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## Background

Iowa City submitted and was successful in applying for the Iowa DOT Traffic Safety Improvement Program (TSIP) funding in 2014 for First Avenue 3-lane conversion from US 6 to north of Mall Drive. The following report summarizes the findings of a detailed capacity analysis of converting First Avenue from a 4-lane to a 3-lane roadway (with continuous center left turn lane) based on current and future forecasted traffic conditions. Iowa City’s DOT Traffic Safety Funds application was used for existing conditions, historic traffic data, and project concept for the corridor.

## Traffic History

Iowa Department of Transportation (DOT) historic counts were compiled from similar locations within the corridor to estimate a traffic growth rate and identify traffic pattern trends. The annual average daily traffic (AADT) volumes from the DOT counts for years 2002, 2006, 2010, and 2014 are shown in Table 1 for locations within the corridor. As is illustrated in Table 1, most of the segments experienced steady traffic volumes or traffic volume decline. The City collected peak hour counts at intersections in the corridor as part of the TSIP application. The total peak hour traffic volumes on First Avenue at intersection approaches are listed in Table 2. Since peak hour counts at Mall Drive and Lower Muscatine Road were conducted a week apart in 2013, the actual peak hour traffic volume counted was used for analysis although the exiting volumes from one intersection do not equal the entering volume at the next intersection. However, since the peak hour count at the intersection of US Hwy 6 was conducted in 2009 and there are no accesses between this intersection and Lower Muscatine Road intersection, the peak hour volume at US Hwy 6 was adjusted so that the exiting volumes from one intersection equaled the entering volume from the other intersection. The percentage change of the adjusted turning traffic volume at US Hwy 6 was also applied to the through traffic volumes at the intersection.

Table 1: Historic Annual Average Daily Traffic

| Roadway Segment <br> (First Avenue) | Historic Daily Traffic |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2002 | 2006 | 2010 | 2014 |
| Mall Drive, south of | 12,800 | - | 13,000 | - |
| US Hwy 6, north of | 11,100 | 10,900 | 11,000 | 9,500 |

- DOT did not count location during count year

Table 2: Existing Total Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

| Roadway Segment <br> (First Avenue) | AM | PM |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Mall Drive, north of | 1,216 | 1,725 |
| Mall Drive, south of | 944 | 1,343 |
| Lower Muscatine, north of | 930 | 1,202 |
| US Hwy 6, north of | 685 | 931 |

## Traffic Volume Forecasts

Metropolitan Planning Organization of Johnson County (MPOJC) provided traffic volumes from their regional travel demand model for base year 2010 and the 2040 horizon year as the source of information for annual rates of traffic change for the corridor. The traffic demand model addresses
future changes in the region and/or corridor development trends that are different from the historical trend. In addition, the model has the capability of taking into account street network changes that may result in First Avenue becoming a more attractive or less attractive route relative to alternative corridors. Thus, there is the potential for observing substantial changes from historical traffic trends if there are forecasted employment, residential development, or roadway network changes from the current conditions or historical trends.

MPOJC base year traffic volumes, future year traffic volumes, and annual change rate are listed in Table 3. Table 4 lists the future year 2040 total peak hour traffic volumes. The annual rate of traffic volume change was applied to existing peak hour traffic volumes to calculate future 2040 peak hour traffic volumes. At the intersection of Mall Drive, only the through traffic volumes on First Avenue had a growth factor applied in the analysis of future conditions since one approach of the intersection is a business access and Mall Drive only connects to fully developed parcels. The growth rate applied to turning traffic from Lower Muscatine Road corresponded to the growth rate of the segment the vehicles were turning on to. The through traffic volumes on Lower Muscatine Road had a growth rate of $0.32 \%$ applied for future analysis.

Table 3: MPOJC Traffic Model Volumes

| Roadway Segment <br> (First Avenue) | Daily Traffic |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2040 | Annual Rate |
| Mall Dr to Lower Muscatine Rd | 13,000 | 14,300 | $0.32 \%$ |
| Lower Muscatine Rd to US Hwy 6 | 11,000 | 12,800 | $0.51 \%$ |

Table 4: 2040 Total Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

| Roadway Segment <br> (First Avenue) | AM | PM |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Mall Drive, north of | 1,312 | 1,830 |
| Mall Drive, south of | 1,018 | 1,448 |
| Lower Muscatine, north of | 1,034 | 1,336 |
| US Hwy 6, north of | 773 | 1,052 |

## Proposed Corridor Improvements

The current and forecasted traffic volumes for the corridor are within the limits of what a 3-lane roadway can typically accommodate with acceptable user delay. The 3-lane corridor was evaluated with every signalized intersection providing protected/permissive left turn phasing on First Avenue along with the traffic signals operating in coordination. The existing and future 3-lane traffic conditions were analyzed with the following improvements:

- 3-lane cross section from Mall Drive (connecting to the proposed 3-lane cross section from the railroad grade separation project) to US 6
o 1 NB Shared through/right turn-lane
o 1 Southbound through/right turn-lane
o 1 Continuous center left turn-lane
o Designated bike lanes from Mall Drive to Lower Muscatine Road
- Protected/permissive left turn phasing at all signalized intersections
- Traffic signals operating in coordination
- Dedicated left turn lanes at signalized intersection with 100' of storage


## Capacity and Intersection Analysis

Traffic operations were evaluated at each key intersection using the existing conditions, existing traffic volumes with 3-lane configuration, and year 2040 forecasted traffic volumes with 3-lane configuration for AM and PM peak period traffic volumes. The measures of effectiveness (MOE's) for the corridor were characterized by quantifying the following:

- The level-of-service (LOS) at each intersection for either STOP controlled or traffic signalized intersection resulted from applying Highway Capacity Manual, 2010 (HCM) methodology incorporated into traffic analysis and modeling software, Synchro 8.
- Corridor travel time and delays of the corridor were modeled utilizing SimTraffic 8 traffic signal coordination software.

At signalized intersections, the LOS is based on the weighted average of all approach delays and is expressed as a letter grade from A through $F$, with each grade representing a range of vehicle delay. Analysis of 3-lane configurations includes the proposed improvements previously described. Tables 5 and 6 list HCM computed vehicle delay and LOS of each intersection by approach for existing conditions, existing traffic volume with 3-lane configuration, and forecasted traffic volumes with 3lane configurations for AM and PM peak periods. The current delay and LOS per each intersection approach and movement is acceptable (LOS D or better). Reconfiguring First Avenue to a 3-lane cross section will increase the intersection vehicle delay by 10 to 20 seconds and decrease the LOS during the peak periods. However the LOS will still stay acceptable with the lane reconfiguration with current traffic volumes and forecasted traffic volumes. The directional travel times along the corridor during the peak analysis periods are listed in Table 7.

Table 7: Travel Time in Seconds

| Peak <br> Hour | Direction of <br> Travel | 2016 <br> Model <br> 4-lane | 2016 <br> Model <br> 3-Lane | 2040 <br> Model <br> 4-Lane | 2040 <br> Model <br> 3-Lane |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Northbound | 56 | 57 | 58 | 58 |
|  | Southbound | 99 | 104 | 111 | 110 |
|  | Northbound | 68 | 68 | 65 | 65 |

Table 5: AM PEAK HOUR HCM 2010 ANALYSIS RESULTS

| Intersection of 1st Avenue w/ | App | 2016 -Existing |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2040 - Future |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4-Lane |  |  |  | 3-Lane |  |  | Peak <br> Volume | 4-Lane |  |  | 3-Lane |  |  |
|  |  | Peak Volume | Delay (secs/ veh) | LOS | Max <br> Queue (ft/lane) | Delay (secs) veh) | LOS | Max <br> Queue (ft/lane) |  | Delay (secs) veh) | LOS | Max Queue (ft/lane) | Delay <br> (secs) <br> veh) | LOS | Max Queue (ft/lane) |
| Mall Dr | NB | 519 | 4 | A | 130 | 6 | A | 180 / Th | 522 | 4 | A | 160 | 6 | A | 190 / Th |
|  | SB | 613 | 4 | A | 110 | 8 | A | 300 / Th | 695 | 4 | A | 190 | 9 | A | 300 / Th |
|  | EB | 113 | 14 | B | 60 | 41 | D | 130 | 114 | 15 | B | 60 | 41 | D | 150 |
|  | WB | 3 | 12 | B | 30 | 36 | D | 30 | 3 | 13 | B | 30 | 36 | D | 30 |
|  | All | 1248 | 5 | A |  | 11 | B |  | 1334 | 5 | A |  | 11 | B |  |
| Lower Muscatine Rd | NB | 376 | 12 | B | 180 | 18 | B | 160 / Th | 452 | 13 | B | 200 | 21 | C | 310 / Th |
|  | SB | 413 | 12 | B | 140 | 19 | B | 260 / Th | 416 | 13 | B | 200 | 21 | C | 250 / Th |
|  | EB | 197 | 12 | B | 160 / Lt | 27 | C | 160 / Lt | 222 | 13 | B | 140 / Th | 27 | C | 140 / Th |
|  | WB | 241 | 18 | B | 160 / Th | 46 | D | 280 / Th | 268 | 20 | B | 200 / Th | 39 | D | 290 / Th |
|  | All | 1227 | 13 | B |  | 26 | C |  | 1358 | 14 | B |  | 26 | C |  |
| US Hwy 6 | SB | 311 | 22 | C | 130 / Rt | 52 | D | 70 / Lt | 323 | 23 | C | 130 / Lt | 40 | D | 90 / Lt |
|  | EB | 716 | 10 | A | 250 / Lt | 25 | C | 360 / Lt | 767 | 11 | B | 350 / Lt | 24 | C | 350 / Lt |
|  | WB | 433 | 13 | B | 140 / Th | 39 | D | 250 / Th | 422 | 15 | B | 160 / Th | 42 | D | 180 / Th |
|  | All | 1460 | 12 | B |  | 30 | C |  | 1512 | 13 | B |  | 31 | C |  |

Table 6: PM PEAK HOUR HCM 2010 ANALYSIS RESULTS

| Intersection of 1st <br> Avenue w/ | App | 2016 -Existing |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2040 - Future |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Peak <br> Volume | 4-Lane |  |  | 3-Lane |  |  | Peak Volume | 4-Lane |  |  | 3-Lane |  |  |
|  |  |  | Delay (secs/ veh) | LOS | Max Queue (ft/lane) | Delay (secs) veh) | LOS | Max Queue (ft/lane) |  | Delay (secs/ veh) | LOS | Max Queue (ft/lane) | Delay (secs) veh) | LOS | Max Queue (ft/lane) |
| Mall Dr | NB | 609 | 6 | A | 110 | 9 | A | 290 / Th | 675 | 6 | A | 140 | 10 | B | 210 / Th |
|  | SB | 828 | 6 | A | 280 | 19 | B | 620 / Th | 941 | 7 | A | 240 | 19 | B | 620 / Th |
|  | EB | 229 | 18 | B | 190 | 34 | C | 150 | 230 | 37 | D | 230 | 42 | D | 340 |
|  | WB | 6 | 14 | B | 30 | 23 | C | 30 | 6 | 29 | C | 30 | 69 | E | 30 |
|  | All | 1672 | 8 | A |  | 17 | B |  | 1852 | 11 | B |  | 19 | B |  |
| Lower Muscatine Rd | NB | 402 | 11 | B | 160 | 16 | B | 120 / Th | 445 | 12 | B | 200 | 19 | B | 140 / Th |
|  | SB | 659 | 13 | B | 320 | 20 | B | 360 / Th | 680 | 13 | B | 440 | 27 | C | 630 / Th |
|  | EB | 343 | 15 | B | 160 / Lt | 33 | C | 160 / Th | 370 | 28 | C | 190 / Th | 29 | C | 370 / Th |
|  | WB | 283 | 19 | B | 200 / Th | 37 | D | 230 / Th | 304 | 39 | D | 180 / Th | 36 | D | 330 / Th |
|  | All | 1687 | 14 | B |  | 24 | C |  | 1799 | 20 | C |  | 27 | C |  |
| US Hwy 6 | SB | 571 | 20 | B | 150 / Rt | 34 | C | 130 / Rt | 608 | 37 | D | 220 / Rt | 36 | D | 170 / Rt |
|  | EB | 1035 | 9 | A | 310 / Lt | 21 | C | 290 / Lt | 991 | 24 | C | 320 / Lt | 20 | C | 330 / Lt |
|  | WB | 460 | 13 | B | 120 / Th | 37 | D | 170 / Th | 402 | 37 | D | 160 / Th | 40 | D | 210 / Th |
|  | All | 2066 | 10 | B |  | 26 | C |  | 2001 | 29 | C |  | 26 | C |  |

## Summary

Given the existing traffic volumes and the number of accesses on First Avenue from Lower Muscatine Road to Mall Drive, converting the 4-lane roadway to a 3-lane roadway with a continuous center left turn will increase intersection vehicle delay by 10 to 20 seconds during the peak periods. However the vehicle delay and LOS will remain acceptable while providing a beneficial left turn lane for vehicles utilizing the accesses between intersections. Reconfiguring First Avenue from 4-lane to 3-lane cross section will increase the projected travel time by 10 seconds in the PM peak period upon implementation of the lane reconfiguration. This portion of Iowa City is developed therefore future forecasted traffic volumes along the corridor are projected to have a minimal increase since there are no undeveloped areas adjacent to the corridor.

The existing business accesses along First Avenue do not all align opposite from one another except the north access of Eastdale Plaza on the east side of First Avenue and Java House on the west side of First Avenue. An unaligned access can cause the potential of left turning vehicle conflicts if they are not directly across from one another, or offset downstream from one another (for example, if an access to the east is south of an access to the west, the left turning vehicle paths may overlap). A left turn conflict was identified as a left turning vehicle having the potential to block the continuous left turn lane for an opposite direction of travel left turning vehicle. However, since all the accesses are offset upstream from one another, a left turn conflict does not exist except for one location. One location that does have the potential of left turning vehicle conflict is the southern access of Eastdale Plaza on the east side of First Avenue and Java House on the west side of First Avenue. To eliminate left turning vehicle conflict, either the southern access to Eastdale Plaza should be eliminated or access to Java House should be eliminated. Additional analysis of internal site circulation should be conducted to determine the feasibility of closing either of the two accesses. If the sites were to be redeveloped, the number and locations of the accesses should be reviewed as it relates to corridor access management and adjacent property accesses.

The future 3-lane traffic conditions should mimic existing 3-lane traffic conditions as tabulated with acceptable vehicle delay with the following recommended improvements to the corridor:

- 3-lane cross section from Mall Drive (connecting to the proposed 3-lane cross section from the railroad grade separation project) to US 6
o 1 NB Shared through/right turn-lane
o 1 Southbound through/right turn-lane
o 1 Continuous center left turn-lane
o Designated bike lanes from Mall Drive to Lower Muscatine Road
- Protected/permissive left turn phasing at all signalized intersections
- Traffic signals operating in coordination
- Dedicated left turn lanes at signalized intersection with 100' of storage

