4:11 PM | 11-Aug-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 3 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Davight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / /3:5out Re | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 35 | 2827961 | 2011 8:10 AM | 24-Sep-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 1 | 1 | 0 | Single veticle crash | Wet | Daviight | Rain | V1:Southbound | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 36 | 2782652 | 2011 5:08 PM | 05-0ct-2011 | Non-fatal injury | 3 | 2 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 95 s |
|  | 37 | 2787675 | 2011 3:20 PM | 07-0ct-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 3 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Davilight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 38 | 2788846 | 2011 4:25 PM | 20-ct-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 4 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 39 | 2793997 | 2011 5:20 PM | 09 -Nov-2011 | Not Reported | 1 | 0 | 0 | Single veticle crash | Dry | Dark-roadway not lighted | Clear | V1:Southbound | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 40 | 2793998 | 2011 4:17 PM | 11-Nov-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 4 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Davight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 41 | 2887405 | 2011 4:18 PM | 18-Nov-2011 | Property damage only (ni | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dusk | clear | V1:Southbound/v2:Southbound Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 42 | 2805793 | 2011 7:57 PM | 22-Nov-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dark-roadway not lighted | clear | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound Rte | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 43 | 3374698 | $201111: 59 \mathrm{AM}$ | 29-Nov-2011 | Not Reported | 1 | 0 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Daylight | Cloudy | V1:Southbound | Rte 95 s | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 44 | 2833764 | 2011 5:34 PM | 13-Dec-2011 | Property damage only (n) | 4 | 0 | 0 | Rear-to-rear | Dry | Dark - roadway not lighted | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 45 | 3235162 | 2012 6:30 PM | 14-Jun-2012 | Property damage only (n) | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound R | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 46 | 2954168 | 2012 12:26 PM | 29-Feb-2012 | Property damage only (n) | 1 | 0 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Wet | Davight | Rain | V1:Southbound R | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 47 | 3069207 | 2012 8:20 AM | 06-Mar-2012 | Not Reported | 2 | 0 | 0 | Angle | Dry | Daylight | clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound Rit | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 48 | 3381262 | 2012 3:41 AM | 06-Oct-2012 | Property damage only (n) | 1 | 0 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Wet | Dark - unknown roadway ligh | Cloudy | V1:Southbound |  |  |
|  | 49 | 2889040 | 2012 11:35 PM | 16-Jan-2012 | Property damage only (n) | 1 | 0 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Snow | Dark-roadway not lighted | Snow | V1:Southbound | Rte 95 | Exit 25 on Rte 95 |
|  | 50 | 2896829 | 2012 8:40 PM | 30-Jan-2012 | Property damage only (n) | 1 | 0 | 0 | Single vehicle crash | Dry | Dark-lighted roadway | Clear | V1:Southbound | Rte 95 s | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 51 | 3049843 | 2012 4:12 PM | 17-Feb-2012 | Non-fatal injury | 3 | 3 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dusk | clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 52 | 3065707 | 2012 6:27 PM | 05-Apr-2012 | Not Reported | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Dusk | clear | V1:Southbound/v2:Southbound R | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 53 | 3049845 | 2012 3:28 PM | 12-Apr-2012 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound R | Rte 95 s | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 54 | 3068814 | 2012 4:05 PM | 27-Apr-2012 | Not Reported | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | clear | V1:Southbound/v2:Southbound Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 55 | 3095220 | 2012 5:05 PM | 01-May-2012 | Not Reported | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Wet | Daylight | Not Reported | V1:Southbound/ / $2:$ Southbound Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 56 | 3118659 | 2012 3:37 PM | 17-May-2012 | Not Reported | 2 | 0 | 0 | Angle | Dry | Dayight | Not Reported | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound Rte | Rte 95 s | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 57 | 3381249 | 2012 3:35 PM | 23-May-2012 | Non-fatal injury | , | 2 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | clear | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound R | Rte 95 s |  |
|  | 58 | 3158785 | 2012 4:43 AM | 13-Jun-2012 | Property damage only (n) | 1 | 0 | 0 | Single veticle crash | Wet | Dawn | Rain | V1:Southbound R | Rte 955 | Exit 24 on Rte 955 |
|  | 59 | 3163119 | 2012 11:00 AM | 21-Jun-2012 | Property damage only (n) |  | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Nort Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 60 | 3168335 | 2012 5:36 PM | 08-Ju-2012 | Non-fatal injury | 4 | 3 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daviight | clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 61 | 3207355 | 2012 3:18 PM | 20-Ju-2012 | Non-fatal injury | , | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Davilight | clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound R | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 95s |
|  | 62 | 3235165 | 2012 4:06 PM | 01-Aug-2012 | Property damage only (n) | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | wet | Davilight | Cloudy/Rain | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound Rte | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 63 | 3242532 | 2012 2:17 PM | 10-Aug-2012 | Property damage only (n) |  | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daviight | Cloudy | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound Rte | Rte 955 | Exit 25 on Rte 95s |
|  | 64 | 3248907 | 2012 2:22 PM | 24-Aug-2012 | Non-fatal injury |  | 3 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daviight | clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound / V3:Sout Re | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 95s |
|  | 65 | 3245322 | 2012 3:30 PM | 29-Aug-2012 | Property damage only (n) | 2 | 0 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Daylight | Clear | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound R R | Rte 95s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 66 | 3251460 | 2012 8:50 PM | 01-Sep-2012 | Property damage only (n) |  | 0 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dark- lighted roadway | claar | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound Re | Rte 95s | Exit 25 on Rte 955 |
|  | 67 | 3381374 | 2012 7:30 PM | 02-Sep-2012 | Property damage only (ni | , | 0 | 0 | Sideswipe, same direction | Dry | Dark-lighted roadway | clar | V1:Southbound / V2:Southbound Riteren | Rte 95s | RAMP-RT 90 TO RT 95 SB |
|  | 68 | 3286163 | 2012 3:46 PM | 26-Oct-2012 | Non-fatal injury | 2 | 1 | 0 | Rear-end | Dry | Davight | clear | V1:Southbound/V2:Southbound Rte | Rte 95 s | Exit 25 on Rte 95s |



## APPENDIX D

## Level of Service (LOS) Analysis <br> Freeway Ramp Merge and Diverge Analys $\mathbf{G}^{\mathbf{s}}$

## LOCATION 1

I-93 Southbound Between I-95 and Montvale Avenue in Woburn and Stoneham

# 2015 Existing Conditions 

1. 2015 AM Merge
2. 2015 AM Diverge
3. 2015 AM Basis Freeway

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | 5/20/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-93 SB (I-95 to Montvale Ave) |
| Junction: | Merge from I-95 NB to I-93 SB |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 4 |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 Existing |
| Description: Low-Cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Merge
4
Free-flow speed on freeway 65.0 mph
Volume on freeway 5750 vph
On Ramp Data


$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

|  | Flow | Entering Merge Influence Area |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| V | Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| $12 A$ | 4101 | 4600 | No |

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\underset{R}{\mathrm{D}}=5.475+0.00734 \underset{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{v}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v} \underset{12}{ }-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}=27.3 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $C$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $\mathrm{M}=0.467$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S |  |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\underset{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{~S}}=54.3$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S_{0}=60.0$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $\mathrm{S}=56.9$ | mph |

## Phone:

Fax:
E-mail:

Diverge Analysis $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.:
Date performed:
Analysis time period: AM Peak Hour
Freeway/Dir of Travel: I-93 SB (I-95 to Montvale Ave)
Junction: Diverge I-93 SB to Montvale
Jurisdiction:
Analysis Year: 2015 Existing
Description: Low-Cost Improvement to Bottleneck Locations

| Type of analysis | Diverge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 65.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 6300 | vph |

Off Ramp Data


| Junction Components | Freeway |  | Ramp |  | Adjacent <br> Ramp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume, V (vph) | 6300 |  | 1400 |  | 150 | vph |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.95 |  | 0.95 |  | 0.95 |  |
| Peak 15-min volume, v15 | 1658 |  | 368 |  | 39 | v |
| Trucks and buses | 4 |  | 3 |  | 3 | \% |
| Recreational vehicles | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | \% |
| Terrain type: | Level |  | Level |  | Level |  |
| Grade | 0.00 | \% | 0.00 | \% | 0.00 | \% |
| Length | 0.00 | mi | 0.00 | mi | 0.00 | mi |
| Trucks and buses PCE, ET | 3.0* |  | 3.0* |  | 3.0* |  |
| Recreational vehicle PCE, ER | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  | 1.2 |  |

$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No

|  | Actual | 4085 | 4400 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\qquad$ Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}-0.009 \mathrm{~L} \quad=\quad 36.2 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$

Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $E$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | D | $=0.636$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | S | $=50.4$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | S | $=68.9$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | 0 | S | $=57.1$ |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis


Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Lane width | - | ft |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right-side lateral clearance | - | ft |
| Total ramp density, TRD | - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed: | Measured |  |
| FFS or BFFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lane width adjustment, fLW | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| TRD adjustment | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Flow rate, vp | 1972 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average passenger-car speed, S | 60.4 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 4 |  |
| Density, D | 32.7 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LOS | D |  |

# 2015 Existing Conditions 

1. 2015 PM Merge
2. 2015 PM Diverge
3. 2015 PM Basis Freeway

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth Asante |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | $5 / 20 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-93 SB (I-95 to Montvale Ave) |
| Junction: | Merge from I-95 NB to I-93 SB |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 4 |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 Existing) |
| Description: Low-Cost Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 65.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 5950 | vph |
| On Ramp Data |  |  |

## Side of freeway

Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp 1700 vph
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists)
Right
1
30.0 mph

1500 ft
ft
$\qquad$

Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

Yes
$950 \quad$ vph
Upstream
Off
1000 ft


Heavy vehicle adjustment, fHV
0.980
0.985
0.985

Driver population factor, fP
$\qquad$


Capacity Checks $\qquad$

| Actual | Maximum | LOS F? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8372 | 9400 | No |

FO 8372 9400

No
$\mathrm{v}_{3}$ or $\mathrm{v} \operatorname{av34}$
Is v or $\mathrm{v} \quad>2700 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h}$ ?
Yes
$3 \operatorname{av} 34$
Is v or $\mathrm{v}>1.5 \mathrm{v} / 2$
Yes
$3 \operatorname{av} 34 \quad 12$
If yes, $v=2607$ (Equation 13-15, 13-16, 13-18, or 13-19)
12A

|  | Flow Entering Merge Influence Area | Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| V 12 A | 4460 | 4600 | No |  |

Density, $D=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}=30.0 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
R R 12 A
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $D$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{S}}=0.568$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $S=51.9$ | $m p h$ |
|  | R |  |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S=59.8$ | mph |
|  | 0 |  |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S=55.3$ | $m p h$ |

HCS 2010: Freeway Merge and Diverge Segments Release 6.70

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth Asante |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | $5 / 20 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-93 SB (I-95 to Montvale Ave) |
| Junction: | Diverge I-93 SB to Montvale |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 4 |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 Existing |
| Description: Low-Cost |  |
|  | Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Diverge
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

4
65.0 mph
$7650 \quad$ vph

Off Ramp Data

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 30.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 1000 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 350 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
| Adjacent | (if one exists) |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | Yes |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp | 350 | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp | Downstream |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp | On |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp | 700 | ft |


$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual

Max Desirable 4400
Violation? 4571 Yes

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$


| Intermediate speed variable, | D | $=0.598$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | S | $=51.2$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | S | $=66.6$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | 0 | S | $=57.8$ |
|  |  | mph |  |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis


Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Lane width | - | ft |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right-side lateral clearance | - | ft |
| Total ramp density, TRD | - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed: | Measured |  |
| FFS or BFFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lane width adjustment, fLW | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| TRD adjustment | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Flow rate, vp | 2095 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average passenger-car speed, S | 58.2 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 4 |  |
| Density, D | 36.0 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LOS | E |  |

# Alternative 1: Lengthen the Deceleration Lane at the Exit 36 Diverge Area 

1. 2025 AM Merge
2. 2025 AM Diverge
3. 2025 AM Basis Freeway

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth Asante |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | 5/20/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-93 SB (I-95 to Montvale Ave) |
| Junction: | Merge from I-95 NB to I-93 SB |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 4 |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 Future Year |
| Description: Low-Cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 65.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 6050 | vph |

## Side of freeway

Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp 1470 vph
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
30.0 mph

1500 ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

Yes
890 vph
Upstream
Off
1000 ft

$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2831 | 4600 | No |

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\underset{R}{\mathrm{D}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}+0.0078 \mathrm{v} \underset{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{v}}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L} \quad=17.4 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $\mathrm{M}=0.297$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S |  |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\underset{R}{S}=58.2$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S_{0}=56.1$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S=56.8$ | mph |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth Asante |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | $5 / 20 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-93 SB (I-95 to Montvale Ave) |
| Junction: | Diverge I-93 SB to Montvale |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 4 |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 Future Year |
| Description: Low-Cost Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Diverge
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

4
65.0 mph 6600 vph

Off Ramp Data

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 | mph |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 30.0 | vph |
| Volume on ramp | 1500 | ft |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 1500 | ft |

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

| Does adjacent ramp exist? | Yes |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume on adjacent ramp | 160 | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp | Downstream |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp | On |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp | 700 | ft |


$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 4301

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No

|  | Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v | 4301 | 4400 | No | Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$

Density, $\quad \underset{R}{D}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}=27.7 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$

Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $C$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | D | $=0.647$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\mathrm{S}=50.1$ | mph |  |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}$ | $=68.7$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | $=56.9$ | mph |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis


Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Lane width | - | ft |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right-side lateral clearance | - | ft |
| Total ramp density, TRD | - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed: | Measured |  |
| FFS or BFFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lane width adjustment, fLW | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| TRD adjustment | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Flow rate, vp | 2071 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average passenger-car speed, S | 58.6 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 4 |  |
| Density, D | 35.3 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LOS | E |  |

# Alternative 1: Lengthen the Deceleration Lane at the Exit 36 Diverge Area 

1. 2025 PM Merge
2. 2025 PM Diverge
3. 2025 PM Basis Freeway

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth Asante |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | $5 / 20 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-93 SB (I-95 to Montvale Ave) |
| Junction: | Merge from I-95 NB to I-93 SB |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 4 |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 Future Year |
| Description: Low-Cost Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 65.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 6300 | vph |

## Side of freeway

Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp 1700 vph
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
30.0 mph

1500 ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

Yes
890 vph
Upstream
Off
1000 ft

$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4566 | 4600 | No |

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\underset{R}{\mathrm{D}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}+0.0078 \mathrm{v} \underset{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{v}}+0.00627 \mathrm{~L}=30.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $D$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $\mathrm{M}=0.606$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S |  |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\underset{R}{S}=51.1$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S_{0}=59.4$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S=54.7$ | mph |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth Asante |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | 5/20/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-93 SB (I-95 to Montvale Ave) |
| Junction: | Diverge I-93 SB to Montvale Av |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 4 |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 Future Year |
| Description: Low-Cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Diverge
Free-flow speed on freeway
4
Volume on freeway 8000 vph
Off Ramp Data

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 30.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 1050 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 1500 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent ramp
Position of adjacent ramp
Type of adjacent ramp
Distance to adjacent ramp

Yes
370 vph
Downstream
On
700 ft

$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
Yes

|  | Flow Entering | Diverge Influence Area |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| 12 | 4684 | 4400 | Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$



| Intermediate speed variable, | $D=0.601$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | S | $=51.2$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | S | $=66.4$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | 0 | S | $=57.7$ |
|  | mph |  |  |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis


Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Lane width | - | ft |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right-side lateral clearance | - | ft |
| Total ramp density, TRD | - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed: | Measured |  |
| FFS or BFFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lane width adjustment, fLW | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| TRD adjustment | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Flow rate, vp | 2205 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average passenger-car speed, S | 55.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 4 |  |
| Density, D | 39.5 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LOS | E |  |

# Alternative 2: Create an Auxiliary Lane for Merging and Diverging Traffic 

1. 2025 AM Merge
2. 2025 AM Diverge
3. 2025 AM Basis Freeway

## Phone:

Fax:
E-mail:

Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth Asante |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | $5 / 20 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-93 SB (I-95 to Montvale Ave) |
| Junction: | Merge from I-95 NB to I-93 SB |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 4 |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 Future Year Alternative 2 |
| Description: Low-Costin Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 65.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 6050 | vph |

## Side of freeway

Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp 1470 vph
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
30.0 mph

1500 ft
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

Yes
890 vph
Upstream
Off
1000 ft

$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2831 | 4600 | No |

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\underset{R}{\mathrm{D}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}+0.0078 \mathrm{v} \underset{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{v}}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L} \quad=17.4 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $\mathrm{M}=0.297$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S |  |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\underset{R}{S}=58.2$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S_{0}=56.1$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S=56.8$ | mph |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth Asante |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | 5/20/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-93 SB (I-95 to Montvale Ave) |
| Junction: | Diverge I-93 SB to Montvale |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 4 |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 Future Year Alt 2 |
| Description: Low-Cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Diverge
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

4
65.0 mph 6600 vph

Off Ramp Data

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 30.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 1500 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 1500 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

| Does adjacent ramp exist? | Yes |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volume on adjacent ramp | 160 | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp | Downstream |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp | On |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp | 700 | ft |


$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual 4301

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No

|  | Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v | 4301 | 4400 | No | Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$

Density, $\quad \underset{R}{D}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}=27.7 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$

Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $C$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | D | $=0.647$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\mathrm{S}=50.1$ | mph |  |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}$ | $=68.7$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | $=56.9$ | mph |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis


Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Lane width | - | ft |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right-side lateral clearance | - | ft |
| Total ramp density, TRD | - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 5 |  |
| Free-flow speed: | Measured |  |
| FFS or BFFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lane width adjustment, fLW | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| TRD adjustment | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Flow rate, vp | 1604 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average passenger-car speed, S | 64.4 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 5 |  |
| Density, D | 24.9 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, Los | C |  |

# Alternative 2: Create an Auxiliary Lane for Merging and Diverging Traffic 

1. 2025 PM Merge
2. 2025 PM Diverge
3. 2025 PM Basis Freeway

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Merge Analysis $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.
CTPS
Date performed: 5/20/2015
Analysis time period: PM Peak Hour
Freeway/Dir of Travel: I-93 SB (I-95 to Montvale Ave)
Junction: Merge from I-95 NB to I-93 SB
Jurisdiction: Highway District 4
Analysis Year: 2025 Future Year Alternative 2
Description: Low-Cost Improvements to Bottleneck Locations

| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 65.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 6300 | vph |

On Ramp Data


$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4566 | 4600 | No |

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\underset{R}{\mathrm{D}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}+0.0078 \mathrm{v} \underset{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{v}}+0.00627 \mathrm{~L}=30.8 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $D$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $\mathrm{M}=0.606$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S |  |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\underset{R}{S}=51.1$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S_{0}=59.4$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S=54.7$ | mph |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:
Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth Asante |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | 5/20/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-93 SB (I-95 to Montvale Ave) |
| Junction: | Diverge I-93 SB to Montvale Av |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 4 |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 Future Year |
| Description: Low-Cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Diverge
Free-flow speed on freeway
4
Volume on freeway 8000 vph
Off Ramp Data

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 30.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 1050 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 1500 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent ramp
Position of adjacent ramp
Type of adjacent ramp
Distance to adjacent ramp

Yes
370 vph
Downstream
On
700 ft

$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

## Actual

 4671Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
Yes

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{R}}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}-0.009 \mathrm{~L} \quad=\quad 30.9 \quad \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$

Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $D$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | D | $=0.599$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\mathrm{S}=51.2$ | mph |  |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}$ | $=66.4$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | $=57.7$ | mph |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis


Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Lane width | - | ft |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right-side lateral clearance | - | ft |
| Total ramp density, TRD | - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 5 |  |
| Free-flow speed: | Measured |  |
| FFS or BFFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lane width adjustment, fLW | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| TRD adjustment | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Flow rate, vp | 1711 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 65.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average passenger-car speed, S | 63.6 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 5 |  |
| Density, D | 26.9 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LOS | D |  |

## LOCATION 2

## I-95 Southbound at the I-90 Interchange in Weston

## 2015 Existing Conditions

1. 2015 AM Diverge to I-90
2. 2015 AM Diverge to Route 30
3. 2015 AM Merge onto Route 30
4. 2015 AM Merge onto l-90

## Phone:

Fax:
E-mail:

Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | 6/1/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 Southbound |
| Junction: | Diverge to Mass Pike |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 Existing |
| Description: Low-Cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |

Freeway Data $\qquad$

Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

Diverge
4
55.0 mph

7100 vph

Off Ramp Data

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 25.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 1750 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 350 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
| Adjacent | (if one exists) |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | Yes |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp | 900 | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp | Downstream |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp | Off |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp | 1400 | ft |


$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4468 | 4400 | Yes |

12
Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$


| Intermediate speed variable, | D | $=0.730$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | S | $=45.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | S | $=57.8$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | 0 | S | $=50.0$ |

## Phone:

Fax:
E-mail:

Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | 6/2/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 Southbound |
| Junction: | Diverge to Route 30 |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 Existing |
| Description: Low-cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |


| Type of analysis | Diverge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 55.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 5350 | vph |

Off Ramp Data

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 25.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 900 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 500 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
| ____Adjacent | (if one exists) |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | Yes |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp | 550 | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp | Downstream |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp | On |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp | 400 | ft |


$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

## Actual

 3184Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No

|  | Flow Entering | Diverge Influence | Area |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| vatual | 3184 | 4400 | Violation? |
| 12 |  |  | No | Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$

Density, $\quad \underset{R}{D}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}=27.1 \quad \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$

Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $C$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | D | $=0.650$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\mathrm{S}=46.6$ | mph |  |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}$ | $=58.8$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | $=51.6$ | mph |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | 6/2/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 SB |
| Junction: | Merge from Route 30 |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 Existing |
| Description: Low-cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 55.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 4450 | vph |

## Side of freeway

Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
1
25.0 mph
$550 \quad$ vph
450 ft
$f t$
$f t$
ft

Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$

$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1307 | 4600 | No |

R12
Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\underset{R}{\mathrm{D}}=5.475+0.00734 \underset{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{v}}+0.0078 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L}=12.6 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$


Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | 6/2/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 Southbound |
| Junction: | Merge from Mass Pike |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Low-cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway

| Merge |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 |  |
| 55.0 | mph |
| 5000 | vph |

On Ramp Data


$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4501 | 4600 | No |

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\underset{R}{\mathrm{D}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}+0.0078 \mathrm{v} \underset{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{v}}+0.00627 \mathrm{~L} \quad=37.1 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $E$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $\mathrm{M}=0.652$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S |  |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}=46.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S_{0}=50.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $\mathrm{S}=48.2$ | mph |

## 2015 Existing Conditions

1. 2015 PM Diverge to I-90
2. $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ PM Diverge to Route 30
3. 2015 PM Merge onto Route 30
4. 2015 PM Merge onto I-90

Phone:
E-mail:

Fax:

Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst: | Seth |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | $6 / 1 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 Southbound |
| Junction: | Diverge to Mass Pike |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 |
| Description: Low-cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
Diverge
4
55.0 mph
$7500 \quad$ vph

Off Ramp Data

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 25.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 2250 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 350 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
|  | (if one exists) |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | Yes |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp | 550 | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp | Downstream |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp | Off |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp | 1400 | ft |


0.980
0.980

Driver population factor, fP
$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area Actual

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
Yes

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$



Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | 6/2/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 Southbound |
| Junction: | Diverge to Route 30 |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 Existing |
| Description: Low-cost | Improvements to Bottleneck |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway 55.0 mph
Volume on freeway 5250 vph
Off Ramp Data


$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

> Actual 2881

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No

|  | Actual | 2881 | 4400 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$

Density, $\quad \mathrm{D}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}-0.009 \mathrm{~L} \quad=\quad 24.5 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$

Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $C$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | D | $=0.613$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\mathrm{S}=47.0$ | mph |  |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | S | $=58.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | $=52.2$ | mph |

## Phone:

Fax:
E-mail:

Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | $6 / 2 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 Southbound |
| Junction: | Merge from Route 30 |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 Existing |
| Description: Low-cost Improvements to Bottleneck Location |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 55.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 4700 | vph |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
1
25.0 mph
$500 \quad \mathrm{vph}$
Length of first accel/decel lane
450
ft
Length of second accel/decel lane
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

Yes
1800 vph
Downstream
On
850 ft



Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2692 | 4600 | No |

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\underset{R}{\mathrm{D}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}+0.0078 \mathrm{v} \underset{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{v}}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L} \quad=23.4 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $C$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $\mathrm{M}=0.356$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S |  |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\underset{R}{S}=50.4$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $\mathrm{S}_{0}=51.1$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S=50.7$ | mph |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth |
| :--- | :--- |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | $6 / 2 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 Southbound |
| Junction: | Merge from Mass Pike |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2015 Existing |
| Description: Low-cost Improvements to Bottleneck Location |  |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 55.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 5200 | vph |

On Ramp Data

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-flow speed on ramp | 25.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 1800 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 400 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
| Adjacent | (if one exists) |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | Yes |  |
| Volume on adjacent Ramp | 400 | vph |
| Position of adjacent Ramp | Upstream |  |
| Type of adjacent Ramp | On |  |
| Distance to adjacent Ramp | 800 | ft |


$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4342 | 4600 | No |

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\underset{R}{\mathrm{D}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}+0.0078 \mathrm{v} \underset{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{v}}+0.00627 \mathrm{~L} \quad=35.9 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $E$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $\mathrm{M}=0.601$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S |  |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\underset{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{~S}}=47.2$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S_{0}=50.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S=48.6$ | mph |

## 2025 With Improvements

1. 2025 AM Diverge to I-90
2. 2025 AM Diverge to Route 30
3. 2025 AM Merge onto Route 30
4. 2025 AM Merge onto I-90

Phone:
E-mail:

Fax:

Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst: | Seth |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | $6 / 1 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 Southbound |
| Junction: | Diverge to Mass Pike |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 Future Year |
| Description: Low-cost Improvements to Bottleneck Location |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway 55.0 mph
Volume on freeway 7450 vph
Off Ramp Data


$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

## Actual

 3541Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\quad \mathrm{D}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}-0.009 \mathrm{~L} \quad=12.2 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$

Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $B$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{S}}=0.731$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\underset{R}{S}=45.5$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S_{0}=55.2$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S=50.5$ | mph |

Phone:
E-mail:

Fax:

Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst: | Seth |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | $6 / 2 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 Southbound |
| Junction: | Diverge to Route 30 |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 Future Year |
| Description: Low-cost Improvements to Bottleneck Location |  |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
Diverge
3
60.0 mph
$5500 \quad$ vph

Off Ramp Data

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 1 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 25.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 950 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 500 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane |  | ft |
|  | (if one exists) |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | Yes |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp | 550 | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp | Downstream |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp | On |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp | 450 | ft |


$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

## Actual

 3870Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No

|  | Actual | 3870 | Max Desirable |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$

Density, $\quad \underset{R}{D}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}_{12}-0.009 \mathrm{~L}=33.0 \quad \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$

Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $D$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | D | $=0.653$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\mathrm{S}=48.3$ | mph |  |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{R}}$ | $=61.1$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | $=52.2$ | mph |

## Phone:

Fax:
E-mail:

Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | 6/2/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | AM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 Southbound |
| Junction: | Merge from Route 30 |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 Future Year |
| Description: Low-cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Location |


| Type of analysis | Merge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in freeway | 3 |  |
| Free-flow speed on freeway | 55.0 | mph |
| Volume on freeway | 4600 | vph |

Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
1
25.0 mph
$550 \quad \mathrm{vph}$
Length of first accel/decel lane 450 ft
Length of second accel/decel lane ft
Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

```
Yes
```

1900 vph
Downstream
On
850 ft

$\qquad$


Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3614 | 4600 | No |

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\underset{R}{\mathrm{D}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}+0.0078 \mathrm{v} \underset{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{v}}+0.00627 \mathrm{~L}=30.6 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $D$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $\mathrm{M}=0.443$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S |  |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\underset{R}{S}=49.2$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S_{0}=49.3$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $\mathrm{S}=49.3$ | mph |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis


Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Lane width | - | ft |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right-side lateral clearance | - | ft |
| Total ramp density, TRD | - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed: | Measured |  |
| FFS or BFFS | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lane width adjustment, fLW | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| TRD adjustment | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Flow rate, vp | 1952 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average passenger-car speed, S | 54.4 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 4 |  |
| Density, D | 35.9 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LOS | E |  |

## 2025 With Improvements

1. 2025 PM Diverge to I-90
2. $\mathbf{2 0 2 5}$ PM Diverge to Route 30
3. 2025 PM Merge onto Route 30
4. 2025 PM Merge onto I-90

Phone:
E-mail:

Fax:

Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst: | Seth |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | $6 / 1 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 Southbound |
| Junction: | Diverge to Mass Pike |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 Future Year |
| Description: Low-cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
Diverge
4
55.0 mph
$7500 \quad$ vph

Off Ramp Data

| Side of freeway | Right |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes in ramp | 2 |  |
| Free-Flow speed on ramp | 30.0 | mph |
| Volume on ramp | 2250 | vph |
| Length of first accel/decel lane | 1000 | ft |
| Length of second accel/decel lane | 500 | ft |
| Adjacent | (if one exists) |  |
| Does adjacent ramp exist? | Yes |  |
| Volume on adjacent ramp | 550 | vph |
| Position of adjacent ramp | Downstream |  |
| Type of adjacent ramp | Off |  |
| Distance to adjacent ramp | 1400 | ft |


$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

> Actual 3919

Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density,
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence
Len

| Intermediate speed variable, | D | $=0.713$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | S | $=45.7$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | S | $=56.0$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | 0 | S | $=50.5$ |
|  |  | mph |  |

Phone:
E-mail:

Fax:

Diverge Analysis $\qquad$

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Analyst: | Seth |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | $6 / 2 / 2015$ |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 Southbound |
| Junction: | Diverge to Route 30 |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 Future Year |
| Description: Low-cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Locations |

Freeway Data $\qquad$
Type of analysis
Number of lanes in freeway
Free-flow speed on freeway
Volume on freeway
Diverge
3
55.0 mph
$5400 \quad$ vph

Off Ramp Data


$\qquad$



Flow Entering Diverge Influence Area

## Actual

 3767Max Desirable 4400

Violation?
No

|  | Actual | 3767 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$

Density, $\quad \mathrm{D}=4.252+0.0086 \mathrm{v}-0.009 \mathrm{~L} \quad=\quad 32.1 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$

Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $D$
Speed Estimation

| Intermediate speed variable, | D | $=0.613$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\mathrm{S}=47.0$ | mph |  |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | S | $=55.4$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | S | $=49.9$ | mph |

## Phone:

Fax:
E-mail:

Merge Analysis $\qquad$

| Analyst: | Seth |
| :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co.: | CTPS |
| Date performed: | 6/2/2015 |
| Analysis time period: | PM Peak Hour |
| Freeway/Dir of Travel: | I-95 Southbound |
| Junction: | Merge from Route 30 |
| Jurisdiction: | Highway District 6 |
| Analysis Year: | 2025 Future year |
| Description: Low-cost | Improvements to Bottleneck Location |


Side of freeway
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
Volume on ramp
Length of first accel/decel lane
Length of second accel/decel lane

Right
Number of lanes in ramp
Free-flow speed on ramp
1
25.0 mph
$500 \quad \mathrm{vph}$
Length of first accel/decel lane
450
ft
Length of second accel/decel lane
ft

Adjacent Ramp Data (if one exists) $\qquad$
Does adjacent ramp exist?
Volume on adjacent Ramp
Position of adjacent Ramp
Type of adjacent Ramp
Distance to adjacent Ramp

Yes
1850 vph
Downstream
On
850 ft



Capacity Checks


Flow Entering Merge Influence Area

| Actual | Max Desirable | Violation? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3804 | 4600 | No |

Level of Service Determination (if not $F$ ) $\qquad$
Density, $\underset{R}{\mathrm{D}}=5.475+0.00734 \mathrm{v}+0.0078 \mathrm{v} \underset{\mathrm{R}}{\mathrm{v}}-0.00627 \mathrm{~L} \quad=32.1 \mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$
Level of service for ramp-freeway junction areas of influence $D$

| Intermediate speed variable, | $\mathrm{M}=0.474$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S |  |
| Space mean speed in ramp influence area, | $\underset{R}{S}=48.8$ | mph |
| Space mean speed in outer lanes, | $S_{0}=48.7$ | mph |
| Space mean speed for all vehicles, | $S=48.8$ | mph |

Phone:
Fax:
E-mail:

Operational Analysis


Speed Inputs and Adjustments $\qquad$

| Lane width | - | ft |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right-side lateral clearance | - | ft |
| Total ramp density, TRD | - | $\mathrm{ramps} / \mathrm{mi}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 4 |  |
| Free-flow speed: | Measured |  |
| FFS or BFFS | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lane width adjustment, fLW | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Lateral clearance adjustment, fLC | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| TRD adjustment | - | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |

LOS and Performance Measures $\qquad$

| Flow rate, vp | 1890 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{h} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Free-flow speed, FFS | 55.0 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Average passenger-car speed, S | 54.8 | $\mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Number of lanes, N | 4 |  |
| Density, D | 34.5 | $\mathrm{pc} / \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{ln}$ |
| Level of service, LOS | D |  |

## APPENDIX E

## MassDOT Highway Division Project Development Process

## Overview of the Project Development Process

Transportation decision-making is complex and can be influenced by legislative mandates, environmental regulations, financial limitations, agency programmatic commitments, and partnering opportunities. Decision-makers and reviewing agencies, when consulted early and often throughout the project development process, can ensure that all participants understand the potential impact these factors can have on project implementation. Project development is the process that takes a transportation improvement from concept through construction.

The MassDOT Highway Division has developed a comprehensive project development process which is contained in Chapter 2 of the MassDOT Highway Division's Project Development and Design Guide. The eight-step process covers a range of activities extending from identification of a project need, through completion of a set of finished contract plans, to construction of the project. The sequence of decisions made through the project development process progressively narrows the project focus and, ultimately, leads to a project that addresses the identified needs. The descriptions provided below are focused on the process for a highway project, but the same basic process will need to be followed for non-highway projects as well.

## 1. Needs Identification

For each of the locations at which an improvement is to be implemented, MassDOT leads an effort to define the problem, establishes project goals and objectives, and defines the scope of the planning needed for implementation. To that end, it has to complete a Project Need Form (PNF), which states in general terms the deficiencies or needs related to the transportation facility or location. The PNF documents the problems and explains why corrective action is needed. For this study, the information defining the need for the project will be drawn primarily, perhaps exclusively, from the present report. Also, at this point in the process, MassDOT meets with potential participants, such as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and community members, to allow for an informal review of the project.

The PNF is reviewed by the MassDOT Highway Division district office whose jurisdiction includes the location of the proposed project. MassDOT also sends the PNF to the MPO, for informational purposes. The outcome of this step determines whether the project requires further planning, whether it is already well supported by prior planning studies, and, therefore, whether it is ready to move forward into the design phase, or whether it should be dismissed from further consideration.

## 2. Planning

This phase will likely not be required for the implementation of the improvements proposed in this planning study, as this planning report should constitute the outcome of this step. However, in general, the purpose of this implementation step is for the project proponent to identify issues, impacts, and approvals that may need to be obtained, so that the subsequent design and permitting processes are understood.

The level of planning needed will vary widely, based on the complexity of the project. Typical tasks include: define the existing context, confirm project need, establish goals and objectives, initiate public outreach, define the project, collect data, develop and analyze alternatives, make recommendations, and provide documentation. Likely outcomes include consensus on the project definition to enable it to move forward into environmental documentation (if needed) and design, or a recommendation to delay the project or dismiss it from further consideration.

## 3. Project Initiation

At this point in the process, the proponent, MassDOT Highway Division, fills out a Project Initiation Form (PIF) for each improvement, which is reviewed by its Project Review Committee (PRC) and the MPO. The PRC is composed of the Chief Engineer, each District Highway Director, and representatives of the Project Management, Environmental, Planning, Right-ofWay, Traffic, and Bridge departments, and the MassDOT Federal Aid Program Office (FAPO). The PIF documents the project type and description, summarizes the project planning process, identifies likely funding and project management responsibility, and defines a plan for interagency and public participation. First the PRC reviews and evaluates the proposed project based on the MassDOT's statewide priorities and criteria. If the result is positive, MassDOT Highway Division moves the project forward to the design phase, and to programming review by the MPO. The PRC may provide a Project Management Plan to define roles and responsibilities for subsequent steps. The MPO review includes project evaluation based on the MPO's regional priorities and criteria. The MPO may assign project evaluation criteria score, a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) year, a tentative project category, and a tentative funding category.

## 4. Environmental Permitting, Design, and Right-of-Way Process

This step has four distinct but closely integrated elements: public outreach, environmental documentation and permitting (if required), design, and right-of-way acquisition (if required). The outcome of this step is a fully designed and permitted project ready for construction. However, a project does not have to be fully designed in order for the MPO to program it in the TIP. The sections below provide more detailed information on the four elements of this step of the project development process.

## Public Outreach

Continued public outreach in the design and environmental process is essential to maintain public support for the project and to seek meaningful input on the design elements. The public outreach is often in the form of required public hearings, but can also include less formal dialogues with those interested in and affected by a proposed project.

Environmental Documentation and Permitting
The project proponent, in coordination with the Environmental Services section of the MassDOT Highway Division, will be responsible for identifying and complying with all applicable federal, state, and local environmental laws and requirements. This includes determining the appropriate project category for both the Massachusetts Environmental Protection Act (MEPA) and the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). Environmental documentation and permitting is often completed in conjunction with the Preliminary Design phase described below.

Design
There are three major phases of design. The first is Preliminary Design, which is also referred to as the 25-percent submission. The major components of this phase include full survey of the project area, preparation of base plans, development of basic geometric layout, development of preliminary cost estimates, and submission of a functional design report. Preliminary Design, although not required to, is often completed in conjunction with the Environmental Documentation and Permitting. The next phase is Final Design, which is also referred to as the 75-percent and $100-$ percent submission. The major components of this phase include preparation of a subsurface exploratory plan (if required), coordination of utility relocations, development of traffic management plans through construction zones, development of final cost estimates, and refinement and finalization of the construction plans. Once Final Design is complete, a full set of Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS\&E) is developed for the project.

Right-of-Way Acquisition
A separate set of Right-of-Way plans are required for any project that requires land acquisition or easements. The plans must identify the existing and proposed layout lines, easements, property lines, names of property owners, and the dimensions and areas of estimated takings and easements.

## 5. Programming (Identification of Funding)

Programming, which typically begins during the design phase, can actually occur at any time during the process, from planning to design. In this step, which is distinct from project initiation, the proponent requests that the MPO place the project in the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The proponent requesting the project's listing on the TIP can be the community or it can be one of the MPO member agencies (the Regional Planning Agency, MassDOT, and the Regional Transit Authority). The MPO then considers the project in terms of state and regional needs, evaluation criteria, and compliance with the regional Transportation Plan and decides whether to place it in the draft TIP for public review and then in the final TIP.

## 6. Procurement

Following project design and programming of a highway project, the MassDOT Highway Division publishes a request for proposals. It then reviews the bids and awards the contract to the qualified bidder with the lowest bid.

## 7. Construction

After a construction contract is awarded, MassDOT Highway Division and the contractor develop a public participation plan and a management plan for the construction process.

## 8. Project Assessment

The purpose of this step is to receive constituents' comments on the project development process and the project's design elements. MassDOT Highway Division can apply what is learned in this process to future projects.

## Project Development Schematic Timetable

| Description | Schedule Influence | Typical Duration |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Step I: Problem/Need/Opportunity Identification The proponent completes a Project Need Form (PNF). This form is then reviewed by the MassDOT District office which provides guidance to the proponent on the subsequent steps of the process. | The Project Need Form has been developed so that it can be prepared quickly by the proponent, including any supporting data that is readily available. The District office shall return comments to the proponent within one month of PNF submission. | 1 to 3 months |
| Step II: Planning <br> Project planning can range from agreement that the problem should be addressed through a clear solution to a detailed analysis of alternatives and their impacts. | For some projects, no planning beyond preparation of the Project Need Form is required. Some projects require a planning study centered on specific project issues associated with the proposed solution or a narrow family of alternatives. More complex projects will likely require a detailed alternatives analysis. | Project Planning Report: 3 to 24+ months |
| Step III: Project Initiation <br> The proponent prepares and submits a Project Initiation Form (PIF) and a Transportation Evaluation Criteria (TEC) form in this step. The PIF and TEC are informally reviewed by the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and MassDOT District office, and formally reviewed by the PRC. | The PIF includes refinement of the preliminary information contained in the PNF. Additional information summarizing the results of the planning process, such as the Project Planning Report, are included with the PIF and TEC. The schedule is determined by PRC staff review (dependent on project complexity) and meeting schedule. | 1 to 4 months |
| Step IV: Design, Environmental, and Right of Way <br> The proponent completes the project design. Concurrently, the proponent completes necessary environmental permitting analyses and files applications for permits. Any right of way needed for the project is identified and the acquisition process begins. | The schedule for this step is dependent upon the size of the project and the complexity of the design, permitting, and right-of-way issues. Design review by the MassDOT district and appropriate sections is completed in this step. | 3 to 48+ months |
| Step V: Programming <br> The MPO considers the project in terms of its regional priorities and determines whether or not to include the project in the draft Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which is then made available for public comment. The TIP includes a project description and funding source. | The schedule for this step is subject to each MPO's programming cycle and meeting schedule. It is also possible that the MPO will not include a project in its Draft TIP based on its review and approval procedures. | 3 to 12+ months |
| Step VI: Procurement The project is advertised for construction and a contract awarded. | Administration of competing projects can influence the advertising schedule. | 1 to 12 months |
| Step VII: Construction The construction process is initiated including public notification and any anticipated public involvement. Construction continues to project completion. | The duration for this step is entirely dependent upon project complexity and phasing. | 3 to 60+ months |
| Step VIII: Project Assessment The construction period is complete and project elements and processes are evaluated on a voluntary basis. | The duration for this step is dependent upon the proponent's approach to this step and any follow-up required. | 1 month |

Source: MassDOT Highway Division Project Development and Design Guide
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