

100 NORTH MAIN STREET
O'FALLON, MISSOURI 63366 636.240.2000

FACSIMILE 636.978-4144
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$1 / 18 / 23$

## RE: Request for Qualifications: RFQ 23-005 West Terra Lane Realignment

Dear Consultant:
The City of O'Fallon is requesting the services of a consulting engineering firm to perform the described professional services for the project included on the attached list. If your firm would like to be considered for these consulting services, you may express your interest by responding to the appropriate office, which is indicated on the attachments. Please limit your letter of interest to no more than 8 pages. This letter should include any information which might help us in the selection process, such as the persons or team you would assign to the project, project approach, the backgrounds of those individuals, and other projects your company has recently completed or are now active, previous federally-funded project experience, experience with right-of-way services including displacements, and any other relevant information.

It is required that your firm be prequalified with MoDOT and listed in MoDOT's Approved Consultant Prequalification List, or your firm will be considered non-responsive.

It is required that your firm's Statement of Qualification (RSMo 8.285 through 8.291) and an Affidavit of Compliance with the federal work authorization program along with a copy of your firm's E-Verify Memorandum of Understanding (15 CSR 60-15.020) be submitted with your firm's Letter of Interest. These documents are not included in the total page count limit.

We request all submittals be received by 12:00 p.m. local time on Thursday February 23, 2023. Submittals shall be clearly labeled RFQ 23-005 West Terra Lane Realignment. Letter of interest should not exceed 8 pages total. A page is defined as $8-1 / 2$ by 11 inches single sided.

The City requires one original copy of the letter of interest and all supporting documentation with a copy of all documents contained on a flash/thumb drive delivered in an envelope labeled "RFQ 23-005 West Terra Lane Realignment" to:

Christine Grabin, Purchasing Agent
100 North Main Street
O'Fallon, MO 63366
cgrabin@ofallon.mo.us
Phone 636-379-5527

Any questions regarding the project may be submitted to the project manager, Paul Talimonchuk, at Ptalimonchuk@ ofallon.mo.us. We request any questions be submitted no later than 2:00 PM local time on February 21, 2023.

Sincerely,
City of O'Fallon


Paul Talimonchuk
Project Manager
Attachments:

- LPA Project information
- BROOKS ACT CONSULTANT SELECTION INFORMATION
- Example Rating Sheet
- Redacted County Road Board Application

| City/County_St. Charles | W. Terra Lane |
| :---: | :---: |
| Federal Aid No: NA | City is looking to apply for federal funds for Construction. |
| Location: W. Terra Ln from N. Central Dr 2,750 lf to the West. |  |
| Proposed Improvement: | Realignment of W. Terra Lane to allow for congetstion mitigation at the intersection of Bryan Road, and future connection points for Deer Creek Extension and any Future I-70 Bryan Road interchange upgrades performed by others. |
| Length: | 1.5 mi |
| Approximate Construction Cost: | \$12,000,000.00 |
| DBE Goal Determination: | 0\% |
| Professional Services OJT | Not required |
| Consultant Services Required: | Major Project scope items include: <br> - Concept and traffic study to review various layouts, intersections configurations (signals, roundabouts, locations), and performance. Proof of concept. <br> - New Roadway and intersection design. <br> - Geotechnical investigation and reports <br> - Hazardous Material Assessments <br> - Environmental Clearances <br> - Cultural Clearances <br> - ADA Improvements <br> - Sidewalk/Pedestrian Improvements <br> - Signal or Roundabout Improvements <br> - Lighting <br> - Storm Sewer <br> - Retaining Walls <br> - Utility coordination and plans of adjustment <br> - Right-of-Way Services including negotiation, displacements, relocations, and acquisitions <br> - Appraisals \& Review Appraisals for Right of Way Takings <br> - Final design and specifications to meet MoDOT Standards <br> - Cost Estimates at various milestones <br> - Open House public meetings |



|  | - Prepare all ROW and easement exhibits, legal descriptions, and all other work associated to acquisition. <br> - Negotiate and acquire ROW. Including handling of displacements and/or relocations. <br> - Prepare draft final plans (95\%) and contract documents for bidding. Submit draft final plans and contract documents. <br> - Provide final construction plans and contract documents for bidding <br> - Prepare and submit all required documentation for Plans Specs and Estimates (PS\&E) <br> - Provide exhibits, material, and staff for open house style public meetings <br> - Facilitate utility coordination including utility relocation designs and plans of adjustmens. Include potholing and survey of existing utilities to determine levels of conflict. <br> - Respond to bidder questions and provide addenda as needed. <br> - Provide shop drawing review and clarification of plans during the construction phase services <br> - Attend construction coordination meetings as required. <br> - Attend on-site visits during construction during critical portions of work, to ensure compliance. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Other Comments: | Project includes coordination with the St. Charles County Road Board. <br> It is anticipated that federal funding will be requested for portions of this project and that federal reuquirements will be followed for the design phase to allow for inclusion of federal funds if awarded. |
| Contact: | Paul Talimonchuk, Project Manager 100 North Main Street <br> O'Fallon, MO 63366 |


|  | $636-379-5513$ <br> ptalimonchuk@ ofallon.mo.us |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $12: 00$ pm February 23, 2023 |
| Deadline: | 123 |
| S |  |

Submittals shall be clearly labeled RFQ 23-005 West Terra Lane Realignment. Letter of interest should not exceed 8 pages total. A page is defined as $8-1 / 2$ by 11 inches single sided.

It is required that your firm's Statement of Qualification (RSMo 8.285 through 8.291) and an Affidavit of Compliance with the federal work authorization program along with a copy of your firm's E-Verify Memorandum of Understanding (15 CSR 60-15.020) be submitted with your firm's Letter of Interest. These documents are not included in the total page count limit.

The City requires one original copy of the letter of interest and all supporting documentation with a copy of all documents contained on a flash/thumb drive delivered in an envelope labeled "RFQ 23-005 West Terra Lane Realignment" to:

Christine Grabin, Purchasing Agent
100 North Main Street
O'Fallon, MO 63366
cgrabin@ofallon.mo.us
Phone 636-379-5527

## BROOKS ACT CONSULTANT SELECTION INFORMATION

Pursuant to the Brooks Act for Consultant Selection - the following criteria will be the basis for selection. Additional criteria can be added with the approval of Central Office Design- MoDOT.

| Experience and Technical Competence - | 30 | Max Points |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Capacity and Capability - | 30 | Max Points |
| Past Record of Performance - | 30 | Max Points |

## O'Fallon Rubric for Evaluating Consultants

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Point Range Legend } \\
30-21=\text { excellent } \quad 20-11=\text { adequate } \quad 10-1=\text { fair } \quad 0=\text { inadequate }
\end{gathered}
$$

## Experience, Technical Competence \& Project Approach

Rate the qualifications of employees designated to this specific job, for example, assigning between 30 and 21 points for the most qualified personnel. Those rated between 20 and 11 points are considered good but lack extensive experience in the particular type of service desired. A value of 10 or less points is assigned to firms with well-qualified personnel who have no experience in the proposed area of work.

## Capacity \& Capability

Evaluate the consulting firm for experience on similar and related types of work it has performed. For example, assigning between 30 and 21points is for many years of established practice in the proposed type of work and related studies. A value of between 20 and 11 points may be assigned for above average experience, while 10 or less points may be given for experience adequate to perform the contract. The points for a firm with little operating experience in the selected field may be reduced further. Reduce the rating for a level of personnel inadequate to handle the firm's indicated workload. The submitted schedule will also be evaluated as part of this portion of the rankings.

## Past Record of Performance

Rate the adequacy of firms that have previously performed work under contract in related fields, assigning a maximum and reducing the points for less experience.

# Terra Lane Realignment 

Sponsor

Project Type Other
O'Fallon

Project No. RB22-000030


## Project Description

The purpose of this application is for the design of the realignment of West Terra Lane to allow for congestion mitigation at the intersection of Bryan Road and West Terra Lane, while also providing for future connection points for Deer Creek Extension and any future I-70/Bryan Road Interchange upgrades to be performed by others. The limits of the proposed West Terra Lane Realignment will extend from the intersection of West Terra Lane and North Central Drive to a tie in point approximately 2,750 linear feet to the West. As part of the design of this project, additional traffic data at the intersection of W. Terra Ln. and Bryan Rd. will be gathered and studied to determine the optimal configuration.

The existing I-70 Bryan Road interchange configuration and its close proximity to West Terra Lane prevents traffic volumes from being adequately conveyed through this area. West Terra Lane is currently located within 375 feet of the traffic signal associated with the I-70 westbound on/off ramps. This close spacing impedes the current traffic flow and will only become worse as traffic volumes increase. It has been observed that vehicle queues for west bound West Terra Lane traffic extend east on West Terra Lane to North Central Drive when school dismisses from St. Dominic and at times during rush hour. Motorists must wait through numerous cycles of the light to get through the intersection. The design of the West Terra Lane Realignment will examine relocating the Bryan Road and West Terra Lane intersection approximately 325 feet to the north, thus providing a total of approximately 700 feet of separation between the westbound I-70 on/off ramp. It is expected that by year 2030, without this relocation, vehicle queuing would become excessive through the West Terra Lane intersection and onto Interstate I-70 westbound off ramp. This is based on information provided in a draft innovative finance application cost sharing program that was compiled by St. Charles County in 2009.

The design would include but not limited to Design of West Terra Lane realignment, CE and cultural clearances as future right of way will require purchasing of structures and relocations, geotechnical analysis, survey, and roadway design.

The final products associated with this application are:
Preliminary Plans
ROW Plans
Final Construction Plans (PS\&E)
NEPA Documents
Utility Coordination
Open Houses
Appraisals of affected properties
This application is for design only and the City is seeking an 80/20 split. If the City is awarded this project our future plan is to pursue CMAQ funding for right of way and construction.


PROJECT INFORMATION

Permit \#:
Name:
Limits:
Lane Miles:
Federal Functional Classification:
Anticipated useful life of the proposed improvements (years):

## Other Information

Traffic Volume ADT:
Construction Year:

RB22-000030
Terra Lane Realignment
The limits of the proposed West Terra Lane Realignment will extend from the intersection of West Terra Lane and North Central Drive to a tie in point approximately 2,750 linear feet to the West.
1.5

3 - Major Collector
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## Road Board Application

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this application is for the design of the realignment of West Terra Lane to allow for congestion mitigation at the intersection of Bryan Road and West Terra Lane, while also providing for future connection points for Deer Creek Extension and any future I-70/Bryan Road Interchange upgrades to be performed by others. The limits of the proposed West Terra Lane Realignment will extend from the intersection of West Terra Lane and North Central Drive to a tie in point approximately 2,750 linear feet to the West. As part of the design of this project, additional traffic data at the intersection of W. Terra Ln. and Bryan Rd. will be gathered and studied to determine the optimal configuration.

The existing I-70 Bryan Road interchange configuration and its close proximity to West Terra Lane prevents traffic volumes from being adequately conveyed through this area. West Terra Lane is currently located within 375 feet of the traffic signal associated with the I-70 westbound on/off ramps. This close spacing impedes the current traffic flow and will only become worse as traffic volumes increase. It has been observed that vehicle queues for west bound West Terra Lane traffic extend east on West Terra Lane to North Central Drive when school dismisses from St. Dominic and at times during rush hour. Motorists must wait through numerous cycles of the light to get through the intersection. The design of the West Terra Lane Realignment will examine relocating the Bryan Road and West Terra Lane intersection approximately 325 feet to the north, thus providing a total of approximately 700 feet of separation between the westbound I-70 on/off ramp. It is expected that by year 2030, without this relocation, vehicle queuing would become excessive through the West Terra Lane intersection and onto Interstate I-70 westbound off ramp. This is based on information provided in a draft innovative finance application cost sharing program that was compiled by St. Charles County in 2009.

The design would include but not limited to Design of West Terra Lane realignment, CE and cultural clearances as future right of way will require purchasing of structures and relocations, geotechnical analysis, survey, and roadway design.

The final products associated with this application are:
Preliminary Plans
ROW Plans
Final Construction Plans (PS\&E)
NEPA Documents
Utility Coordination
Open Houses
Appraisals of affected properties
This application is for design only and the City is seeking an $80 / 20$ split. If the City is awarded this project our future plan is to pursue CMAQ funding for right of way and construction

CONTACT INFORMATION

Sponsoring Agency:
Contact Person Name:
Title:
Telephone Number:
E-mail Address:
SIGNATURE

City of O'Fallon
Anthony Friedman
(636) 379-5492
tfriedman@ofallon.mo.us
$\xrightarrow{\text { hytan_ }}$
signature
date



NB Bryan Rd @ I-70


NB Bryan Rd @ W. Terra Ln


WB W. Terra Ln @ Bryan Rd.


EB W. Terra Ln looking at Bryan
Rd intersection


Gentleman Rd Looking towards
Bryan Road intersection


## Utilities Continued



## WEST TERRA LN REALIGNMENT - CONCEPTUAL PLAN



WEST TERRA LN REALIGNMENT - CONCEPTUAL REMOVALS


| To: | Mr. John Griefzu, PE <br> Ms. Amanda Brauer, PE, PTOE |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | Chris Beard, PE, PTOE <br> Tyson King, PE, PTOE <br> Lorne Jackson, PE <br> Collin Wilcox, PE <br> Fasil Sagir |
| Date: | August 31, 2020 |
| Subject: | Interchange Study <br> I-70 at Route 79/Salt Lick Road <br> I-70 at Bryan Road |

On behalf of St. Charles County, Lochmueller Group completed the following traffic and safety analysis and conceptual design of interchange improvements at I-70 and Route 79/Salt Lick Rd in St. Peters, Missouri and at I-70 and Bryan Rd in O'Fallon, Missouri. The purpose of this study was to develop and evaluate alternative interchange configurations for each location. The alternative configurations are intended to address congestion and safety and accommodate forecasted traffic increases in the future. This study includes traffic and safety analyses, conceptual designs of each alternative, and cost estimates for design and construction.

This study expanded upon previous analyses that evaluated a fourth through lane in each direction on I70 between Route 79 and Bryan Rd. The previously recommended configuration with four lanes in the I70 Lane Addition Study was incorporated into this analysis as an assumed project.

## I-70 AT ROUTE 79/SALT LICK ROAD

Based on a screening of preliminary alternatives, two alternatives were developed for the l-70 interchange with Route 79/Salt Lick Rd, as follows:

- Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI)
- Partial Cloverleaf Interchange

The existing interchange is a diamond augmented by a southbound-to-eastbound loop ramp. The diverging diamond alternative would remove the loop ramp to facilitate a four-ramp interchange typical of a diverging diamond. In addition, the ramps between southbound Route 79 and Terra Ln north of the interchange would be shifted approximately 500 feet north to increase their separation from the $1-70$ ramps. The relocated ramps would intersect Terra Ln opposite Commerce Dr.

The diverging diamond alternative would include dual-lane southbound left-turn and northbound rightturn movements onto eastbound I-70. These movements would feed a single two-lane eastbound on-
ramp. Therefore, this alternative would incorporate a traffic signal to assign right-of-way where these two movements merge together at the ramp.

Both alternatives would address the Salt Lick Rd intersection with Veterans Memorial Pkwy to the immediate south of the interchange. A dedicated southbound right-turn lane would be added on Salt Lick Rd, and the eastbound approach would be widened to provide two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane.

The partial cloverleaf alternative would retain the existing southbound-to-eastbound loop ramp and add a complementary northbound-to-westbound loop ramp. In addition, the I-70 eastbound off-ramp would be relocated to Veterans Memorial Pkwy opposite an entrance to the 79 Crossing Shopping Center, where a roundabout would be provided. Relocating the terminus to Veterans Memorial Pkwy would eliminate the ramp's existing unsignalized intersection on Route 79/Salt Lick Rd.

On the north side of the interchange, the addition of a northbound-to-westbound loop ramp would simplify the ramp terminal intersection, as only the westbound off-ramp and north-south through traffic would be served by the traffic signal. Southbound traffic on Route 79 destined to $1-70$ would be barrierseparated from the through lanes, enabling those movements to by-pass the signal entirely and operate as free-flow.

To facilitate this configuration, the ramps between southbound Route 79 and Terra Ln would be modified. The on-ramp from Terra Ln to southbound Route 79 would be relocated north, and the ramp from southbound Route 79 to Terra Ln would be integrated with the on-ramp to westbound I-70, where it would branch off as a right-turn movement onto Terra Ln. A roundabout would be provided on Terra Ln to facilitate U-turn maneuvers for traffic wanting to make a left-turn onto Terra Ln from southbound Route 79.

## Traffic Operations Analysis

A design year traffic operations analysis was performed to evaluate each interchange alternative. A 2040 design year was assumed for consistency with the I-70 Lane Addition Study. A No Build traffic analysis of 2040 conditions revealed failing levels of service, as the existing interchange configuration would be unable to accommodate design year traffic volumes. Since the No Build results are not a meaningful benchmark, they were omitted from this report for brevity.

Traffic forecasts from the I-70 O'Fallon Access Justification Report and outputs from the St. Charles County Regional Travel Demand Model served as the basis for the traffic forecasts developed for this study. Forecasts from both sources were generally consistent, but the forecasts from the previous study were determined to be more reasonable, particularly for lower-volume movements which are difficult for travel demand models to accurately interpret. Therefore, the previous forecasts were utilized for this analysis. The 2040 peak hour traffic volume forecasts are summarized in Appendix A.

The traffic analysis focused on operating conditions at the Route 79/Salt Lick Rd intersections with the I70 ramps and Veterans Memorial Pkwy as well as any additional intersections affected by the alternatives, along with weaving along Route 79 between the interchange and ramps to/from Terra Ln.
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Note that the traffic modeling included mainline I-70 and the interchange ramp merges and diverges, although the performance of those components is not reported in this summary, as it was substantially addressed by the previous I-70 Lane Addition Study.

The traffic analysis was performed in VISSIM, which is a microsimulation model that replicates individual vehicles and their interactions. Hence, it is an appropriate tool to utilize in locations with complex traffic movements, such as interchanges. In addition to VISSIM, a Synchro model was developed for signal timing development and optimization.

The traffic operational performance was graded in accordance with six levels of traffic service, as established by the Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition (HCM), published by the Transportation Research Board. Levels of services (LOS), which range from LOS A ("free flow") to LOS F ("oversaturated"), are measures of traffic flow that consider factors such as speed, delay, interruptions, safety, and driver comfort and convenience. LOS C is commonly used for design purposes, and was therefore established as the target for this study.

For intersections, levels of service criteria are based on the delay experienced by motorists traveling through the intersection. The thresholds for signalized intersection levels of service are summarized in Table 1. For weaving segments, levels of service criteria are based on density or the number of vehicles occupying a given amount of space along a roadway. The thresholds for weaving along an expressway facility such as Route 79 are summarized in Table 2, based on the multilane highway criteria.

Table 1: Signalized Intersection Levels of Service Criteria

| LEVEL OF <br> SERVICE | CONTROL DELAY PER <br> VEHICLE |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $<10$ |
| B | $>10-20$ |
| C | $>20-35$ |
| D | $>35-55$ |
| E | $>55-80$ |
| F | $>80$ |

Values reported in seconds per vehicle

Table 2: Weaving Segments Levels of Service Criteria

| LEVEL OF <br> SERVICE | CONTROL DELAY PER <br> VEHICLE |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $<12$ |
| B | $>12-24$ |
| C | $>24-32$ |
| D | $>32-36$ |
| E | $>36-40$ |
| F | $>40$ |

Values reported in vehicles per mile per lane
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Forecasted operating conditions with both the Diverging Diamond and Partial Cloverleaf are summarized in Table 3 for the morning peak hour and in Table 4 for the afternoon peak hour. More detailed summaries including operations by intersection approach and movement are summarized in Appendix B. During each peak hour, both alternatives would perform favorably, with each intersection operating at LOS B overall or better. The partial cloverleaf would operate with less overall delay as compared to the diverging diamond.

Specifically, the Route 79 intersection with the I-70 westbound ramps would experience $18 \%$ to $33 \%$ less delay with the partial cloverleaf alternative, due to fewer conflicting movements and signal phases. In addition, the diverging diamond includes a signalized intersection with the I-70 eastbound ramps that is omitted in the partial cloverleaf alternative. The diverging diamond also includes a signal to manage traffic turning onto the I-70 eastbound on-ramp from the north and south; it would operate efficiently at LOS A during both peak hours.

The partial cloverleaf alternative includes two roundabout intersections - one on Veterans Memorial Pkwy and one on Terra Ln. Both of these intersections would operate with minimal delay (LOS A), but neither are incorporated into the diverging diamond alternative.

Table 3: I-70 at Route 79/Salt Lick Rd Overall Intersection LOS \& Delay - AM Peak Hour

| INTERSECTION | DIVERGING DIAMOND | PARTIAL CLOVERLEAF |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Route 79 at I-70 WB Ramps | $\mathrm{B}(18.0)$ | $\mathrm{B}(11.9)$ |
| Route 79 at I-70 EB Ramps | $\mathrm{B}(18.3)$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| I-70 EB On-Ramp Signal | $\mathrm{A}(8.1)$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Salt Lick Rd at Veterans Memorial Pkwy | $\mathrm{B}(15.9)$ | $\mathrm{B}(17.0)$ |
| Veterans Memorial Pkwy at I-70 EB Ramp | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{A}(3.6)$ |
| Terra Ln Roundabout | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{A}(0.9)$ |

Delay reported in seconds per vehicle

Table 4: I-70 at Route 79/Salt Lick Rd Overall Intersection LOS \& Delay - PM Peak Hour

| INTERSECTION | DIVERGING DIAMOND | PARTIAL CLOVERLEAF |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Route 79 at I-70 WB Ramps | $\mathrm{B}(16.5)$ | $\mathrm{B}(13.5)$ |
| Route 79 at I-70 EB Ramps | $\mathrm{B}(12.5)$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| I-70 EB On-Ramp Signal | $\mathrm{A}(8.4)$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Salt Lick Rd at Veterans Memorial Pkwy | $\mathrm{B}(13.9)$ | $\mathrm{B}(15.4)$ |
| Veterans Memorial Pkwy at I-70 EB Ramp | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{A}(3.2)$ |
| Terra Ln Roundabout | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{A}(1.2)$ |

Delay reported in seconds per vehicle

Route 79 contains weaving segments between the I-70 westbound ramps and ramps leading to/from Terra Ln. These weaving segments would be affected by ramp relocations and changes in weaving distance imposed by each alternative. Weaving operations along northbound and southbound Route 79 are summarized in Table 5.

As shown, the weaving segments in both alternatives would operate acceptably at LOS C or better. However, the partial cloverleaf alternative would outperform the diverging diamond relative to southbound weaving during the morning peak hour. This is attributable to the free-flow movements from southbound Route 79 onto both eastbound and westbound I-70 in the partial cloverleaf alternative, compared to the diverging diamond alternative which channels these movements through traffic signals.

Table 5: Route 79 Weaving Segments

| PEAK <br> HOUR | SEGMENT | DIVERGING DIAMOND |  | PARTIAL CLOVERLEAF |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Density | Speed | LOS | Density | Speed |
| AM | SB Btw Terra Ln \& I-70 WB Ramps | C | 28.5 | 20.5 | B | 15.3 | 40.7 |
| AM | NB Btw I-70 WB Ramps \& Terra Ln | A | 9.8 | 41.6 | A | 9.4 | 41.4 |
| PM | SB Btw Terra Ln \& I-70 WB Ramps | B | 23.1 | 22.6 | B | 12.6 | 42.0 |
| PM | NB Btw I-70 WB Ramps \& Terra Ln | B | 13.8 | 43.9 | B | 15.1 | 40.1 |

Density reported in vehicles per mile per lane
Speed reported in miles per hour

## Safety Analysis

A safety analysis was performed in accordance on methodologies outlined in the Highway Safety Manual (HSM). The HSM provides quantitative analysis to support decision making for improving transportation safety. Its methodology relies upon safety performance functions to correlate crash expectancy with location-specific roadway characteristics, such as the number of lanes, presence of shoulders, speeds, and traffic volumes.

Given the various types of roadway facilities comprising each interchange, multiple HSM tools were utilized. Specifically, the HSM spreadsheet was utilized for urban and suburban arterial intersections and segments, while iSATe was used to analyze ramps, and IHSDM was used to analyze roundabouts and arterials segments beyond the scope of the HSM spreadsheet. Diagrams indicating the geographic scope of each HSM tool are provided in Appendix C.

The HSM predictive methodology forecasts relative changes in crashes between the No Build and Alternative scenarios. Historical crash data (2014-2018) from MoDOT was utilized to weight predicted crashes based on actual crash data for the study area. As summarized in Table 6, the diverging diamond alternative would yield the larger reduction in crashes by eliminating nearly 15 crashes annually. The partial cloverleaf option would only reduce crashes by 5 annually.

Table 6: Highway Safety Manual Analysis Results I-70 at Route 79/Salt Lick Rd

| ALTERNATIVE | EXPECTED AVERAGE CRASH FREQUENCY (CRASHES/YEAR) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fatal \& Injury | Property Damage Only | Total |
| No Build | 27.1 | 80.8 | 107.9 |
| Diverging Diamond | 24.1 | 69.2 | 93.3 |
| Partial Cloverleaf | 26.5 | 76.5 | 103.1 |

## Conceptual Design \& Cost Estimate

A conceptual design and cost estimate was prepared for both alternatives. The design schematics are attached as Appendix D. The conceptual cost estimate is provided in Appendix E. The preliminary estimate for design and construction of the diverging diamond alternative is $\$ 29$ million. The preliminary estimate for design and construction of the partial cloverleaf alternative is $\$ 41$ million. These amounts include conservative estimates for utility relocations, right-of-way acquisitions, and annual cost escalations. In addition, a 20\% contingency was applied.

## I-70 AT BRYAN ROAD

Based on a screening of preliminary alternatives, two alternatives were developed for the I-70 interchange with Bryan Rd, as follows:

- Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI)
- Expanded Diamond Interchange

The existing interchange is a diamond, so the expanded diamond alternative would simply add turning lanes at both the north and south ramp terminal intersections and widen the Bryan Rd overpass at I-70.

Both alternatives would address adjacent intersections along Bryan Rd to the immediate north and south of the interchange. Terra Ln would be realigned to run behind existing businesses along the north side of the road. A new intersection with Bryan Rd would be provided with increased separation from the interchange.

The intersection of Bryan Rd with Veterans Memorial Pkwy would be upgraded for additional traffic capacity. Specifically, the eastbound approach would be widened to provide two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane. Additionally, Bryan Rd itself would be expanded to provide three through lanes in each direction at Veterans Memorial Pkwy. This widening would be extended south approximately 1,000 feet to the driveway of the $O^{\prime}$ Fallon Police Department and Municipal Court. This additional capacity would help disperse traffic from the interchange.

Both interchange alternatives also assume that Deer Creek Rd is extended south to Terra Ln, where it would align opposite Bryan Rd to create a continuous north-south corridor. This project is a future year project of the City of O'Fallon and is reflected in their Comprehensive Plan.

## Traffic Operations Analysis

A design year traffic operations analysis was performed to evaluate each interchange alternative. A 2040 design year was assumed for consistency with the I-70 Lane Addition Study. A No Build traffic analysis revealed failing levels of service, as the existing interchange configuration is unable to accommodate design year traffic volumes. Since the No Build results are not a meaningful benchmark, they were omitted from this report for brevity.

Traffic forecasts from the I-70 O'Fallon Access Justification Report and outputs from the St. Charles County Regional Travel Demand Model served as the basis for the traffic forecasts developed for this study. Forecasts from both sources were generally consistent. Select through movements along Bryan
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Rd were higher in the travel demand model due to the Deer Creek Rd extension, which may not have been considered previously. The previous forecasts were utilized except instances where the travel demand model forecasts were notably higher. The 2040 peak hour traffic volume forecasts are summarized in Appendix A.

The traffic analysis focused on operating conditions at the Bryan Rd intersections with Terra Ln, the I-70 ramps, and Veterans Memorial Pkwy. Note that the traffic modeling included mainline I-70 and the interchange ramp merges and diverges, although the performance of those components is not reported in this summary, as it was substantially addressed by the previous I-70 Lane Addition Study.

The traffic analysis was performed in VISSIM, which is a microsimulation model that replicates individual vehicles and their interactions. Hence, it is an appropriate tool to utilize in locations with complex traffic movements, such as interchanges. In addition to VISSIM, a Synchro model was developed for signal timing development and optimization.

The traffic operational performance of the Bryan Rd intersections was graded in accordance with six levels of traffic service, as established by the Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition (HCM), published by the Transportation Research Board. Levels of services (LOS), which range from LOS A ("free flow") to LOS F ("oversaturated"), are measures of traffic flow that consider factors such as speed, delay, interruptions, safety, and driver comfort and convenience.

For intersections, levels of service criteria are based on the delay experienced by motorists traveling through the intersection. The thresholds for signalized intersection levels of service are summarized in Table 6. LOS C is commonly used for design purposes, and was therefore established as the target for this study.

Table 6: Signalized Intersection Levels of Service Criteria

| LEVEL OF <br> SERVICE | CONTROL DELAY PER <br> VEHICLE |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $<10$ |
| B | $>10-20$ |
| C | $>20-35$ |
| D | $>35-55$ |
| E | $>55-80$ |
| F | $>80$ |

Values reported in seconds per vehicle

Forecasted operating conditions with both the Diverging Diamond and Expanded Diamond are summarized in Table $\mathbf{7}$ for the morning peak hour and in Table 8 for the afternoon peak hour. More detailed summaries including operations by intersection approach and movement are summarized in Appendix B. I-70 at Bryan Road
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Table 7: I-70 at Bryan Rd Overall Intersection LOS \& Delay - AM Peak Hour

| INTERSECTION | DIVERGING DIAMOND | EXPANDED DIAMOND |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Bryan Rd/Deer Creek Rd at Terra Ln | $\mathrm{C}(21.9)$ | $\mathrm{C}(22.3)$ |
| Bryan Rd at I-70 WB Ramps | $\mathrm{B}(16.4)$ | $\mathrm{B}(18.4)$ |
| Bryan Rd at I-70 EB Ramps | $\mathrm{B}(14.7)$ | $\mathrm{B}(19.9)$ |
| Bryan Rd at Veterans Memorial Pkwy | $\mathrm{C}(25.4)$ | $\mathrm{C}(23.8)$ |

Delay reported in seconds per vehicle

Table 8: I-70 at Bryan Rd Overall Intersection LOS \& Delay - PM Peak Hour

| INTERSECTION | DIVERGING DIAMOND | EXPANDED DIAMOND |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Bryan Rd/Deer Creek Rd at Terra Ln | $\mathrm{C}(28.3)$ | $\mathrm{C}(29.4)$ |
| Bryan Rd at I-70 WB Ramps | $\mathrm{B}(17.9)$ | $\mathrm{C}(29.7)$ |
| Bryan Rd at I-70 EB Ramps | B (17.1) | $\mathrm{B}(19.1)$ |
| Bryan Rd at Veterans Memorial Pkwy | $\mathrm{C}(32.6)$ | $\mathrm{D}(41.4)$ |

Delay reported in seconds per vehicle
During the morning peak hour, both interchange configurations would perform favorably, with each ramp terminal intersection operating at LOS B overall. While the overall levels of service would be identical, the performance of individual movements would vary, as the diverging diamond configuration inherently prioritizes left-turn movements, whereas the expanded diamond configuration naturally promotes more efficient through movements. Adjacent intersections at Terra Ln and at Veterans Memorial Pkwy would operate acceptably at LOS C overall.

During the afternoon peak hour, the diverging diamond interchange would outperform the expanded diamond, primarily due to more efficient servicing of the heavy left-turn movements onto and off of the westbound $\mathrm{I}-70$ ramps. With the diverging diamond, the Bryan Rd intersection with the I-70 westbound ramps would operate at LOS B overall, with all movements operating at LOS C or better. Conversely, the same intersection with the expanded diamond would operate at LOS C overall and the northbound leftturn movement would operate at LOS F.

The adjacent intersections at Terra Ln and at Veterans Memorial Pkwy would operate acceptably at LOS C or LOS D overall during the afternoon peak hour. However, despite expanded eastbound capacity and the addition of a third through lane on Bryan Rd, the intersection with Veterans Memorial Pkwy would remain constrained for specific movements, particularly the northbound left-turn. As land to the southeast and southwest of the intersection develops in the future, care should be taken to ensure the intersection configuration accommodates the traffic generation of those developments.

## Safety Analysis

A safety analysis was performed in accordance with methodologies outlined in the Highway Safety Manual (HSM). The HSM provides quantitative analysis to support decision making for improving transportation safety. Its methodology relies upon safety performance functions to correlate crash expectancy with location-specific roadway characteristics, such as the number of lanes, presence of shoulders, speeds, and traffic volumes.

Interchange Study
I-70 at Route 79/Salt Lick Road I-70 at Bryan Road
August 31, 2020
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Given the various types of roadway facilities comprising each interchange, multiple HSM tools were utilized. Specifically, the HSM spreadsheet was utilized for urban and suburban arterial intersections and segments, while iSATe was used to analyze ramps, and IHSDM was used to analyze roundabouts and arterials segments beyond the scope of the HSM spreadsheet. Diagrams indicating the geographic scope of each HSM tool are provided in Appendix C.

The HSM predictive methodology forecasts relative changes in crashes between the No Build and Alternative scenarios. Historical crash data (2014-2018) from MoDOT was utilized to weight predicted crashes based on actual crash data for the study area. As summarized in Table 9, the diverging diamond alternative would yield the larger reduction in crashes by eliminating 17 crashes annually. The expanded diamond option would only reduce crashes by less than 4 annually.

Table 9: Highway Safety Manual Analysis Results I-70 at Bryan Rd

| ALTERNATIVE | EXPECTED AVERAGE CRASH FREQUENCY (CRASHES/YEAR) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fatal \& Injury | Property Damage Only | Total |
| No Build | 34.3 | 79.9 | 114.2 |
| Diverging Diamond | 29.5 | 67.6 | 97.2 |
| Expanded Diamond | 33.1 | 77.4 | 110.6 |

## Conceptual Design \& Cost Estimate

A conceptual design and cost estimate was prepared for both alternatives. The design schematics are attached as Appendix D. The conceptual cost estimate is provided in Appendix E. The preliminary estimate for design and construction of the diverging diamond alternative is $\$ 40$ million. The preliminary estimate for design and construction of the expanded diamond alternative is $\$ 43$ million. These amounts include conservative estimates for utility relocations, right-of-way acquisitions, and annual cost escalations. In addition, a 20\% contingency was applied.

Interchange Study
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## Appendix

Appendix A: 2040 Forecasted Traffic Volumes
Appendix B: Intersection Forecasted Operating Conditions

Appendix C: HSM Methodology Diagrams

Appendix D: Conceptual Designs of Alternatives

Appendix E: Conceptual Cost Estimate





2040 No Build Traffic Volumes
XX- AM Peak Hour
(XX) - PM Peak Hour



## 2040 Expanded Diamond Traffic Volumes

XX-AM Peak Hour
(XX) - PM Peak Hour
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## Appendix B: Intersection Forecasted Operating Conditions

Table B1: I-70 at Route 79/Salt Lick Rd Forecasted Operating Conditions - AM Peak Hour

| Node | Movement/ Approach | Diverging Diamond |  |  | Partial Cloverleaf |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS <br> (Delay) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Max. Queue (ft) | LOS (Delay) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Max. Queue (ft) |
|  | WB LT | C (22.3) | 35 | 235 | C (28) | 42 | 228 |
|  | WB RT | A (1.5) | 0 | 20 | A (0.6) | 0 | 20 |
|  | WB APPROACH | A (8.6) | 35 | 235 | A (9.9) | 42 | 228 |
|  | NB LT | A (2.2) | 0 | 11 | B (19.1) | 28 | 257 |
|  | NB THRU | B (12) | 20 | 156 | A (1.3) | 3 | 139 |
|  | NB APPROACH | A (9.4) | 20 | 156 | A (1.3) | 3 | 139 |
|  | SB THRU | C (29.6) | 158 | 757 | B (13.9) | 18 | 178 |
|  | SB RT | A (3.4) | 75 | 615 | - | - | - |
|  | SB APPROACH | C (27.1) | 158 | 757 | B (13.9) | 18 | 178 |
|  | Overall | B (18) |  |  | B (11.9) |  |  |
|  | EB LT | A (8) | 8 | 171 | - | - | - |
|  | EB RT | A (2.7) | 1 | 81 | - | - | - |
|  | EB APPROACH | A (6.1) | 8 | 171 | - | - | - |
|  | NB THRU | D (42.3) | 74 | 345 | - | - | - |
|  | NB RT | A (6.3) | 1 | 138 | - | - | - |
|  | NB APPROACH | B (16.3) | 74 | 345 | - | - | - |
|  | SB LT | A (9.8) | 20 | 533 | - | - | - |
|  | SB THRU | B (10.9) | 33 | 634 | - | - | - |
|  | SB APPROACH | B (10.2) | 33 | 634 | - | - | - |
|  | Overall | B (12.5) |  |  | - |  |  |
|  | EB LT | E (57.2) | 81 | 360 | E (57.4) | 127 | 537 |
|  | EB THRU | D (44.1) | 81 | 360 | D (39.1) | 127 | 538 |
|  | EB RT | A (1.3) | 0 | 37 | A (1.9) | 1 | 82 |
|  | EB APPROACH | D (47.9) | 81 | 360 | D (44.9) | 127 | 538 |
|  | WB LT | E (56.3) | 5 | 61 | E (58.1) | 6 | 75 |
|  | WB THRU | D (54.4) | 5 | 61 | E (67.3) | 6 | 75 |
|  | WB RT | C (21.9) | 14 | 96 | C (27.2) | 13 | 97 |
|  | WB APPROACH | C (32) | 14 | 96 | D (36.8) | 13 | 97 |
|  | NB LT | B (10.8) | 143 | 1156 | B (13.5) | 177 | 1118 |
|  | NB THRU | B (12.3) | 147 | 1156 | B (11.8) | 188 | 1118 |
|  | NB RT | B (11.8) | 165 | 1194 | A (9.8) | 205 | 1152 |
|  | NB APPROACH | B (12.2) | 165 | 1194 | B (11.9) | 205 | 1152 |
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|  | SB LT | D（42．3） | 22 | 207 | D（47．4） | 9 | 101 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SB THRU | A（10） | 24 | 207 | A（4．5） | 10 | 102 |
|  | SB RT | A（6．6） | 25 | 226 | A（2．8） | 7 | 124 |
|  | SB APPROACH | A（9．5） | 25 | 226 | A（4．9） | 10 | 124 |
|  | Overall | B（15．9） | 0 | 0 | B（17） |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 方会 } \\ & \text { 品 } \end{aligned}$ | SB LT | A（7．4） | 47 | 264 | － | － | － |
|  | NB RT | A（9．3） | 58 | 393 | － | － | － |
|  | Overall | A（8．4） |  |  | － |  |  |
|  | Overall | － |  |  | A（3．6） |  |  |
|  | Overall | － |  |  | A（0．9） |  |  |

Delay reported in seconds per vehicle
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Table B2: I-70 at Route 79/Salt Lick Rd Forecasted Operating Conditions - PM Peak Hour

| Node | Movement/ Approach | Diverging Diamond |  |  | Partial Cloverleaf |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS <br> (Delay) | Average Queue (ft) | Max. Queue (ft) | LOS <br> (Delay) | Average Queue (ft) | Max. Queue (ft) |
|  | WB LT | B (19.4) | 63 | 568 | C (23.2) | 84 | 777 |
|  | WB RT | A (3.6) | 4 | 289 | A (3) | 18 | 599 |
|  | WB APPROACH | B (10.3) | 65 | 568 | B (11.5) | 84 | 777 |
|  | NB LT | A (3.8) | 0 | 65 | B (16.1) | 22 | 212 |
|  | NB THRU | A (2.7) | 3 | 65 | A (0.7) | 0 | 95 |
|  | NB APPROACH | A (3.1) | 3 | 65 | A (0.7) | 0 | 95 |
|  | SB THRU | D (37.4) | 120 | 464 | C (24.9) | 44 | 240 |
|  | SB RT | A (9.1) | 37 | 327 | - | - | - |
|  | SB APPROACH | C (32.4) | 120 | 464 | C (24.9) | 44 | 240 |
|  | Overall | B (16.5) |  |  | B (13.5) |  |  |
|  | EB LT | A (9.5) | 3 | 87 | - | - | - |
|  | EB RT | B (15.6) | 21 | 266 | - | - | - |
|  | EB APPROACH | B (14.1) | 21 | 266 | - | - | - |
|  | NB THRU | D (53.4) | 147 | 509 | - | - | - |
|  | NB RT | A (1.6) | 17 | 274 | - | - | - |
|  | NB APPROACH | C (29.7) | 147 | 509 | - | - | - |
|  | SB LT | A (3) | 20 | 386 | - | - | - |
|  | SB THRU | B (16.4) | 79 | 586 | - | - | - |
|  | SB APPROACH | B (12.5) | 79 | 586 | - | - | - |
|  | Overall | B (18.3) |  |  | - |  |  |
|  | EB LT | E (57.5) | 79 | 295 | E (55) | 88 | 342 |
|  | EB THRU | D (47.4) | 79 | 295 | D (47.3) | 88 | 342 |
|  | EB RT | A (5.4) | 6 | 204 | A (6.6) | 28 | 295 |
|  | EB APPROACH | D (44.8) | 79 | 295 | D (35.2) | 88 | 342 |
|  | WB LT | E (67.1) | 4 | 63 | E (63) | 4 | 76 |
|  | WB THRU | E (59.5) | 4 | 63 | E (63.5) | 4 | 76 |
|  | WB RT | B (11.8) | 10 | 99 | B (13.4) | 9 | 98 |
|  | WB APPROACH | C (21.1) | 10 | 99 | C (22.4) | 9 | 98 |
|  | NB LT | C (30.2) | 26 | 275 | C (30.4) | 31 | 313 |
|  | NB THRU | A (7.4) | 27 | 276 | A (8.3) | 33 | 317 |
|  | NB RT | A (5.4) | 40 | 316 | A (6.9) | 45 | 350 |
|  | NB APPROACH | A (8.8) | 40 | 316 | A (9.7) | 45 | 350 |
|  | SB LT | B (15.5) | 54 | 555 | C (21.6) | 45 | 493 |
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|  | SB THRU | A (9.5) | 56 | 555 | A (9.8) | 46 | 493 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SB RT | A (4.1) | 60 | 576 | A (9.1) | 51 | 522 |
|  | SB APPROACH | A (8.8) | 60 | 576 | A (9.8) | 51 | 522 |
|  | Overall | B (13.9) |  |  | B (15.4) |  |  |
|  | SB LT | A (1.5) | 3 | 77 | - | - | - |
|  | NB RT | B (15.5) | 31 | 217 | - | - | - |
|  | Overall | A (8.1) |  |  | - | - | - |
|  | Overall | - |  |  | A (3.2) |  |  |
|  | Overall | - |  |  | A (1.2) |  |  |
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Table B3: I-70 at Bryan Rd Forecasted Operating Conditions - AM Peak Hour

| Node | Movement/ Approach | Diverging Diamond |  |  | Expanded Diamond |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\underset{\text { LDelay) }}{\text { LOS }}$ | Average Queue (ft) | Max. Queue (ft) | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS } \\ \text { (Delay) } \end{gathered}$ | Average Queue (ft) | Max. Queue (ft) |
|  | EB LT | C (31.1) | 44 | 233 | C (28.9) | 47 | 245 |
|  | EB THRU | D (52.3) | 44 | 233 | D (52.9) | 47 | 245 |
|  | EB RT | A (7.6) | 41 | 258 | A (8.4) | 44 | 275 |
|  | EB APPROACH | C (25.1) | 44 | 258 | C (25.9) | 47 | 275 |
|  | WB LT | D (49.9) | 76 | 285 | D (47.9) | 78 | 274 |
|  | WB THRU | C (34) | 76 | 285 | C (32.9) | 78 | 274 |
|  | WB RT | C (34.7) | 76 | 285 | B (16.3) | 121 | 327 |
|  | WB APPROACH | D (46.3) | 76 | 285 | D (44.2) | 121 | 327 |
|  | NB LT | B (17.2) | 27 | 251 | C (23.3) | 43 | 338 |
|  | NB THRU | B (11.2) | 27 | 257 | B (17.1) | 45 | 338 |
|  | NB RT | A (7.9) | 24 | 257 | A (5.1) | 42 | 338 |
|  | NB APPROACH | B (10.4) | 27 | 257 | B (11.2) | 45 | 338 |
|  | SB LT | B (15.3) | 25 | 124 | B (16.8) | 29 | 145 |
|  | SB THRU | B (18.4) | 25 | 124 | C (20.9) | 29 | 145 |
|  | SB RT | B (10) | 46 | 171 | B (13.7) | 53 | 194 |
|  | SB APPROACH | B (17.8) | 46 | 171 | C (20.3) | 53 | 194 |
|  | Overall | C (21.9) |  |  | C (22.3) |  |  |
|  | WB LT | C (32.9) | 67 | 278 | D (44.6) | 66 | 236 |
|  | WB RT | A (7.1) | 17 | 289 | A (6.2) | 50 | 267 |
|  | WB APPROACH | C (22.1) | 67 | 289 | C (28.7) | 66 | 267 |
|  | NB LT | A (4.3) | 47 | 326 | E (77) | 81 | 211 |
|  | NB THRU | C (26.7) | 79 | 378 | A (1.6) | 76 | 211 |
|  | NB APPROACH | C (21) | 79 | 378 | C (20.6) | 81 | 211 |
|  | SB THRU | A (9.1) | 23 | 196 | A (8.3) | 16 | 227 |
|  | SB RT | A (2.1) | 8 | 141 | A (2.1) | 0 | 61 |
|  | SB APPROACH | A (6.6) | 23 | 196 | A (6.9) | 16 | 227 |
|  | Overall | B (16.4) |  |  | B (18.4) |  |  |
|  | EB LT | B (11.5) | 26 | 294 | D (46.6) | 70 | 263 |
|  | EB RT | A (5.8) | 9 | 239 | A (5.2) | 20 | 243 |
|  | EB APPROACH | A (8.4) | 26 | 294 | C (23.6) | 70 | 263 |
|  | NB THRU | D (35.7) | 103 | 489 | B (11.1) | 122 | 644 |
|  | NB RT | B (11.9) | 66 | 443 | C (21.7) | 83 | 645 |
|  | NB APPROACH | C (21.6) | 103 | 489 | B (17.4) | 122 | 645 |
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|  | SB LT | A (6.3) | 9 | 173 | C (34) | 80 | 287 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SB THRU | B (11.6) | 23 | 246 | B (15.5) | 77 | 288 |
|  | SB APPROACH | B (10.1) | 23 | 246 | C (20.5) | 80 | 288 |
|  | Overall | B (14.7) |  |  | B (19.9) |  |  |
|  | EB LT | D (53.1) | 96 | 427 | D (51.1) | 99 | 389 |
|  | EB THRU | D (52.9) | 95 | 427 | D (49.6) | 100 | 389 |
|  | EB RT | A (4.5) | 76 | 433 | A (2.9) | 71 | 398 |
|  | EB APPROACH | D (42.7) | 96 | 433 | D (40) | 100 | 398 |
|  | WB LT | D (49) | 21 | 108 | D (40.5) | 21 | 112 |
|  | WB THRU | E (56.4) | 21 | 108 | E (62.8) | 21 | 112 |
|  | WB RT | A (1.3) | 0 | 54 | A (1.4) | 1 | 51 |
|  | WB APPROACH | C (24.9) | 21 | 108 | C (23.8) | 21 | 112 |
|  | NB LT | E (66.2) | 82 | 328 | E (72.5) | 86 | 369 |
|  | NB THRU | C (21.1) | 82 | 328 | C (23.4) | 86 | 369 |
|  | NB RT | B (13.8) | 124 | 380 | B (15.2) | 109 | 420 |
|  | NB APPROACH | C (23.7) | 124 | 380 | C (26.2) | 109 | 420 |
|  | SB LT | D (36.5) | 60 | 345 | D (43.5) | 68 | 309 |
|  | SB THRU | B (13.6) | 60 | 345 | A (6.4) | 69 | 309 |
|  | SB RT | B (11) | 30 | 294 | A (4.9) | 30 | 249 |
|  | SB APPROACH | B (17.1) | 60 | 345 | B (12.2) | 69 | 309 |
|  | Overall | C (25.4) |  |  | C (23.8) |  |  |

Delay reported in seconds per vehicle
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Table B4: I-70 at Bryan Rd Forecasted Operating Conditions - PM Peak Hour

| Node | Movement/ Approach | Diverging Diamond |  |  | Expanded Diamond |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS <br> (Delay) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Max. <br> Queue <br> (ft) | LOS <br> (Delay) | Average Queue <br> (ft) | Мax. <br> Queue <br> (ft) |
|  | EB LT | C (25.2) | 76 | 413 | C (27.4) | 90 | 548 |
|  | EB THRU | E (55.9) | 76 | 413 | E (58.3) | 90 | 548 |
|  | EB RT | B (15.9) | 86 | 432 | B (19.3) | 101 | 538 |
|  | EB APPROACH | C (28.6) | 86 | 432 | C (31.7) | 101 | 548 |
|  | WB LT | D (45.5) | 108 | 580 | D (45.7) | 111 | 495 |
|  | WB THRU | C (25.8) | 107 | 580 | C (27.5) | 111 | 495 |
|  | WB RT | B (12.6) | 149 | 632 | B (17.6) | 156 | 556 |
|  | WB APPROACH | D (42.4) | 149 | 632 | D (42.8) | 156 | 556 |
|  | NB LT | C (20.9) | 70 | 558 | C (26.1) | 60 | 596 |
|  | NB THRU | C (23.5) | 70 | 558 | B (15.9) | 60 | 596 |
|  | NB RT | A (5.2) | 69 | 558 | A (6.6) | 72 | 626 |
|  | NB APPROACH | B (16.1) | 70 | 558 | B (14.4) | 72 | 626 |
|  | SB LT | C (23.3) | 52 | 321 | C (33.1) | 71 | 351 |
|  | SB THRU | C (29.3) | 52 | 322 | D (35.4) | 72 | 351 |
|  | SB RT | B (19.6) | 80 | 368 | C (24.4) | 105 | 400 |
|  | SB APPROACH | C (28.8) | 80 | 368 | C (35) | 105 | 400 |
|  | Overall | C (28.3) |  |  | C (29.4) |  |  |
|  | WB LT | C (27.5) | 142 | 680 | D (36.5) | 128 | 552 |
|  | WB RT | A (4.2) | 6 | 260 | A (4.6) | 87 | 556 |
|  | WB APPROACH | C (22.8) | 142 | 680 | C (30.1) | 128 | 556 |
|  | NB LT | A (8.2) | 25 | 280 | F (98.8) | 152 | 387 |
|  | NB THRU | B (15.9) | 46 | 316 | B (14) | 150 | 387 |
|  | NB APPROACH | B (13.2) | 46 | 316 | D (44.1) | 152 | 387 |
|  | SB THRU | B (19.6) | 64 | 245 | C (23.2) | 73 | 379 |
|  | SB RT | A (1.3) | 33 | 198 | A (3.7) | 7 | 238 |
|  | SB APPROACH | B (15.5) | 64 | 245 | B (19.4) | 73 | 379 |
|  | Overall | B (17.9) |  |  | C (29.7) |  |  |
|  | EB LT | A (9.5) | 17 | 234 | E (57.9) | 108 | 453 |
|  | EB RT | B (19.4) | 42 | 382 | D (37.2) | 101 | 476 |
|  | EB APPROACH | B (14.6) | 42 | 382 | D (47.2) | 108 | 476 |
|  | NB THRU | D (38.3) | 114 | 506 | B (14.5) | 118 | 569 |
|  | NB RT | A (8.9) | 74 | 459 | C (20.4) | 93 | 585 |
|  | NB APPROACH | C (22.5) | 114 | 506 | B (17.7) | 118 | 585 |
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|  | SB LT | B (10.5) | 63 | 422 | C (34.3) | 53 | 281 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SB THRU | B (15.3) | 77 | 490 | A (8.4) | 53 | 281 |
|  | SB APPROACH | B (14.4) | 77 | 490 | B (13.1) | 53 | 281 |
|  | Overall | B (17.1) |  |  | B (19.1) |  |  |
|  | EB LT | D (53.6) | 131 | 606 | D (54.7) | 79 | 304 |
|  | EB THRU | E (68.4) | 131 | 606 | D (50.7) | 79 | 304 |
|  | EB RT | A (3.3) | 96 | 601 | A (2.6) | 54 | 311 |
|  | EB APPROACH | D (49.3) | 131 | 606 | D (41.4) | 79 | 311 |
|  | WB LT | D (37.5) | 56 | 287 | D (38.2) | 63 | 388 |
|  | WB THRU | E (55.2) | 56 | 287 | E (57.6) | 63 | 388 |
|  | WB RT | A (2.5) | 3 | 173 | A (2.6) | 1 | 117 |
|  | WB APPROACH | C (33.6) | 56 | 287 | C (34.7) | 63 | 388 |
|  | NB LT | F (162.3) | 296 | 853 | F (179.6) | 412 | 1053 |
|  | NB THRU | C (27.1) | 296 | 853 | C (27.9) | 412 | 1053 |
|  | NB RT | B (17.2) | 343 | 902 | B (17.5) | 462 | 1102 |
|  | NB APPROACH | D (44.6) | 343 | 902 | D (47) | 462 | 1102 |
|  | SB LT | D (50.6) | 156 | 731 | D (53.9) | 321 | 836 |
|  | SB THRU | B (17.7) | 157 | 731 | D (38.5) | 321 | 836 |
|  | SB RT | B (15.3) | 116 | 682 | C (32.2) | 270 | 779 |
|  | SB APPROACH | C (20.7) | 157 | 731 | D (39.2) | 321 | 836 |
|  | Overall | C (32.6) |  |  | D (41.4) |  |  |

Delay reported in seconds per vehicle
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## Appendix C: HSM Methodology Diagrams



Interchange Study
I-70 at Route 79/Salt Lick Road
I-70 at Bryan Road
August 31, 2020
Page 26


Interchange Study
I-70 at Route 79/Salt Lick Road
I-70 at Bryan Road
August 31, 2020
Page 27

## INTERSTATE 70 / ROUTE - 79 IMPROVEMENTS <br> PARCLO
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# INTERSTATE 70 / BRYAN RD IMPROVEMENTS IMPROVED DIAMOND 



## INTERSTATE 70 / ROUTE 79 IMPROVEMENTS - DIVERGING DIAMOND



INTERSTATE 70 / ROUTE 79 IMPROVEMENTS - PARCLO


INTERSTATE 70 / BRYAN RD IMPROVEMENTS - DIVERGING DIAMOND


## INTERSTATE 70 / BRYAN RD IMPROVEMENTS - IMPROVED DIAMOND



| Project Sponsor: | MODOT |
| :---: | :---: |
| Project Titile: | Route 79 and I-70 DDI Interchange |
| Date: | 8/20/2020 |



| Specific Signal Items |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Amount |
| Install/Modify Traffic Signal | 4 | EA | \$200,000.00 | \$800,000.00 |
| ITS Equipment | 1 | LS | \$360,000.00 | \$360,000.00 |
|  |  |  | SUBTOTAL | \$1,160,000.00 |


| Specific Pedestrian Items | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Amount |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | SUBTOTAL | $\$ 0.00$ |  |


| Miscellaneous Other Items |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Amount |
| Mobilization (6\%) | 1 | LS | \$843,000.00 | \$843,000.00 |
| Traffic Control (6\%) | 1 | LS | \$843,000.00 | \$843,000.00 |
| Utility Relocations/Adjustments (10\%) | 1 | LS | \$1,405,000.00 | \$1,405,000.00 |
| Construction Surveving/Staking (1\%) | 1 | Ls | \$141,000.00 | \$141,000.00 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0.00 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$3,232,000.00 |


| Construction Cost Total | \$14,050,994.00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Contingency 20\% | \$3,513,000.00 |
| Inflation (4\% x 5 years) | \$3,513,000.00 |
| Construction Subtotal (Rounded) | \$21,077,000.00 |
| Engineering (15\%) | \$3,162,000.00 |
| Construction Engineering/Inspection (10\%) | \$2,108,000.00 |
| Right-of-Way | \$2,730,000.00 |
| Project Total | \$29,077,000.00 |


| Project Sponsor: | MODOT |
| :---: | :---: |
| Project Title: | Route 79 and 1-70 Partial Cloverleaf Interchange |
| Date: | 8/20/2020 |

## Specific Roadway Items

| Item | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pavement Removal (Includes Curb, Median, Shldr, Entrances, and Sidewalk) | 83,033 | SY | \$15.00 | \$1,245,495.00 |
| Clearing and Grubbing | 4 | ACRE | \$10,000.00 | \$40,000.00 |
| Class A Excavation | 53,526 | CY | \$20.00 | \$1,070,520.00 |
| Compacting Embankment | 45,160 | CY | \$5.00 | \$225,800.00 |
| Embankment in Place | 35,129 | CY | \$15.00 | \$526,935.00 |
| Paved Approach | 654 | SY | \$75.00 | \$49,050.00 |
| Aggregate Base (4") | 81,121 | SY | \$15.00 | \$1,216,815.00 |
| Concrete Pavement (Includes Curb, Median, Shldr) | 80,289 | SY | \$90.00 | \$7,226,010.00 |
| Remove/Replace Guardrail | 2,297 | LF | \$50.00 | \$114,850.00 |
| Crashworthy End Terminal | 9 | EA | \$3,000.00 | \$27,000.00 |
| Lighting, Signing, Striping | 1 | LS | \$1,038,000.00 | \$1,038,000.00 |
| Drainage Improvements | 1 | LS | \$1,616,591.00 | \$1,616,591.00 |
| Landscaping | 1 | LS | \$606,222.00, | \$606,222.00 |
| Erosion Control | 1 | LS | \$404,148.00 | \$404,148.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | SUBTOTAL | \$15,407,436.00 |


| Specific Signal Items |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item |  |  |  |  |  |
| Install/Modify Traffic Signal |  | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Amount |
| IITS Equipment |  |  |  | EA | $\$ 200,000.00$ |


| Specific Pedestrian Items |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Amount |
| Concrete Sidewalk, 4" | 94 | SY | \$20.00 | \$1,880.00 |
| Concrete Curb Ramps | 84 | SY | \$250.00 | \$21,000.00 |
| Truncated Domes | 50 | SF | \$50.00, | \$2,500.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$25,380.00 |


| Miscellaneous Other Items |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Amount |
| Mobilization (6\%) | 1 | LS | \$1,246,000.00, | \$1,246,000.00 |
| Traffic Control (6\%) | 1 | LS | \$1,246,000.00 | \$1,246,000.00 |
| Utility Relocations/Adjustments (10\%) | 1 | LS | \$2,076,000.00 | \$2,076,000.00 |
| Construction Surveying/Staking (1\%) | 1 | LS | \$208,000.00, | \$208,000.00 |
|  |  |  |  | \$0.00 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$4,776,000.00 |


| Construction Cost Total | \$20,758,816.00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Contingency 20\% | \$5,190,000.00 |
| Inflation (4\% x 5 years) | \$5,190,000.00 |
| Construction Subtotal (Rounded) | \$31,139,000.00 |
| Engineering (15\%) | \$4,671,000.00 |
| Construction Engineering/Inspection (10\%) | \$3,114,000.00 |
| Right-of-Way | \$3,038,542.00 |
| Project Total ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | \$41,962,542.00 |

Man

| Specific Roadway Items |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Amount |
| Pavement Removal (Includes Curb, Median, Shldr, Entrances, and Sidewalk) | 58,754 | SY | \$15.00 | \$881,310.00 |
| Clearing and Grubbing | 14 | ACRE | \$10,000.00 | \$140,000.00 |
| Class A Excavation | 42,901 | CY | \$20.00 | \$858,020.00 |
| Compacting Embankment | 64,351 | CY | \$5.00 | \$321,755.00 |
| Paved Approach | 2,878 | SY | \$75.00 | \$215,850.00 |
| Aggregate Base (4") | 70,057 | SY | \$15.00 | \$1,050,855.00 |
| Concrete Pavement (Includes Curb, Median, Shldr) | 64,351 | SY | \$90.00 | \$5,791,590.00 |
| Remove/Replace Guardrail | 1,716 | LF | \$50.00 | \$85,800.00 |
| Crashworthy End Terminal | 3 | EA | \$3,000.00 | \$9,000.00 |
| Retaining Wall | 5,000 | SF | \$150.00 | \$750,000.00 |
| Widen Existing Bridge | 2,675 | SF | \$150.00 | \$401,250.00 |
| Safety Barrier | 1,500 | LF | \$100.00 | \$150,000.00 |
| Lighting, Signing, Striping | 1 | LS | \$907,100.00 | \$907,100.00 |
| Drainage Improvements | 1 | LS | \$681,819.00 | \$681,819.00 |
| Landscaping | 1 | LS | \$255,682.00 | \$255,682.00 |
| Erosion Control | 1 | LS | \$170,455.00 | \$170,455.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$12,670,486.00 |


| Specific Signal Items |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Amount |
| Install/Modify Traffic Signal | 4 | EA | \$200,000.00 | \$800,000.00 |
| ITS Equipment | 1 | LS | \$360,000.00 | \$360,000.00 |
|  |  |  | SUBTOTAL | \$1,160,000.00 |

## Specific Pedestrian Items

| Item | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Concrete Sidewalk, 4" | 2,528 | SY | \$20.00 | \$50,560.00 |
| Concrete Curb Ramps | 300 | SY | \$250.00 | \$75,000.00 |
| Truncated Domes | 288 | SF | \$50.00 | \$14,400.00 |
|    SUBTOTAL <br>  $\$ 139,960.00$   |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


Man

| Specific Roadway Items |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Amount |
| Pavement Removal (Includes Curb, Median, Shldr, Entrances, and Sidewalk) | 59,696 | SY | \$15.00 | \$895,440.00 |
| Clearing and Grubbing | 14 | ACRE | \$10,000.00 | \$140,000.00 |
| Class A Excavation | 43,392 | CY | \$20.00 | \$867,840.00 |
| Compacting Embankment | 65,088 | CY | \$5.00 | \$325,440.00 |
| Paved Approach | 2,885 | SY | \$75.00 | \$216,375.00 |
| Aggregate Base (4") | 70,932 | SY | \$15.00 | \$1,063,980.00 |
| Concrete Pavement (Includes Curb, Median, Shldr) | 65,088 | SY | \$90.00 | \$5,857,920.00 |
| Remove/Replace Guardrail | 1,716 | LF | \$50.00 | \$85,800.00 |
| Crashworthy End Terminal | 3 | EA | \$3,000.00 | \$9,000.00 |
| Widen Existing Bridge | 9,585 | SF | \$150.00 | \$1,437,750.00 |
| Retaining Wall | 5,000 | SF | \$150.00 | \$750,000.00 |
| Safety Barrier | 500 | LF | \$100.00 | \$50,000.00 |
| Lighting, Signing, Striping | 1 | LS | \$979,900.00 | \$979,900.00 |
| Drainage Improvements | 1 | LS | \$681,819.00 | \$681,819.00 |
| Landscaping | 1 | LS | \$255,682.00 | \$255,682.00 |
| Erosion Control | 1 | LS | \$170,455.00 | \$170,455.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$13,787,401.00 |


| Specific Signal Items |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Amount |
| Install/Modify Traffic Signal | 4 | EA | \$200,000.00 | \$800,000.00 |
| ITS Equipment | 1 | LS | \$360,000.00 | \$360,000.00 |
|  |  |  | SUBTOTAL | \$1,160,000.00 |

## Specific Pedestrian Items




## Traffic Counts

| Weekday Turning Movement Count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 Minute Counts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DATE | TIME | INTID | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | Total |
| 12/9/2021 | 600 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 6 | 17 | 28 | 5 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| 12/9/2021 | 615 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 3 | 38 | 46 | 7 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 |
| 12/9/2021 | 630 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 9 | 47 | 69 | 8 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250 |
| 12/9/2021 | 645 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 21 | 32 | 61 | 16 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 326 |
| 12/9/2021 | 700 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 14 | 61 | 82 | 7 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 317 |
| 12/9/2021 | 715 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 20 | 70 | 101 | 22 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 430 |
| 12/9/2021 | 730 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 27 | 69 | 129 | 16 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 544 |
| 12/9/2021 | 745 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 18 | 62 | 116 | 37 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 526 |
| 12/9/2021 | 800 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 4 | 67 | 61 | 15 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 280 |
| 12/9/2021 | 815 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 6 | 51 | 51 | 14 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 |
| 12/9/2021 | 830 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 14 | 43 | 71 | 11 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 255 |
| 12/9/2021 | 845 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 13 | 48 | 68 | 16 | 0 | 50 | 1 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 268 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1100 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 22 | 77 | 69 | 10 | 1 | 56 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 299 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1115 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 12 | 64 | 60 | 28 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 71 |  | 0 | 1 | 286 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1130 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 1 | 9 | 85 | 89 | 8 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 330 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1145 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 19 | 53 | 77 | 17 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 78 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 311 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1200 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 17 | 85 | 88 | 18 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 359 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1215 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 19 | 57 | 71 | 20 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 321 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1230 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 13 | 67 | 78 | 30 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 324 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1245 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 22 | 60 | 74 | 20 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 314 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1500 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 26 | 60 | 160 | 37 | 1 | 79 | 0 | 87 |  | 0 | 0 | 450 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1515 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 18 | 59 | 104 | 23 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 111 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 369 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1530 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 28 | 99 | 137 | 30 | 1 | 53 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 446 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1545 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 22 | 63 | 125 | 19 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 116 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 400 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1600 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 17 | 76 | 106 | 21 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 366 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1615 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 14 | 50 | 109 | 36 | 0 | 52 | 2 | 138 |  | 1 | 0 | 402 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1630 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 34 | 64 | 159 | 54 | 0 | 51 | 1 | 135 |  | 0 | 0 | 498 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1645 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 19 | 56 | 153 | 67 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 499 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1700 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 20 | 100 | 150 | 63 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 479 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1715 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 13 | 77 | 92 | 17 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 115 |  | 0 | 0 | 358 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1730 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 10 | 53 | 95 | 19 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 314 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1745 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 10 | 38 | 101 | 21 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 129 |  | 0 | 0 | 333 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1800 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 15 | 29 | 113 | 6 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 110 |  | 2 | 0 | 305 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1815 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 10 | 16 | 104 | 21 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 118 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 306 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1830 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 8 | 24 | 81 | 25 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 261 |
| 12/9/2021 | 1845 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 7 | 20 | 83 | 12 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 |


| Saturday Turning Movement Count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 Minute Counts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DATE | TIME | INTID | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | Total |
| 12/11/2021 | 1000 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 15 | 57 | 65 | 23 | 0 | 36 | 1 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 259 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1015 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 12 | 39 | 57 | 21 | 1 | 49 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 249 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1030 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 14 | 33 | 66 | 23 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 243 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1045 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 18 | 60 | 72 | 17 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 310 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1100 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 13 | 38 | 81 | 21 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 259 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1115 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 19 | 41 | 68 | 13 | 0 | 36 | 1 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 251 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1130 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 21 | 51 | 69 | 14 | 0 | 60 | , | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 286 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1145 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 14 | 53 | 70 | 8 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 268 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1200 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 13 | 48 | 112 | 13 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 332 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1215 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 14 | 45 | 116 | 22 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 328 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1230 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 15 | 55 | 70 | 11 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 75 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 267 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1245 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 18 | 47 | 83 | 13 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 278 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1300 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 14 | 49 | 91 | 23 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 265 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1315 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 15 | 32 | 65 | 18 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 251 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1330 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 8 | 28 | 67 | 13 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 246 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1345 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 16 | 36 | 84 | 18 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 269 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1400 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 19 | 44 | 80 | 13 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 273 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1415 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 13 | 30 | 81 | 11 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 259 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1430 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 13 | 31 | 93 | 14 | 0 | 28 | , | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 262 |
| 12/11/2021 | 1445 | Bryan Rd@ West Terra Lane | 0 | 11 | 24 | 87 | 8 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 237 |

O'FALLON - TERRA LANE
CRASH DATA ANALYSIS

|  | Date | Address | Reason | \# of injuries | Fatal | Serious Injury | Minor Injury | Property Damage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 | 2017 | Terra Lane @ Bryan Road | driver error | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 2 | 2018 | Terra Lane @ Bryan Road | driver error | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 3 | 2018 | Terra Lane @ Bryan Road | driver error | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 4 | 2018 | Terra Lane @ Genteman Rd | weather | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| 5 | 2019 | Terra Lane @ Bryan Road | weather | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 6 | 2019 | Terra Lane @ Bryan Road | driver error | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 7 | 2019 | Terra Lane @ Bryan Road | driver error | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 8 | 2019 | Terra Lane @ Bryan Road | driver error | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 9 | 2020 | Terra Lane @ Genteman Rd | driver error | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 10 | 2021 | Terra Lane @ Bryan Road | driver error | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 11 | 2021 | Terra Lane @ Bryan Road | driver error | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 12 | 2021 | Terra Lane @ Bryan Road | driver error | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 13 | 2021 | Terra Lane @ Bryan Road | driver error | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |




## Bike Use Heat Map



Consultant Selection Rating Sheet (Example)

City:
Route:
Project:
Date:

O'Fallon
Main St.
Main St. Phase III Project STP-7302(690)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Experience, <br> Technical <br> Competence <br> \& Project <br> Approach <br> (Max. <br> points=30) |  <br> Capability <br> (Max. <br> points=30) | Past Record <br> of <br> Performance <br> (Max. <br> points=30) | Total |
| Consultant |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Rater Comments:

Fig 136.4.7

