NORTHVILLE DOWNS TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

NORTHVILLE, MICHIGAN

DECEMBER 14, 2021 REVISED JANUARY 20, 2022





27725 STANSBURY BLVD., SUITE 195 FARMINGTON HILLS, MI 48334

Notice and Disclaimer

This document is provided by Fleis & VandenBrink Engineering, Inc. for informational purposes only. No changes or revisions may be made to the information presented in the document without the express consent of Fleis & VandenBrink Engineering, Inc. The information contained in this document is as accurate and complete as reasonably possible. Should you find any errors or inconsistencies, we would be grateful if you could bring them to our attention.

The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed herein are those of Fleis & VandenBrink Engineering, Inc. and do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the City of Northville or the Wayne County Department of Public Services, which makes no warranty, either implied or expressed, for the information contained in this document; neither does it assume legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of this information. Any products, manufacturers or trademarks referenced in this document are used solely for reference purposes.



I hereby certify that this engineering document was prepared by me or under my direct personal supervision and that I am a duly licensed Professional Engineer under the laws of the State of Michigan.

Agency Review	Date	Comments
City/OHM	12/30/21	Provided in Review letter
City/OHM	1/13/22	Provided in Review letter



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Background Data Trip Generation	2
SITE TRIP DISTRIBUTION	3
OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS SUMMARY	3
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 BACKGROUND DATA	2
2.1 Study Roadway Network2.2 Traffic Volume Data	2 8
3 EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS (2021)	9
3.1 SCENARIO 1 - BASELINE OPERATIONS (PRE-COVID)	9
3.2 SCENARIO 2 – MAIN ST. & CENTER ST. CLOSED	10
3.3 Scenario 3 - Main St. Closed Only	10
3.4 EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS SUMMARY	10
3.4.1 Signal Warrant Analyses	14
3.4.2 All-Way Stop Control Analysis	16
3.4.3 Center Street and Randolph Street	17
3.4.4 Center Street and Cady Street	17
3.4.5 Noninvine Road (S. Main Sireel) and N. Seven Mile Road	17 20
A BACKGPOLIND CONDITIONS ANALYSIS (2028)	20
	23
4.1 SCENARIO 1 - BASELINE OPERATIONS (PRE-COVID)	23
4.2 SCENARIO 2 - MAIN ST. & CENTER ST. CLOSED	23
4.5 SCENARIO 5 - MAIN ST. CLUSED ONLY	23 24
4.4.1 Signal Warrant Analyses	24
4.4.2 All-Way Stop Control Analysis	28
5 SITE TRIP GENERATION	33
6 SITE TRIP DISTRIBUTION	34
7 FUTURE CONDITIONS (2028)	35
7.1 Scenario 1 - Baseline Operations (Pre-COVID)	35
7.2 Scenario 2 - Main St. & Center St. Closed	35
7.3 Scenario 3 - Main St. Closed Only	35
7.4 FUTURE CONDITIONS ANALYSIS SUMMARY	35
7.4.1 Signal Warrant Analyses	40
7.4.2 All-Way Stop Control Analysis	40
8 CONCLUSIONS	45

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE E1: TRIP GENERATION SUMMARY	. 3
TABLE E2: ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION SUMMARY	. 4
TABLE 3.1: EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS SUMMARY	11
TABLE 3.2: EXISTING SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS SUMMARY	15
TABLE 3.3: EXISTING ALL-WAY WARRANT ANALYSIS SUMMARY	16
TABLE 3.4: EXISTING INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY	18
TABLE 3.5: EXISTING CONDITIONS WITH MITIGATION ANALYSIS SUMMARY	19
TABLE 3.6: SCENARIO 1 - CENTER ST. AND SEVEN MILE RD. INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY (EXISTING)	21
TABLE 3.7: SCENARIO 2 - CENTER ST. AND SEVEN MILE RD. INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY (EXISTING)	21
TABLE 3.8: SCENARIO 3 - CENTER ST. AND SEVEN MILE RD. INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY (EXISTING)	22
TABLE 4.1: BACKGROUND CONDITIONS ANALYSIS SUMMARY	24
TABLE 4.2: BACKGROUND SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS SUMMARY	27
TABLE 4.3: BACKGROUND ALL-WAY WARRANT ANALYSIS SUMMARY	28
TABLE 4.4: BACKGROUND INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY	29
TABLE 4.5: BACKGROUND CONDITIONS WITH MITIGATION ANALYSIS SUMMARY	30
TABLE 4.6: SCENARIO 1 - CENTER ST. AND SEVEN MILE RD. INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY (BACKGROUND)	31
TABLE 4.7: SCENARIO 2 - CENTER ST. AND SEVEN MILE RD. INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY (BACKGROUND)	31
TABLE 4.8: SCENARIO 3 - CENTER ST. AND SEVEN MILE RD. INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY (BACKGROUND)	32
TABLE 5.1: TRIP GENERATION SUMMARY	33
TABLE 6.1: SITE GENERATED TRAFFIC DISTRIBUTION	34
TABLE 7.1: FUTURE CONDITIONS ANALYSIS SUMMARY	35
TABLE 7.2: FUTURE SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS SUMMARY	40
TABLE 7.3: FUTURE ALL-WAY WARRANT ANALYSIS SUMMARY	40
TABLE 7.4: FUTURE INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY	41
TABLE 7.5: FUTURE CONDITIONS WITH MITIGATION ANALYSIS SUMMARY	42
TABLE 7.6: SCENARIO 1 - CENTER ST. AND SEVEN MILE RD. INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY (FUTURE)	43
TABLE 7.7: SCENARIO 2 - CENTER ST. AND SEVEN MILE RD. INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY (FUTURE)	43
TABLE 7.8: SCENARIO 3 - CENTER ST. AND SEVEN MILE RD. INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY (FUTURE)	44
TABLE 8.1: ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION SUMMARY	46
· · · ·	

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE E1: SITE LOCATION	1
FIGURE E2: INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY	5
FIGURE 1: SITE LOCATION	1
FIGURE 9: INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY	47



FIGURE 2.1: LANE USE AND TRAFFIC CONTROL	A
FIGURE 3.1: SCENARIO 1-EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES	B
FIGURE 3.2: SCENARIO 2-EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES	B
FIGURE 3.3: SCENARIO 3-EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES	B
FIGURE 4.1: SCENARIO 1-BACKGROUND TRAFFIC VOLUMES	C
FIGURE 4.2: SCENARIO 2- BACKGROUND TRAFFIC VOLUMES	C
FIGURE 4.3: SCENARIO 3- BACKGROUND TRAFFIC VOLUMES	C
FIGURE 6.1: SCENARIO 1 - SITE GENERATED TRAFFIC VOLUMES	D
FIGURE 6.2: SCENARIO 2 - SITE GENERATED TRAFFIC VOLUMES	D
FIGURE 6.3: SCENARIO 3 - SITE GENERATED TRAFFIC VOLUMES	D
FIGURE 7.1: SCENARIO 1 - FUTURE TRAFFIC VOLUMES	D
FIGURE 7.2: SCENARIO 2 - FUTURE TRAFFIC VOLUMES	D
FIGURE 7.3: SCENARIO 3 - FUTURE TRAFFIC VOLUMES	D

LIST OF APPENDICES

- A. Background Information
- B. Existing Traffic Conditions
- C. Background (2028) Traffic Conditions
- D. Future Traffic Conditions
- E. Warrant Summaries
- F. Supplemental Information

REFERENCES

- AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS (AASHTO). (2018). A POLICY ON GEOMETRIC DESIGN OF HIGHWAYS AND STREETS. WASHINGTON DC.
- FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORATION, MICHIGAN STATE POLICE. (2011). MICHIGAN MANUAL ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES.

INSTITUTE OF TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS. (2021). TRIP GENERATION MANUAL, 11TH EDITION. WASHINGTON DC.

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (U.S.) TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD. (2000). *HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL,* 47th Edition (HCM 2000). WASHINGTON, D.C.: TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD.

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (U.S.) TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD. (2016). *HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL,* 67th Edition (HCM6). WASHINGTON, D.C.: TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD.

PAPACOSTAS, & PREVEDOUROS. (2001). TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING AND PLANNING.

STOVER, V. G., & KOEPKE, F. J. (2006). *TRANSPORTATION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT* (Vol. 2ND EDITION). WASHINGTON DC: INSTITUTE OF TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS (ITE).



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for the proposed development in the City of Northville, Michigan. The project site is located generally in the northeast quadrant of the Center Street and Hines Drive/Seven Mile Road intersection on the property that is currently occupied by Northville Downs, as shown on **Figure E1**. The proposed development includes the construction of mixed-use, with various residential unit types and commercial. The development includes site access to Cady Street, Griswold Street, Beal Street, Fairbrook Street, and Center Street.

FIGURE E1: SITE LOCATION

The scope of this study was developed based on Fleis & VandenBrink's (F&V) knowledge of the study area, understanding of the development program, accepted traffic engineering practice and information published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). In addition, the City of Northville and their traffic engineering consultant OHM and planning consultant Carlisle Wortman provided input regarding the scope of work included herein. The study includes the evaluation of three (3) scenarios which are summarized below



[**] F&V**

BACKGROUND DATA

- Traffic volume data was collected at the study intersections by F&V subconsultants Traffic Data Collection Inc. (TDC) on May 15, 2018, and October 18, 2018, and by Gewalt Hamilton Associates, Inc (GHA) on October 19, 2021, during the weekday AM (7:00 AM-9:00 AM) and PM (4:00 PM-6:00 PM) peak periods.
- The analysis includes the evaluation of 28 off-site intersections in the City of Northville adjacent to the project site and six (6) new site driveway intersections for a total of 34 study intersection.
- An annual 0.2% background growth was determined from SEMCOG data to calculate the projected implicit background traffic growth to the site buildout year in 2028.
- In addition to background growth, the following developments were identified by the City of Northville to include as background traffic: Cady Project – 6-unit condominium (South side of Cady Street, east of Center Street), 355 E. Cady St. - 3-story mixed-use building; first floor Retail, office above, 455 E. Cady St "Hanger Building"- office space, and Foundry Flask – 78 Multi-Family Units, corner store specialty market.

TRIP GENERATION

The proposed development includes single family, attached housing, multi-family units and commercial uses. The following ITE Trip Generation Manual land uses were determined to be the best fit for the proposed development.

Single-Family Detached Housing (LUC 210)

• A single-family detached housing site includes any single-family detached home on an individual lot.

Single-Family Attached Housing (LUC 215)

• Single-family attached housing includes any single-family housing unit that shares a wall with an adjoining dwelling unit, whether the walls are for living space, a vehicle garage, or storage space. Includes duplexes and townhouses/rowhouses, joined side-by-side in a row and each with an outside entrance.

Mid-Rise Multi-Family Home (LUC 221)

• Mid-rise multifamily housing includes apartments and condominiums located in a building that has between four and 10 floors of living space. Access to individual dwelling units is through an outside building entrance, a lobby, elevator, and a set of hallways.

Strip Retail Plaza <40k SF (LUC 822)

 A strip retail plaza is an integrated group of commercial establishments that is planned, developed, owned, and managed as a unit. Each study site in this land use has less than 40,000 square feet of gross leasable area (GLA).





The number of AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips that would be generated by the proposed development was forecast based on data published by ITE in the *Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition*.

	ІТГ			Average	AM P	eak Ho	ur (vph)	PM P	ır (vph)	
Land Use	Code	e Amount Units		(vpd)	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Single-Family Detached Housing	210	39	DU	424	8	24	32	26	15	41
Single-Family Attached Housing	215	259	DU	1,923	40	89	129	86	65	151
Multi-Family Home (Mid-Rise)	221	174	DU	784	15	50	65	41	27	68
	3,131	63	163	226	153	107	260			
		Internal	Capture	190	1	2	3	14	5	19
		Ne	w Trips	2,941	62	161	223	139	102	241
Strip Retail Plaza (<40k SF)	822	17,374	SF	963	25	16	41	58	57	115
		Internal	Capture	190	2	1	3	5	14	19
		Pass-E	<i>By (</i> 34%)	327	8	5	13	16	16	32
		Ne	w Trips	446	15	10	25	37	27	64
		To	tal Trips	4,094	88	179	267	211	164	375
	380	3	3	6	19	19	38			
	327	8	5	13	16	16	32			
		Total Ne	w Trips	3,387	77	171	248	176	129	305

Table E1: Trip Generation Summary

SITE TRIP DISTRIBUTION

- The vehicular trips that would be generated by the proposed development were assigned to the study roads based on existing peak hour traffic patterns in the adjacent roadway network and the methodologies published by ITE.
- The global trip generation is based on trips in the AM going from the residential development exiting the study network and returning to the study network in the PM. The vehicular traffic volumes were distributed to the roadway network according to the global traffic distribution.
- The proposed development plan has multiple site access points to the adjacent roadway network; therefore, the impact of the development is dispersed throughout the area study intersections. Additionally, the trips were routed to the roadway network based on the available roadway connectively associated with each of the roadway scenarios.

OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS SUMMARY

- The study intersections generally operate well with all Scenarios, with a few exceptions noted below.
- The recommended improvements identified for existing and background conditions were found to mitigate the future intersection delays at the study intersections with the additional of the site generated traffic volumes.
- The additional delays and mitigation measures noted for Background conditions are highlighted in green and additional delays from Future conditions are highlighted below in <u>blue</u>. No mitigation measures are recommended.
- No additional mitigation measures were identified with the additional site generated traffic in the Future conditions.
- The mitigations are generally similar across all evaluation scenarios. The operations and recommendations are summarized in **Table E.2** and shown on **Figure E.2**
- The results of this analysis concludes that the majority of intersections within the City of Northville will experience a negligible increase in traffic volumes associated with the Northville Downs development. Additionally, alternatives for mitigating existing delays are recommended which will also support the projected increases in traffic volumes generated by the proposed development. Furthermore, the recommendations included herein are consistent with the recommendations identified by the City's Mobility Task Force.



Table E2: Analysis a	nd Mitigation Summary
----------------------	-----------------------

	Intersection	Scenario #1 (Pre-COVID)	Scenario #2 (Both Closed)	Scenario #3 (Main Closed)
2	Randolph Street & Center Street	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	All Way Stop Control Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.
8	Main Street & Hutton Street	Signal Timing Optimization Recommended*		n/a
9	Main Street & Griswold Street	Sigr	nal Timing Optimization Recon	nmended*
12	Cady Street & Center Street	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	All Way Stop Control Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.
21	Fairbrook Street & Center Street	A review of network simulations indicates acceptable operations. Queue lengths were minimal and vehicles were able to find gaps in traffic.	n/a	A review of network simulations indicates acceptable operations. Queue lengths were minimal and vehicles were able to find gaps in traffic.
22	Seven Mile Road & Wing Street / St. Lawrence	A review of network simul operations. Queue lengths w able to find g	ations indicates acceptable rere minimal and vehicles were gaps in traffic.	n/a
23	Seven Mile Road & Sheldon Avenue / Center Street	Option 2: Widen the bridge/culvert across the Johnson Creek to provide a NB left-turn lane with 500- ft of storage length and/or Option 3: Roundabout is recommended.	n/a	Option 2: Widen the bridge/culvert across the Johnson Creek to provide a NB left-turn lane with 500- ft of storage length and/or Option 3: Roundabout is recommended.
24	Seven Mile Road & Hines Drive	Delays on the NB approach are due to impacts/queue lengths extending from Seven Mile Road & Sheldon Avenue / Center Street intersection.	n/a	Delays on the WB and NB approach are due to impacts/queue lengths extending from Seven Mile Road & Sheldon Avenue / Center Street intersection.
26/ 27	Northville Road & N. Seven Mile Road	Delays for WB Stop co	Signal Recommended ntrol approach, northbound left-t	urn sight distance limitations.
28	Northville Road & S. Seven Mile Road	Sigr	nal Timing Optimization Recon	nmended*
32	Center Street & Proposed Beal Street	A review of network simulations indicates acceptable operations. Queue lengths were minimal and vehicles were able to find gaps in traffic.	n/a	n/a

* Details of the proposed signal timing optimization are included in Appendix F





FIGURE E2: INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY



1 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for the proposed development in the City of Northville, Michigan. The project site is located adjacent to the south side of Cady Street, between Center Street and Griswold Street on the property that was previously occupied by Northville Downs as shown on **Figure 1**. The proposed development includes the construction of mixed-use commercial and multi-family residential units. The City has required a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for the project as part of the site plan approval process.



The scope of this study was developed based on Fleis & VandenBrink's (F&V) knowledge of the study area, understanding of the development program, accepted traffic engineering practice and information published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). In addition, the City of Northville and their traffic engineering consultant OHM and planning consultant Carlisle Wortman provided input regarding the scope of work included herein.

The study analyses were completed using Synchro/SimTraffic (Version 11) and Rodel traffic analysis software Sources of data for this study include traffic counts conducted by F&V subconsultants Traffic Data Collection, Inc. (TDC) and Gewalt Hamilton Associates (GHA), City of Northville, Wayne County Department of Public Services (WCDPS), and ITE. All background information is provided in **Appendix A**.

The study will include the evaluation of three (3) scenarios which are summarized in the table below with the corresponding Section of this report.

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3		
	Baseline Operations (Pre-COVID)	Main St. & Center St. Closed	Main St. Closed Only		
Section 3	Section 3.1	Section 3.2	Section 3.2		
Existing Conditions	Pre-COVID 2018 traffic volumes grown to 2021	2021 Existing Traffic Volumes	2021 Existing Traffic Volumes, adjusted		
Section 4	Section 4.1	Section 4.2	Section 4.3		
Background Conditions	Baseline + Growth Rate + Background Developments	Existing + Growth Rate + Background Developments	Existing Adj. + Growth Rate + Background Developments		
Section 6	Figure 6.1	Figure 6.2	Figure 6.2		
Site Traffic Volumes	Site Generated Traffic	Site Generated Traffic	Site Generated Traffic		
Section 7	Section 7.1	Section 7.2	Section 7.3		
Future Conditions	Background Conditions + Site Generated Traffic	Background Conditions + Site Generated Traffic	Background Conditions + Site Generated Traffic		



2 BACKGROUND DATA

2.1 STUDY ROADWAY NETWORK

Vehicle transportation for the proposed development is provided via Center Street, Cady Street, and Beal Street. Regional transportation is provided via I-96, I-275, and M-14; with access to these routes within 5 miles of the project site location. The lane use and traffic control at the study intersections are shown on **Figures 2.1**, **2.2**, and **2.3** for Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 respectively and the study roadways are further described below. For the purposes of this study, all minor streets and driveways are assumed to have an operating speed of 25 miles per hour (mph).



Scenario 1 Baseline Operations (Pre-COVID)





Scenario 2 Main St. & Center St. Closed



Scenario 3 Main St. Closed Only

Center Street / Sheldon Avenue

- Functional Classification: Other Principal Arterial
- Runs in the north and south directions, generally adjacent to the west side of the project site.
- North of Hines Drive/7 Mile Road: Center Street, Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volume of 14,175 vehicles per day (SEMCOG 2018), under the jurisdiction of the City of Northville.
- South of Hines Drive/7 Mile Road: Regional Name Sheldon Road and is under the jurisdiction of WCDPS.
- North of Cady: 25 mph, on-street parking
- South of Cady Street: 35 mph, bike lanes
- The roadway is a typical two-lane cross-section, with one lane in each direction.
- At the intersection with Hines Drive/7 Mile Road, the roadway is striped as a single shared lane for northbound and southbound traffic. However, vehicles on the northbound and southbound approaches utilize the available pavement width as a short left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.





Northville Road

- Functional Classification: Minor Arterial.
- Under the jurisdiction of WCDPS
- Runs in the north and south directions, generally east side of the project site.
- Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volume of 17,000 vehicles per day (MDOT 2019),
- Speed Limit varies 25 mph to 40 mph
- North of 7 Mile Road: Four-lane cross-section with two lanes in each direction
- South of 7 Mile Road: Tow-lane cross section with one lane each direction.
- Undivided south of 7 Mile Road (south)
- Median divided at 7 Mile Road (north)



Main Street

Functional Classification: Minor Arterial

• Runs in the east and west directions, north of the project site.

• Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volume of 8,175 vehicles per day (SEMCOG 2018), under the jurisdiction of the City of Northville.

South of 7 Mile Road: Regional name is Northville Road and is under the jurisdiction of WCDPS.

- Speed Limit 25 mph
- On-street parking provided on both sides of the roadway.
- The roadway is a typical two-lane cross-section, with one lane in each direction.
- On-street parking typically ends prior to an intersection, in order to provide short (25-50 ft typical) right-turn lanes at the intersections..
- The section of roadway east of Griswold Street becomes S. Main Street; for the purposes of this study S. Main Street is labeled Northville Road, specifically at the intersection with Beal Street.





7 Mile Road

- Functional Classification: Minor Arterial.
 Under the jurisdiction of WCDPS
- Runs in the east and west directions, adjacent to the south site of the project site..
- Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volume of 8,155 vehicles per day (SEMCOG 2019),
- Speed Limit 35 mph
- The study section of 7 Mile Road is split at Northville Road for the purposes of this study:West of Northville Road referred to as N. 7 Mile Road, East of Northville Road referred to as S. 7 Mile Road
- The study section of roadway (N. 7 Mile Road) is a typical two-lane cross-section, with one lane in each direction. However, there is intermittent right/left-turn auxiliary lane.



Edward N. Hines Drive

Functional Classification: Other Principal Arterial.
Under the jurisdiction of WCDPS

• Runs in the east/southeast and west/northwest directions south side of the project site..

South of 7 Mile Road Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volume of 3,800 vehicles per day (MDOT 2019),

• Speed Limit 35 mph to 40 mph

The roadway is a typical two-lane cross-section with one lane in each direction.

The adjacent exhibit further depicts the unique intersection geometry and operations of the Edward N. Hines Drive and 7 Mile Road intersection.



Cady Street

- Functional Classification: Local Road
- Under the jurisdiction of City of Northville
- Runs in the east and west directions, adjacent to the north side of the project site..
 - Speed Limit 25 mph
- The roadway has a typical two-lane crosssection with one lane in each direction and has on-street parking on both sides of the road between Hutton Street and Griswold Street.







Griswold Street

- North of Main Street under the jurisdiction of WCDPS north of Main Street and a Minor Arterial functional classification:
- South of Main Street under the jurisdiction of the City of Northville and a Local Road functional classification:
 Runs in the north and south directions, generally east of the project site.
- Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volume of 7,500 vehicles per day (MDOT 2019)
 Speed Limit 35 mph
- Two-lane cross-section with one lane in each direction
 On-street parking south of Main Street adjacent to the west side of the road

Hutton Street

- Functional Classification: Local Road
- Under the jurisdiction of the City of Northville :
- Runs in the north and south directions, generally north of the project site.
- Speed Limit 25 mph
- Two-lane cross-section with one lane in each direction
- On-street parking north of Main Street on both sides of the roadway.



Wing Street

- Functional Classification: Local Road
- Under the jurisdiction of the City of Northville :
- Runs in the north and south directions, west of the project site.
 Parrell route to Center Street between Randoph St. and 7 Mile Road.
- Speed Limit 25 mph
- Two-lane cross-section with one lane in each direction
- On-street parking on both sides of the roadway (with a few exceptions along the roadway)



Randolph Street

- Functional Classification: Major Collector
- Under the jurisdiction of City of Northville
- Runs in the east and west directions, north of the project site.
- Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volume of 4,120 vehicles per day (SEMCOG 2019)
 Speed Limit 25 mph
- The roadway has a typical two-lane crosssection with one lane in each direction



Dunlap Street

- Functional Classification: Local Road
- Under the jurisdiction of City of Northville
- Runs in the east and west directions, north of the project site.
- Speed Limit 25 mph
- The roadway has a typical two-lane crosssection with one lane in each direction





Fairbrook Street

Functional Classification: Local Road
Under the jurisdiction of City of Northville
Runs in the east and west directions, west of the project site.

Speed Limit 25 mph

• The roadway has a typical two-lane crosssection with one lane in each direction and has on-street parking on both sides of the roadway.



Beal Street

- Functional Classification: Local Road
- Under the jurisdiction of City of Northville
- Runs in the east and west directions, adjacent to the west side of the project site.
- Speed Limit 25 mph
- The roadway has a typical two-lane cross-section with one lane in each direction



River Street

- Functional Classification: Local Road
- Under the jurisdiction of the City of Northville :
- Runs in the north and south directions, adjacent to the east side of the
- project site.
 - Speed Limit 25 mph
- Two-lane cross-section with one lane in each direction



2.2 TRAFFIC VOLUME DATA

Traffic volume data was collected at the study intersections by F&V subconsultants, Traffic Data Collection Inc. (TDC) on May 15, 2018, and October 18, 2018, and by Gewalt Hamilton Associates, Inc (GHA) on October 19, 2021, during the weekday AM (7:00 AM-9:00 AM) and PM (4:00 PM-6:00 PM) peak periods. The data collection performed is summarized below and the raw traffic volume data are included in **Appendix A**.

The data collection was intentionally performed on a day with no live events at the Northville Downs racetrack to avoid any additional traffic generated by the peak existing operations. During collection of the manual intersection turning movement counts, pedestrian data and commercial truck percentages were recorded and used in the traffic analysis. Peak Hour Factors (PHFs) were also calculated for each study intersection approach.

Data Collection May 15, 2018 (TDC) October 19, 2021 (GHA)

- Main Street & Center Street
- Main Street & Hutton Street
- Main Street & Griswold Street
- Main Street & Cady Street
- Cady Street & Center Street
- Cady Street & Hutton Street
- Cady Street & Church Street
- Cady Street & Griswold Street
- Beal Street & Griswold Street
- Beal Street & River Street
- Seven Mile Road & First Street / Fairbrook
- Fairbrook Street & Center Street
- Seven Mile Road & Sheldon
 Avenue / Center Street
- Seven Mile Road & Hines Drive
- Seven Mile Road & River Street

Data Collection

October 1, 2018 (TDC) October 19, 2021 (GHA)

- Beal Street & Northville Road
- SB Northville Road & N. Seven Mile Road
- NB Northville Road & N. Seven Mile Road
- Northville Road & S. Seven Mile Road

Data Collection October 19, 2021 (GHA)

- Randolph Street & Wing Street
- Randolph Street & Center Street
- Dunlap Street & Wing Street
- Center Street & Dunlap Street
- Dunlap Street & Hutton Street
- Main Street & Wing Street
- Cady Street & Wing Street
- Fairbrook Street & Wing Street
- Seven Mile Road & Wing Street / St. Lawrence Blvd



3 EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS (2021)

Section 3	Section 3.1	Section 3.2	Section 3.2		
	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3		
Existing Conditions	Baseline Operations (Pre-COVID)	Main St. & Center St. Closed	Main St. Closed Only		
Existing Traffic Volumos	Pre-COVID 2018 traffic	2021 Existing Traffic	2021 Existing Traffic Volumes,		
EXISTING TRAILE VOIUTIES	volumes grown to 2021	Volumes	adjusted		

The existing conditions analysis performed an evaluation for the three (3) scenarios as summarized below.

The existing AM and PM peak hour vehicle delays and Levels of Service (LOS) were calculated at the study intersections using Synchro (Version 11) traffic analysis software.

There are several study intersections where the traffic control used are not supported by the HCM 6th Edition analysis methodology; therefore, HCM2000 and SimTraffic simulation delays were determined to be more appropriate for use at these intersections. All remaining study intersections and driveways were analyzed using the HCM 6th Edition methodology. These intersections are summarized below:

- *Griswold Street & Beal Street:* The two-way stop control on the eastbound and southbound approaches at the T-intersection is not supported by the HCM. Therefore, SimTraffic delays were utilized.
- Seven Mile Road & First Street/Fairbrook: The stop control for southbound First Street and westbound Fairbrook Street is not supported by the HCM. Therefore, SimTraffic delays were utilized.
- Seven Mile Road & Hines Drive: The stop control for northbound Hines Drive and the westbound leftturn movement for Seven Mile Road is not supported by the HCM. Therefore, SimTraffic delays were utilized.
- Northville Road & N. Seven Mile Road: The yield control at the median crossover at the intersection is not supported by HCM 6th edition. Therefore, HCM 2000 analysis was utilized.

Descriptions of LOS "A" through "F" as defined in the HCM are provided in **Appendix B** for signalized and unsignalized intersections. Typically, LOS D is considered acceptable, with LOS A representing minimal delay, and LOS F indicating failing conditions.

3.1 SCENARIO 1 - BASELINE OPERATIONS (PRE-COVID)

The traffic volumes for this analysis utilized the existing 2018 (Pre-COVID) turning movement counts collected at the study intersections. A background growth rate of 0.2% provided by SEMCOG was applied to the 2018 traffic counts to calculate the baseline 2021 traffic volumes. There are several intersections which were added into the scope of work for this study, and therefore did not have 2018 traffic volume data. In order to evaluate these intersections under the Pre-COVID conditions the traffic volumes were adjusted and balanced with the adjacent roadway network considering the reductions in traffic associated with the current downtown street closures on Center Street and Main Street. The peak hour volumes for each

Additional	Study	Intersections	Collected	October	2021

- Randolph Street & Wing Street
- Randolph Street & Center Street
- Dunlap Street & Wing Street
- Center Street & Dunlap Street
- Dunlap Street & Hutton Street
- Main Street & Wing Street
- Cady Street & Wing Street
- Fairbrook Street & Wing Street
- · Seven Mile Road & Wing Street / St. Lawrence Blvd

intersection were utilized and the volumes were balanced upward through the study network. At locations where access is provided between study intersections, "dummy" intersections were used to account for sink and source volumes, and through volumes were carried along the main study roadways. The results of the Scenario 1 existing conditions analysis were based on the lane use and traffic control shown on **Figure 2.1 in Appendix A** and the traffic volumes shown on **Figure 3.1 in Appendix B**.



3.2 SCENARIO 2 – MAIN ST. & CENTER ST. CLOSED

The traffic volumes for this analysis utilized the existing 2021 turning movement counts collected at the study intersections. No COVID adjustment factors were applied to the traffic volumes and the analysis included in the current roadway operations, including the closures on Center Street and Main Street. The peak hour volumes for each intersection were utilized and the volumes were balanced upward through the study network. At locations where access is provided between study intersections, "dummy" intersections were used to account for sink and source volumes, and through volumes were carried along the main study roadways. The results of the Scenario 2 existing conditions analysis were based on the lane use and traffic control shown on **Figure 2.1** in **Appendix A** and the traffic volumes shown on **Figure 3.2. in Appendix B**

3.3 SCENARIO 3 - MAIN ST. CLOSED ONLY

The traffic volumes for this analysis utilized the existing 2021 turning movement counts collected at the study intersections. No COVID adjustment factors were applied to the traffic volumes and the analysis included the current roadway operations with the closures on Main Street. This evaluation included reopening Center Street, therefore for analysis purposes, Scenario 1 traffic volumes from Center Street to the west would be utilized and Scenario 2 traffic volumes east of Center Street would be utilized. The peak hour volumes for each intersection were utilized and the volumes were balanced upward through the study network. At locations where access is provided between study intersections, "dummy" intersections were used to account for sink and source volumes, and through volumes were carried along the main study roadways. The results of the Scenario 3 existing conditions analysis were based on the lane use and traffic control shown on **Figure 2.1 in Appendix A** and the traffic volumes shown on **Figure 3.3 in Appendix B**.

3.4 EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS SUMMARY

The results of the existing conditions analysis summarized in **Table 3.1** and are presented in **Appendix B.** The results of the existing conditions analysis indicate that all study intersection approaches and movements currently operate acceptably at a LOS D or better, with the exception of those highlighted in **Table 3.1**.

In order to improve traffic operations to a LOS D or better for all intersection approaches and movements in the existing condition scenarios, mitigation measures were investigated and are summarized in **Table 3.3**. The results of the analysis with the recommendations are summarized in **Table 3.3**.



				Scenario #1 (Pre-COVID)			Scenario #2 (Both Closed)				Scenario #3 (Main Closed)				
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak
				Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS
	Randolph Street	Chan	EB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
1	&	Stop (Minor)	WBL	7.8	Α	8.2	Α	7.7	А	8.1	Α	7.7	Α	8.1	Α
	Wing Street	(iviirior)	NB	11.9	В	18.9	С	11.0	В	16.9	С	11.3	В	15.8	С
2	Davidately Charact		EB	39.5	Ε	265.4	F	19.0	С	34.3	D	27.4	D	154.5	F
	Randolph Street	Stop	WB	34.3	D	154.6	F	18.2	С	25.9	D	30.2	D	79.4	F
	Center Street	(Minor)	NBL	9.3	Α	9.3	Α	8.8	Α	8.5	Α	8.9	А	9.0	А
			SBL	8.5	Α	9.0	Α	8.0	А	8.4	Α	8.7	Α	9.2	Α
			EB	8.6	Α	9.7	Α	10.0	Α	12.0	В	8.4	А	9.2	А
	Dunlap Street	Ston	WB	9.0	А	12.1	В	15.7	С	23.5	С	8.7	А	10.9	В
3	& 14/1	(All-Way)	NB	8.5	А	11.4	В	12.4	В	25.3	D	8.4	А	10.5	В
	wing Street	ζ <i>J</i> /	SB	8.9	A	10.3	В	10.8	В	14.5	B	8.8	B	9.7	A
			Overall	8.8	Α	11.2	В	13.2	В	21.5	С	8.6	Α	10.3	В
		Sconario #1	EBL	21.4	С	25.1	С	15.1	С	18.7	С	25.9	С	38.8	D
		Signalized	EBTR	18.7	В	19.2	В	10.1	В	11.2	В	18.5	В	19.7	В
		/	WBL	19.1	В	17.4	В		N.	/A		18.8	В	19.9	В
	Center Street	Scenario #2	WBIR	19.7	B	20.3	C	11.6	B	18.2	С	22.9	C	39.6	D
4	& Dunlap Street	Stop (All-Way) / Scenario #3 Signalized	NBL	1.6	A	3.5	A	N/A			1.1	A	2.3	A	
			NBIR	1.3	A	2.0	A	11/		A		1.1	A	1.2	A
			SBL	6.3	A	5.9	A	14.6	В	18.7	C	6.0	A	5.7	A
			SBIR	8.0	A	10.1	B	13.1	В	13.9	B	7.3	A	8.8	A
			Overall	7.6	A	9.3	A	13.4	B	16.9	C A	8.9	A	14.3	В
-	Dunlap Street	Stop	EBL	7.6 A 8.1 A		0.0 A 0.0 A			A	7.9	A	8.5	A		
Э	م Hutton Street	(Minor)	SD SD	10.6		12.0	D	12 5		10 7	C	12.2		30 10.7	
			FR	10.0		10.0	B	11.0	B	17.7	B	0.7		17.7	
				10.0 8 0	A	0.0		0.0		13.5	B	9.7 Q 5	A	0.0	A
6	Main Street	Stop	NR	0.7 Q Q	A	7.7	R	7.0 10.7	R	12.5		0.J 8.6	A	0.0	
0	Wing Street	(All-Way)	SB	0.7		10.3	B	10.7		18.2	C	0.0		7.7 0.3	
	5		Overall	9.6	Δ	10.5	B	12.7	B	16.2	C	9.4	Δ	97	Δ
			FR	20.0	B	20.1	C	73	Δ	7 /	Δ	10.0	B	18.1	C
	Main Stroot	#1 & #3 Signalized	WB	19.2	B	19.7	B	7.5	N	/A	Λ	17.7	N	/A	
7		Siynalizeu /	NB	9.8	A	10.0	B	8.3	A	8.8	Α	9.0	A	8.9	Α
	Center Street	#2 Stop	SB	1.1	Α	1.8	A		N	/A		0.9	Α	1.5	A
		(All-Way)	Overall	9.6	Α	10.1	В	7.8	Α	8.3	Α	7.7	Α	6.1	Α
			EBTL	0.3	Α	0.3	Α		N	/A			N	/A	
		Scoparia #1	EBR	0.0	Α	0.0	Α		N	/A			N	Ά	
		Scenario #1	WBTL	12.7	В	7.6	Α	9.5	Α	10.1	В	9.5	Α	10.1	В
0	Main Street		WBR	13.5	В	9.2	Α	10.3	В	14.4	В	10.2	В	14.4	Α
8	& Hutton Street	#2 & #3	NB	17.2	В	19.1	В	10.5	В	11.6	В	10.2	В	11.6	В
		Stop	SBTL	21.3	С	70.2	Ε	12.7	В	15.7	С	12.7	В	15.7	С
		(All-Way)	SBR	16.5	В	16.5	В	8.8	А	9.9	Α	8.8	Α	9.9	А
			Overall	12.6	В	22.1	С	10.9	В	13.5	В	10.8	В	13.5	В

Table 3.1: Existing Conditions Analysis Summary

				Scenar	io #1	(Pre-CO	/ID)	Scenari	o #2 (Both Clo	sed)	Scenari	o #3 (Main Clo	sed)
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	ak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	ak	PM Pe	ak
				Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS
			EBTL	12.0	В	24.1	С	9.6	А	10.2	В	9.6	А	10.2	В
			EBTR	10.1	В	17.8	В	9.7	А	10.2	В	9.7	Α	10.2	В
	Main Street		WBTL	10.1	В	11.8	В	10.4	В	11.1	В	10.4	В	11.1	В
9	&	Signalized	WBTR	10.5	В	12.5	В	10.8	В	11.9	В	10.8	В	11.9	В
	Griswold Street		NB	15.3	В	16.4	В	16.2	В	16.7	С	15.6	В	16.0	С
			SB	17.0	B	32.3	С	17.4	B	25.9	С	17.4	B	22.7	С
			Overall	12.9	В	20.2	С	13.2	B	16.2	В	13.0	В	15.0	В
	Main Street	Stop	EB		⊦r	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
10	& Cady Streat	(Minor)	WBL	7.9	A	8.6	A	8.0	A	8.4	A	8.0	A	8.4	A
	Cauy Sileei		NB	9.7	A	13.3	В	10.2	В	12.5	В	10.2	В	12.5	В
			EB	8.5	A	8.9	A	9.5	A	9.8	A	8.2	A	8.5	A
11	Cady Street	Stop	WB	8.0	A	8.6	A	9.2	A	10.0	A	7.9	A	8.3	A
11	& Wing Street	(All-Way)	NB NB	8.1	A	9.3	A	9.3	A	11.3	В	8.U	A	8.9	A
	Wing Street		SD Ovorall	8.9 9.5	Б Л	9.4 0.1	A	10.5	D R	12.7 11 /	D B	0.0 9.2	A	8.9 9.7	A
			FR	10.5	A C	37.7	F	14.7	B	22.9	C	22.0		116.1	F
	Cady Street	Ston	WB	44.9	F	132.3	F	44.6	F	331.8	F	250.9	F	1554 5	F
12	&	(Minor)	NBI	8.4	A	9.2	Α	7.6	Δ	77	Α	8.2	A	87	A
	Center Street	(SBL	9.0	A	8.9	A	8.2	A	8.5	A	9.0	A	9.2	A
	Cadu Stroot		FBI	7.8	A	7.6	A	8.4	A	8.3	A	8.3	A	8.0	A
13	Cady Street	Stop	WB	7.0	Fr	ee		0.1	Fr	ee		0.0	Fr	3e	
	Hutton Street	(Minor)	SB	11.5	В	10.2	В	11.7	В	14.8	В	11.4	В	12.7	В
	Cadu Streat		EB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
14	Cauy Sileei &	Stop	WB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	<u>e</u>	
	Church Street	(Minor)	SB	10.3	B	9.9	Α	11.7	B	11.5	В	11.5	B	10.9	В
			FB	11.0	B	13.9	B	12.9	B	15.1	C	12.3	B	13.5	B
	Cady Street	Ston	WB	9.5	A	11.0	B	11.1	B	10.7	B	11.1	B	10.4	B
15	& Criowald Streat	(Minor)	NBL	7.4	A	7.6	A	7.6	A	7.9	A	7.6	A	7.8	A
	GIISWOID SILEEL		SBL	7.3	А	7.4	Α	7.3	Α	7.3	Α	7.3	А	7.3	А
	Roal Stroot		EB	0.0*	Α	0.0*	Α	0.0*	Α	0.0*	Α	0.0*	А	0.0*	Α
16	&	Stop	WB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee	J		Fr	ee	I
	Griswold Street	(EB & SB)	SB	0.0**	А	3.9**	Α	3.7**	Α	3.9**	Α	3.7**	А	3.9**	А
	Roal Stroot		EB		Fr	ee		-	Fr	ee		-	Fr	ee	
17		Stop	WBL	7.3	Α	7.4	Α	7.3	Α	7.4	Α	7.3	А	7.4	Α
	River Street	(Minor)	NB	9.1	А	9.8	Α	9.1	Α	9.5	Α	9.1	А	9.5	А
	Pool Stroot		EB	10.5	В	12.6	В	9.8	Α	11.3	В	9.8	А	11.3	В
18		Stop	NBL	8.0	А	8.6	А	8.0	А	8.5	А	8.0	А	8.5	А
	Northville Road	(Minor)	SB		Fr	ee	<u> </u>		Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
			EBI	1.7**	A	6.7**	Α	1.8**	A	3.5**	Α	5.0**	A	2.1**	Α
	Seven Mile Road	Ston	WB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	 ee	· · ·
19	First Street /	(Minor)	SB	10.0**	B	27.9**	D	9.6**	A	12.5**	В	9.3**	A	16.6**	С
	Fairbrook Street		SW	6.8**	Α	12.1**	В	6.5**	Α	9.6**	Α	7.1**	А	8.5**	A



				Scenar	io #1	(Pre-CO	/ID)	Scenari	o #2 (Both Clo	sed)	Scenari	o #3 (Main Clo	sed)
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	ak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak
			, pp. coo	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS
			EB	7.5	Α	8.1	Α	8.0	Α	8.4	А	7.4	Α	8.0	Α
	Fairbrook Street		WB	6.8	А	7.9	Α	7.4	А	8.1	Α	6.7	Α	7.7	Α
20	&	Stop	NB	7.5	Α	8.5	Α	8.3	Α	8.7	Α	7.5	Α	8.2	Α
	Wing Street	(All-Way)	SB	7.5	Α	8.3	Α	8.9	Α	9.3	Α	7.4	Α	8.1	Α
			Overall	7.4	Α	8.2	Α	8.5	Α	8.9	Α	7.3	Α	8.0	Α
	Fairbrook Street		EB	22.6	С	23.2	С	14.5	В	13.7	В	18.3	В	18.9	В
21	&	Stop (Minor)	NBL	8.5	Α	10.1	В	8.3	А	8.3	А	8.3	Α	9.5	Α
	Center Street		SB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
	Seven Mile Road		EBL	7.7	Α	9.2	Α	7.9	А	8.9	Α	7.8	Α	8.9	Α
22	&	Stop	WBL	8.8	А	8.4	Α	8.2	А	8.1	А	8.2	А	8.5	Α
22	Wing Street / St.	(Minor)	NB	15.3	С	22.3	С	13.2	В	17.9	С	12.9	В	21.0	С
	Lawrence Blvd		SB	17.4	С	39.4	Е	22.7	С	95.0	F	14.6	В	32.0	D
			EBL	20.6	С	33.1	С	20.5	С	31.0	С	21.5	С	30.1	С
			EBTR	33.3	С	26.7	С	29.5	С	28.5	С	23.3	С	27.3	С
			WBL	37.6	D	39.4	D	39.9	D	50.8	D	27.0	С	38.6	D
	Seven Mile Road		WBT	18.3	B	27.8	С	18.8	B	26.4	C	18.9	B	25.2	С
23	& Chaldan Avanua /	Signalized	WBR	1/.4	В	18.4	B	16.8	B	17.9	B	17.2	В	18.1	B
	Contor Street	5	NBL	19.9	B	40.0	D	22.1	С	20.5	С	18.2	В	30.4	C
	Center Street			21.0		27.5		10.7	B	19.4 27.5	B	18.8	В	21.8	
			SBL	33.3 15 /	B	43.0	C	21.Z 15.Q	B	27.5	B	27.0	B	18.9	B
			Overall	23.6	C	27.7	C	21.3	C	24.0	C	19.3	B	23.9	C
			WBI	13.1**	B	22.4**	C	11.2**	B	17.6**	C	4.3**	A	21.8**	C
	Seven Mile Road	Stop	WBR		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	e	
24	& 	(NB Hines &	NB	17.0**	C	31.1**	D	14.3**	B	25.1**	D	12.6**	B	25.5**	D
	Hines Drive	WBL / Mile)	SBL	4.7**	A	4.0**	A	3.9**	A	3.8**	A	3.6**	A	4.3**	A
	Sovon Milo Poad		FBI	77	Α	87	Α	7.8	Α	8.6	Α	7.8	Α	8.6	A
25	&	Stop	WB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
	River Street	(Minor)	SB	11.0	В	13.7	В	10.9	В	13.9	В	10.9	В	13.9	В
	SB Northvillo Poad		EBT	11.5	В	14.4	В	11.5	В	13.9	В	11.5	В	13.9	В
		Stop/Yield	EBR	12.2	В	13.7	В	10.9	В	13.3	В	10.9	В	13.3	В
26	N. Seven Mile	(Minor)	WB	13.9	В	69.2	F	13.8	В	66.8	F	13.8	В	66.8	F
	Road		SB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee	1		Fr	ee	
	NB Northville Road		EBL	14.5	В	32.2	D	15.1	С	32.0	D	15.1	С	32.0	D
27	&	Yield	NBTL	4.9	Α	5.9	Α	4.8	Α	6.2	Α	4.8	Α	6.2	Α
2,	N. Seven Mile Road	(Minor)	NBT		Fr	ee			Fr	ee	•		Fr	ee	
			WBL	21.5	С	22.3	С	21.5	С	24.7	С	21.5	С	24.7	С
			WBR	9.9	Α	15.3	В	9.6	А	14.8	В	9.6	A	14.8	В
	Northville Road		NBT	40.0	D	129.2	F	49.9	D	107.9	F	49.9	D	107.9	F
28	& S. Seven Mile	Signalized	NBTR	58.8	E	131.7	F	68.8	E	111.6	F	68.8	Ε	111.6	F
	Road		SBL	57.4	Ε	44.1	D	37.1	D	39.7	D	37.1	D	39.7	D
			SBT	11.3	В	12.2	В	11.3	В	12.0	В	11.3	В	12.0	В
			Overall	37.1	D	58.7	E	36.3	D	50.1	D	36.3	D	50.1	D

* Indicates no vehicle volume present ** Indicates SimTraffic delay was utilized



3.4.1 Signal Warrant Analyses

The signal warrant analysis was conducted in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD). The existing traffic volumes at the study intersections of Center Street & Randolph Street, Center Street & Cady Street, and Northville Road & 7-Mile Road were utilized for each of the scenarios to evaluate the MMUTCD warranting criteria. F&V only collected 4-hour turning movement count data at the study intersections, with the exception of the Northville Road & 7-Mile Road (Scenario #1) intersection; therefore, if the Warrants for 1A or 1B are not met for all 4 hours of evaluation, higher volumes are not expected during the off-peak hours, indicating the full Warrant 1A and/or 1B would not be met.

Warrant 1 (8-Hour Vehicular Volume)

According to the MMUTCD, Warrant 1, Condition A is intended for application at locations where a large volume of intersecting traffic is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal. Condition B is intended for application where Condition A is not satisfied and where the traffic volume on the major street is so heavy that traffic on a minor intersecting street suffers excessive delay or conflict in entering or crossing the major street. It is intended that Warrant 1 be treated as a single warrant, where Warrant 1 is satisfied if either Conditions A or B are met. Additionally, in applying each condition, the major-street and minor-street volumes shall be for the same 8 hours. On the minor street, the higher volume shall not be required to be on the same approach during each of these 8 hours.

Warrant 2 (4-Hour Vehicular Volume)

The Four-Hour signal warrant conditions are intended to be applied where the volume of intersecting traffic is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal. The need for a traffic signal shall be considered if, for each of any four hours of an average day, the approach volumes fall above the applicable curve on Figure 4C-1.

Warrant 3 (Peak-Hour Vehicular Volume)

The Peak Hour signal warrant conditions is intended for use at a location where traffic conditions are such that for a minimum of 1 hour of an average day, the minor-street traffic suffers undue delay when entering or crossing the major street. The need for a signal shall be considered if on any hour of an average day, the approach volumes fall above the applicable curve on Figure 4C-3.

Warrant 4 (Pedestrian Volumes)

The Pedestrian Volume signal warrant is intended for application where the traffic volume on a major street is so heavy that pedestrians experience excessive delay in crossing the major street. The need for a traffic signal shall be considered if, for each of any four hours of an average day, the vehicular and pedestrian volumes fall above the applicable curve on Figure 4C-5 **<u>OR</u>** if on any hour of an average day, the vehicular and pedestrian volumes fall above the applicable curve on Figure 4C-7.

Warrant 5 (School Crossing)

The School Crossing signal warrant is intended for application where the fact that schoolchildren cross the major street is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal. For the purposes of this warrant, the word "schoolchildren" includes elementary through high school students. None of the study intersections evaluated are within close proximity to a school; therefore, this warrant is not applicable.

Warrant 6 (Coordinated Signal System)

Progressive movement in a coordinated signal system sometimes necessitates installing traffic control signals at intersections where they would not otherwise be needed in order to maintain proper platooning of vehicles. The study intersections evaluated are not part of a coordinated network focused on platooning and progression of vehicles, encouraging throughput; therefore, this warrant is not applicable.

Warrant 7 (Crash Experience)

The Crash Experience signal warrant conditions are intended for application where the severity and frequency of crashes are the principal reasons to consider installing a traffic control signal. The need for a signal shall be considered if five or more reported crashes of types susceptible to correction by a traffic control signal, have occurred within a 12-month period, each crash involving personal injury or property damage apparently exceeding the applicable requirements for a reportable crash <u>AND</u> Warrant 1A and/or Warrant 1B are met to 80 percent of the required volumes.



Warrant 8 (Roadway Network)

Installing a traffic control signal at some intersections might be justified to encourage concentration and organization of traffic flow on a roadway network. The need for a traffic signal shall be considered at location of two or more major routes, in addition to volume criteria. The study intersections evaluated each contain at least one minor route; therefore, this warrant is not applicable.

Warrant 9 (Intersection Near a Grade Crossing)

The Intersection Near a Grade Crossing signal warrant is intended for use at a location where none of the conditions described in the other eight traffic signal warrants are met, but the proximity to the intersection of a grade crossing on an intersection approach controlled by a STOP or YIELD sign is the principal reason to consider installing a traffic control signal. None of the study intersections evaluated are within close proximity to a grade crossing; therefore, this warrant is not applicable.

Study Intersection	1	Ce Rand	nter Str & dolph S	reet Street	Ce Ca	nter Sti & ady Str	reet eet	Nort 7-I	hville R & Vile Ro	Road ad
Scenario		#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3
Warrant 1: Eight Ho	ur	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Condition A	Hours Met	1	1	2	0	3	0	8	3	3
CONUMION A	Warrant Met	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Condition P	Hours Met	1	0	3	2	0	2	5	2	2
CONUMON B	Warrant Met	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Warrant 2. Four Hour	Hours Met	1	0	2	1	2	2	7	2	2
Warrant 2: Four-Hour	Warrant Met	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO
Warrant 2. Deak Hour	Hours Met	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	2	2
Warrant 3: Peak-Hour	Warrant Met	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
Morront 4. Dedectrion Volume	Hours Met	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
warrant 4: Pedestrian volume	Warrant Met	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Warrant 5: School Cros	ssing		N/A			N/A			N/A	
Warrant 6: Coordinated Sigr	nal System		N/A			N/A			N/A	
	Crashes		4/5			4/5			4/5	
warrant 7: Crash Experience	Warrant Met		NO			NO			NO	
Warrant 8: Roadway Ne		N/A			N/A			N/A		
Warrant 9: Intersection Near Gr		N/A			N/A			N/A		

 Table 3.2: Existing Signal Warrant Analysis Summary

The results of the existing conditions signal warrant analyses are summarized in **Table 3.2**, the warrant charts are included in **Appendix E**, and the data indicates the following:

- <u>Scenario #3 (Pre-COVID):</u> Center Street & Randolph Street meets Warrant 3.
- <u>Scenario #1 (Pre-COVID):</u> Northville Road & 7-Mile Road meets Warrant 1A, 2, and 3.
- <u>Scenario #2 (Pre-COVID):</u> Northville Road & 7-Mile Road meets Warrant 3.
- <u>Scenario #3 (Pre-COVID)</u>: Northville Road & 7-Mile Road meets Warrant 3.

The study intersections of Center Street & Randolph Street (Scenario #1) and Center Street & Cady Street (Scenario #1 & #3) do not meet the signal warrants based on existing volumes; however, the minor street suffers undue delay during the peak hour. Therefore, although the signal warrants are not met, traffic signals are recommended at these study intersections (Scenario #1 & #3), in an effort to mitigate the failing LOS and vehicular delays and improve vehicle queueing under existing conditions.



3.4.2 All-Way Stop Control Analysis

With the reduced volumes along Center Street associated with Scenario #2 (Both Closed), all-way stop control was determined to be a more appropriate mitigation measure at the study intersections of Center Street & Randolph Street and Center Street & Cady Street, which are four-legged with stop-control on the minor approaches. Section 2B.07 of the *MMUTCD* provides the following criterion to evaluate for the consideration of multi-way stop control at an intersection.

- A. Where traffic control signals are justified, the multi-way stop is an interim measure that can be installed quickly to control traffic while arrangements are being made for the installation of the traffic control signal.
- B. Five or more reported crashes in a 12-month period that are susceptible to correction by a multi-way stop installation. Such crashes include right-turn and left-turn collisions as well as right-angle collisions.
- C. Minimum volumes:
 - 1 The vehicular volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 300 vehicles per hour for any 8 hours of an average day; and
 - 2 The combined vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volume entering the intersection from the minor street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours, with an average delay to minor-street vehicular traffic of at least 30 seconds per vehicle during the highest hour; but
 - 3 If the 85th-percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph, the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values provided in Items 1 and 2.
- D. Where no single criterion is satisfied, but where Criteria B, C.1, and C.2 are all satisfied to 80 percent of the minimum values. Criterion C.3 is excluded from this condition.

	Multi-Way Stop Sign Criterion (MMUTCD Section 2B.07)	Center Street & Randolph Street Met?	Center Street & Cady Street Met?
Α.	Signal	No	No
В.	Crashes	No	No
C.	Traffic Volumes	No	Yes
D.	80% Criteria	No	Yes
Mu	Iti-Way Stop Control Recommended	No	Yes

Table 3.3: Existing All-Way Warrant Analysis Summary

The results of the existing conditions all-way stop warrant analyses are summarized in **Table 3.3** and indicate that the study intersection of Center Street & Cady Street meets the traffic volume warrants for all 4 hours of available data, based on existing volumes; therefore, all-way stop is recommended for this intersection under existing conditions.



3.4.3 Center Street and Randolph Street

Several mitigation measures were identified at this intersection in order to address the intersection delays and vehicle queueing identified in all three (3) Scenarios. These alternatives are summarized below.



3.4.4 Center Street and Cady Street

Several mitigation measures were identified at this intersection in order to address the intersection delays and vehicle queueing identified in all three (3) Scenarios. These alternatives are summarized below.



3.4.5 Northville Road (S. Main Street) and N. Seven Mile Road

Several mitigation measures were identified at this intersection in order to address the intersection delays and vehicle queueing identified in all three (3) Scenarios. These alternatives are summarized below.





	Intersection	Scenario #1 (Pre- COVID)	Scenario #2 (Both Closed)	Scenario #3 (Main Closed)
2	Randolph Street & Center Street	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	n/a	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.
8	Main Street & Hutton Street	Signal Timing Optimization Recommended*	п	la
9	Main Street & Griswold Street	Signal T	iming Optimization Recom	mended*
12	Cady Street & Center Street	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	All Way Stop Control Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.
22	Seven Mile Road & Wing Street / St. Lawrence	A review of network simula operations. Queue lengths were able to fin	ations indicates acceptable were minimal, and vehicles d gaps in traffic.	n/a
23	Seven Mile Road & Sheldon Avenue / Center Street	Option 2: Widen the bridge/culvert across the Johnson Creek to provide a NB left-turn lane with 500-ft of storage length and/or Option 3: Roundabout is recommended.	n/a	Option 2: Widen the bridge/culvert across the Johnson Creek to provide a NB left-turn lane with 500-ft of storage length and/or Option 3: Roundabout is recommended.
26/ 27	Northville Road & N. Seven Mile Road	Delays for WB Stop control	rn sight distance limitations.	
28	Northville Road & S. Seven Mile Road	Signal T	iming Optimization Recom	mended*

Table 3.4: Existing Intersection Mitigation Summary

* Details of the proposed signal timing optimization are included in Appendix F



				Scenar	io #1	(Pre-CO	/ID)	Scenari	io #2 ((Both Clo	osed)	Scenari	o #3 (Main Clo	sed)
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak
				Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS
			EB	25.9	С	27.9	С					26.4	С	26.7	С
	Randolph Street	#1 8. #2	WB	20.9	С	18.5	В					21.8	С	19.4	В
2	&	Signalized	NB	1.0	А	1.7	Α		No C	hange		1.0	А	1.8	Α
	Center Street	5	SB	7.6	Α	9.8	Α					6.2	Α	8.1	Α
			Overall	8.0	Α	10.3	В					6.9	Α	8.9	Α
			EBTL			20.6	С								
		Scenario #1	EBR			17.8	В								
	Main Street	Signalized	WBTL			17.0	B								
8	&		WBR	No Cha	nge	23.4	С		No C	hange			No Cł	nange	
	Hutton Street	#2 & #3 Stop	NB		5	8.6	A	3						5	
		(All-Way)	SBIL			11.2	B								
			SBR			8.3	A								
			Overall			17.5	B			15.0				45.0	
			EBIL			32.8	C		1	15.2	В			15.2	В
			EBTR 22.4 C 15.0 B	В			15.0	В							
_	Main Street	Circalizad	WBIL			17.5	В	Ne Che		16.3	B	Na Cha		16.3	В
9	& Griswold Street	Signalized	WBIR	NO Cha	nge	19.2	В	NO Cha	inge	18.0	В	NO Cha	inge	18.0	В
						11.2	D			11.3 15.4	D			11.0	D
			Overall			17.5 10.0	B			15.4 15.2	B			14.0 15.0	B
			FR	247	C	22.0	C	10.7	B	13.2	B	22.2	C	10.0	B
	Cody Street	#1 & #3	WR	24.7	C	22.7	C	13.2	B	20.2	C	25.2	C	24.6	C
12	Cauy Sireei &	Signalizeu /	NB	5.4	A	67	A	15.2	C	34.6	D	73	A	10.1	B
12	Center Street	#2 Stop	SB	0.6	A	1.3	A	10.9	B	14.2	B	0.7	A	15	A
		(All-Way)	Overall	5.5	A	6.2	A	13.6	B	24.4	C	8.7	A	10.4	B
			EBL	24.6	С	37.0	D	24.7	C	35.8	D	24.7	С	35.8	D
	SD Northvillo Dood		EBR	15.5	B	16.6	B	13.6	B	16.5	B	13.6	B	16.5	B
	SD NUTUIVIIE RUdu &		NBL	6.8	А	4.9	Α	6.9	Α	4.9	Α	6.9	Α	4.9	Α
26	N. Seven Mile	Signalized	NBT	0.2	А	0.2	Α	0.2	А	0.2	Α	0.2	Α	0.2	Α
	Road		SB	24.2	С	25.0	С	24.2	С	24.6	С	24.2	С	24.6	С
			Overall	12.7	В	11.8	В	11.6	В	12.0	В	11.6	В	12.0	В
			WBL	34.9	С	33.2	С	34.8	С	41.4	D	24.8	С	41.4	D
			WBR	13.0	В	22.6	С	12.6	В	21.6	С	12.6	В	21.6	С
	Northville Road		NBT	29.0	С	41.9	D	31.8	С	38.5	D	31.8	С	38.5	D
28	& S. Soven Mile	Signalized	NBTR	34.1	С	43.2	D	36.1	D	39.9	D	36.1	D	39.9	D
	S. Seven Mile Road		SBL	35.3	D	32.7	С	31.6	С	29.7	С	31.6	С	29.7	С
			SBT	14.0	В	4.2	Α	14.0	В	4.2	А	14.0	В	4.2	А
			Overall	28.5	С	29.3	С	28.5	С	28.9	С	28.5	С	28.9	С

Table 3.5: Existing Conditions with Mitigation Analysis Summary

3.4.6 Sheldon Avenue/Center Street and Seven Mile Road/Hines Drive

The LOS at this intersection showed acceptable intersection delays; however, review of the Sim Traffic simulations showed long vehicles queues for several movements. Therefore, mitigation measures were investigated at this intersection in order to address the vehicle queuing and subsequent intersection delays. The mitigation measures options evaluated are summarized below and the results of the operations for each option for each scenario are provided on **Tables 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8** for Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

Option 1: Signalization Improvements

- Upgrade to a fully actuated, 2-phase traffic signal.
- Restripe the NB approach to provide a left-turn lane Note: length would be limited by existing geometric constraints of the bridge.
- Restripe the SB approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane.

Option 2: Increased Northbound Left-Turn Storage

- Widen the bridge/culvert across the Johnson Creek to provide a NB left-turn lane with 300- ft of storage length.
- Restripe the SB approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane.

Option 3: Roundabout

- Additional ROW required, in order to accommodate a roundabout.
- Potential wetland mitigation may be needed.
- · Grading west of the intersection and vertical sight distance issues to address
- Will require special design consideration for pedestrians and bicycles.

Summary

- The results of the analysis showed that increasing the left-turn storage (Option 2) provided the highest reduction in vehicle queueing.
- However, the construction of a roundabout (Option 3) may also be considered to reduce delays and improve vehicle queueing
- Option 1 (Signal upgrade) is expected to provide minimal improvement over existing conditions, unless installed in conjunction with Option 2; therefore, Option 1 is not recemmended for this intersection.

Peak	Existing Conditions	ons	Op Ir	1 Sigi nprov	nalizati vement	ion s	Op2	Increa Sto	ased N rage	B LT	Ор	3 Roi	undabo	out			
Period	Approach	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)
	EBL	20.6	С	25	60	23.3	С	30	144	20.6	С	26	84	Q /	٨	100	272
	EBTR	33.3	С	163	266	50.4	D	223	371	33.3	С	197	340	0.4		100	572
	WBL	37.6	D	20	51	28.6	С	21	43	37.6	D	21	52				
	WBT	18.3	В	47	94	27.5	С	66	117	18.3	В	50	106	4.7	А	27	60
	WBR	17.4	В	13	40	23.2	С	13	35	17.4	В	16	47				
AM	NBL	19.9	В	27	63	21.0	С	27	61	19.9	В	22	59				
	NBT	21.6	C	257	451	50.3	П	415	781	18.6	В	224	414	11.5	В	1653	3147
	NBR	21.0	Ŭ	207	101	50.5	D	415	701	11.3	В	30	85				
	SBL	33.3	С	57	121	28.4	С	38	72	28.1	С	52	107	52	Δ	78	164
	SBTR	15.4	В	113	202	27.8	С	145	258	15.4	В	123	207	0.2	~	70	104
	Overall	23.6	С	N/A	N/A	40.3	D	N/A	N/A	22.3	С	N/A	N/A	8.1	Α	N/A	N/A
	EBL	33.1	С	26	68	31.7	С	16	44	33.1	С	26	65	10.3	B	102	151
	EBTR	26.7	С	150	243	54.6	D	227	363	26.7	С	144	237	10.5	D	172	JJT
	WBL	39.4	D	83	188	36.8	D	107	261	39.4	D	92	216				
	WBT	27.8	С	186	292	52.4	D	249	401	27.8	С	206	354	8.6	А	599	785
	WBR	18.4	В	65	174	27.5	С	88	252	18.4	В	76	241				
PM	NBL	40.0	D	50	75	28.0	С	47	73	40.0	D	171	374				
	NBT	27 5	C	2844	5931	54.4	П	2631	4614	20.6	С	304	531	15.9	С	5631	12659
	NBR	27.0	Ŭ	2044	5751	04.4	U	2001	FIDE	11.6	В	33	85				
	SBL	43.0	D	77	184	29.1	С	81	243	31.8	С	74	179	13.6	В	519	531
	SBTR	21.7	С	223	354	37.3	D	323	509	21.7	С	239	375	10.0		517	001
	Overall	27.1	С	N/A	N/A	46.0	D	N/A	N/A	24.6	С	N/A	N/A	12.3	В	N/A	N/A

Table 3.6: Scenario 1 - Center St. and Seven Mile Rd. Intersection Mitigation Summary (Existing)

Table 3.7: Scenario 2 - Center St. and Seven Mile Rd. Intersection Mitigation Summary (Existing)

Peak Period	Approach	Exis	sting (Conditi	ions	Op Ir	1 Sig npro\	nalizati /ement	ion s	Op2	Increa Sto	ased N rage	B LT	Ор	3 Roi	indabo	out
Period	Арргоаст	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)
	EBL	20.5	С	10	33	18.3	В	11	32	20.5	С	9	28	6.0	٨	70	100
	EBTR	29.5	С	150	244	31.8	С	173	301	29.5	С	140	237	0.9	А	75	120
	WBL	39.9	D	51	122	21.3	С	33	62	39.9	D	47	95				
	WBT	18.8	В	60	152	20.0	В	56	125	18.8	В	64	119	3.9	А	44	78
	WBR	16.8	В	7	23	16.3	В	10	42	16.8	В	6	27				
AM	NBL	22.1	С	36	72	21.8	С	35	74	22.1	С	35	79				
	NBT	167	D	100	250	20.2	C	220	121	14.9	В	148	288	6.1	А	155	287
	NBR	10.7	D	199	300	30.3	C	220	431	11.3	В	34	85				
_	SBL	21.2	С	18	58	21.7	С	22	53	18.4	В	20	52	5.0	٨	45	120
	SBTR	15.9	В	109	180	30.3	С	116	224	15.9	В	105	176	0.0	А	00	130
	Overall	21.3	С	N/A	N/A	28.2	С	N/A	N/A	20.6	С	N/A	N/A	5.6	Α	N/A	N/A



Peak Period A	Approach	Exis	ting (Conditi	ions	Op Ir	1 Sigi nprov	nalizati vement	ion s	Op2	Increa Sto	ased N rage	B LT	Ор	3 Rou	indabo	out
Period	Арргоасн	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)
	EBL	31.0	С	17	46	24.8	С	22	91	31.0	С	19	52	7 2	٨	80	174
	EBTR	28.5	С	143	234	43.0	D	230	385	28.5	С	146	238	7.5	A	00	174
	WBL	50.8	D	103	220	32.6	С	89	207	50.8	D	88	188				
	WBT	26.4	С	188	359	33.4	С	194	329	26.4	С	170	314	5.6	А	176	336
	WBR	17.9	В	63	262	21.1	С	69	216	17.9	В	52	219				
PM	NBL	20.5	С	45	74	20.6	С	43	74	20.5	С	53	108				
	NBT	10 /	D	าดว	100	20.0	р	/10	640	16.2	В	167	338	8.0	А	992	1978
	NBR	19.4	D	203	40Z	30.0	U	410	040	11.7	В	43	92				
-	SBL	27.5	С	47	100	24.3	С	35	69	22.2	С	41	80	61	٨	10E	200
	SBTR	14.3	В	112	174	25.9	С	147	235	14.3	В	105	171	U. I	А	105	209
	Overall	24.0	С	N/A	N/A	33.8	С	N/A	N/A	22.8	С	N/A	N/A	6.7	Α	N/A	N/A

Table 3.8: Scenario	3 - Center St. and Seve	en Mile Rd. Intersection	Mitigation Summary	(Existina)
				()

Peak	Approach	Exis	ting (Condit	ions	Op Ir	1 Sigi nprov	nalizati vement	ion s	Op2	Increa Sto	ased N rage	B LT	Ор	3 Roi	undabo	out
Period	Approach	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)
	EBL	21.5	С	23	49	21.1	С	17	40	21.5	С	20	51	5.6	٨	57	115
	EBTR	23.3	С	125	214	31.1	С	129	234	23.3	С	113	191	5.0	Λ	57	115
	WBL	27.0	С	20	48	22.6	С	19	45	27.0	С	18	49				
	WBT	18.9	В	67	119	25.8	С	76	137	18.9	В	73	142	4.1	А	45	83
	WBR	17.2	В	12	33	20.5	С	12	35	17.2	В	13	38				
AM	NBL	18.2	В	20	57	15.1	В	29	72	18.2	В	18	47				
	NBT	18.8	R	200	380	27.2	C	263	116	16.9	В	190	343	7.3	А	249	495
	NBR	10.0	D	200	500	21.2	C	203	440	11.2	В	30	84				
	SBL	27.0	С	39	84	18.2	В	39	73	23.8	С	40	84	18	٨	53	100
	SBTR	14.6	В	118	182	19.9	В	104	183	14.6	В	118	197	4.0	А	00	107
	Overall	19.3	В	N/A	N/A	25.1	С	N/A	N/A	18.4	В	N/A	N/A	5.7	Α	N/A	N/A
	EBL	30.1	С	21	54	26.9	С	22	92	30.1	С	22	53	0.2	٨	102	425
	EBTR	27.3	С	156	259	46.3	D	204	325	27.3	С	156	265	7.2	A	175	420
	WBL	38.6	D	67	157	29.1	С	81	204	38.6	D	62	120				
	WBT	25.2	С	164	271	36.1	D	205	325	25.2	С	148	240	6.3	А	348	787
	WBR	18.1	В	50	150	23.9	С	66	197	18.1	В	44	119				
PM	NBL	30.4	С	47	73	24.0	С	46	74	30.4	С	66	139				
	NBT	21.0	C	400	1000	12.2	D	1150	2210	18.1	В	217	370	10.4	В	5522	11813
	NBR	Z1.0	C	493	1009	43.3	U	1150	2210	11.5	В	36	89				
	SBL	31.5	С	66	169	25.3	С	64	201	25.8	С	50	128	0.2	٨	Г10	гээ
	SBTR	18.9	В	184	282	34.5	С	297	486	18.9	В	199	305	9.3	А	519	533
	Overall	23.9	С	N/A	N/A	37.7	D	N/A	N/A	22.5	С	N/A	N/A	8.8	Α	N/A	N/A



4 BACKGROUND CONDITIONS ANALYSIS (2028)

The proposed development is expected to have an opening day in 2024 with the first dwelling units occupied, with a full buildout of the site in 2028. Therefore, the background conditions analysis evaluated the projected operations in 2028 *without the proposed development* for the three (3) scenarios as summarized below.

Section 4	Section 4.1	Section 4.2	Section 4.3
Background Conditions	Scenario 1 Baseline Operations (Pre-COVID)	Scenario 2 Main St. & Center St. Closed	Scenario 3 Main St. Closed Only
Background Traffic Volumes	Baseline + Growth Rate + Background Developments	Existing + Growth Rate + Background Developments	Existing adj. + Growth Rate + Background Developments

A background growth was determined to calculate the projected implicit background traffic growth to the site buildout year in 2028. Population and employment data were used in order to determine the applicable growth rate for the existing traffic volumes to the project build-out year of 2028. The SEMCOG community profile for the City of Northville was reviewed and showed an average annual growth rate of 0.20% population growth and a 0.07% employment growth from 2020 to 2045. Therefore, an annual growth rate of 0.20% per year was applied to the existing traffic volumes evaluated in Section 3 for all three (3) scenarios.

In addition to background growth, it is important to account for traffic that will be generated by approved and/or proposed developments within the vicinity of the study area that have yet to be constructed or are currently under construction. The following developments were identified by the City of Northville:

- Cady Project 6-unit condominium (South side of Cady Street, east of Center Street)
- 355 E. Cady St. 3-story mixed-use building; first floor Retail, office above
- 455 E. Cady St "Hanger Building"- office space
- Foundry Flask 78 Multi-Family Units, corner store specialty market

The number of AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips that would be generated by the proposed developments were forecast based on data published by ITE in the *Trip Generation Manual*, 10th Edition¹ and the ITE *Trip Generation Handbook*, 3rd Edition. The trip distribution that was determined for the proposed Northville Downs development was used to distribute the trip projections for these developments.

4.1 SCENARIO 1 - BASELINE OPERATIONS (PRE-COVID)

The traffic volumes for this analysis utilized the baseline 2021 traffic volumes shown on Figure 3.1. A 0.2% annual background growth rate was applied to these traffic volumes and the trips generated by the adjacent developments were added into the study network to calculate the Scenario 1 background conditions traffic volumes. The results of the Scenario 1 background conditions analysis were based on the lane use and traffic control shown on **Figure 2.1** the traffic volumes shown on **Figure 4.1 in Appendix C**.

4.2 SCENARIO 2 - MAIN ST. & CENTER ST. CLOSED

The traffic volumes for this analysis utilized the baseline 2021 traffic volumes shown on Figure 3.2. A 0.2% annual background growth rate was applied to these traffic volumes and the trips generated by the adjacent developments were added into the study network to calculate the Scenario 2 background conditions traffic volumes. The results of the Scenario 2 background conditions analysis were based on the lane use and traffic control shown on **Figure 2.1** and the traffic volumes shown on **Figure 4.2 in Appendix C**.

4.3 SCENARIO 3 - MAIN ST. CLOSED ONLY

The traffic volumes for this analysis utilized the baseline 2021 traffic volumes shown on Figure 3.3. A 0.2% annual background growth rate was applied to these traffic volumes and the trips generated by the adjacent developments were added into the study network to calculate the Scenario 3 background conditions traffic volumes. The results of the Scenario 3 background conditions analysis were based on the lane use and traffic control shown on **Figure 2.1** the traffic volumes shown on **Figure 4.3 in Appendix C**.

¹The ITE Trip Generation 11th edition was published in October 2021. The trip generation analysis performed for these land uses was performed before the release of this publication, therefore the 10th Edition data was utilized for these developments



4.4 BACKGROUND CONDITIONS ANALYSIS SUMMARY

The results of the background conditions analysis summarized in **Table 4.1** and are presented in **Appendix C**. The results of the background conditions analysis indicate that all study intersection approaches and movements are expected to operate similar to existing conditions with the following additional delays, highlighted in **Table 4.1**.

In order to improve traffic operations to a LOS D or better for all intersection approaches and movements in the background condition scenarios, the mitigation measures evaluated in the existing conditions analyses were investigated in addition to mitigation measures identified as necessary to accommodate the additional projected background traffic volumes. The recommended mitigation measures are summarized in **Table 4.2** and the results of the analysis with the recommendations is summarized in **Table 4.3**.

				Scenar	io #1	(Pre-CO	VID)	Scenari	o #2 (Both Clo	osed)	Scenari	o #3 ((Main Clo	osed)
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak
		Control	Approach	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS
	Randolph Street	Ston	EB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
1	&	(Minor)	WBL	7.8	Α	8.3	Α	7.7	Α	8.1	А	7.7	Α	8.1	А
	Wing Street	(NB	12.0	В	19.9	С	11.1	В	17.4	С	11.4	В	16.3	С
	Dandolph Stroot		EB	42.6	E	308.9	F	19.4	С	38.7	E	28.8	D	187.7	F
2	Rahuuph Sileei &	Stop	WB	36.4	E	188.3	F	18.7	С	27.5	D	31.7	D	92.1	F
2	Center Street	(Minor)	NBL	9.3	Α	9.4	А	8.8	Α	8.6	А	9.0	А	9.1	А
			SBL	8.6	Α	9.1	Α	8.0	A	8.5	Α	8.7	Α	9.3	A
			EB	8.6	А	9.9	А	10.1	В	12.6	В	8.5	А	9.5	А
	Dunlap Street	Stop	WB	9.1	Α	12.6	В	16.3	С	27.0	D	8.8	Α	11.4	В
3	& M/a a Charach	(All-Way)	NB	8.6	A	11.8	B	12.7	B	28.7	D	8.4	A	10.9	B
	wing Street	, <i>,</i> ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	SB	8.9	A	10.5	В	11.0	В	15.3	C	8.8	В	9.9	A
			Overall	8.8	A	11.6	B	13.6	B	24.1	C	8.6	A	10.7	В
		Scenario #1	EBL	21.6	C	25.9	C	15.4	C	19.5	C	26.5	C	44.6	D
		Scenario #1 Signalized	EBIR	18.8	B	19.4	B	10.2		11.6	В	18.6	B	19.9	B
	Center Street	1	WBL	19.1	B	17.5	B	11.0		A		18.9	B	20.1	C
		Scenario #2 Stop (All-Way)	WRIK	19.9	B	20.9	C	11.9	L B	20.7	C	23.4	C	48.2	D
4	& Duplan Stroot		NBL	1.0	A	3.6	A	N/A N/A				1.1	A	2.4	A
	Duniap Street	(All-VVay) /		1.3	A	2.1	A	15.0		A		1.2	A	1.Z	A
		Scenario #3	SBL	6.4	A	6.0	A	15.0	B	20.2		6.0	A	5.8	A
		Signalized	SBIR	8.0	A	10.2	B	13.5	В	14.4	B	7.4	A	8.9	A
				1.1	A	9.0	A	13.7	B	18.2		9.2	A	10.0	В
F	Dunlap Street	Stop	EBL	7.6	A Fr	8.2	A	8.0	A Fr	8.7	A	7.9	A Fr	8.7	A
5	α Hutton Street	(Minor)	SB	10.8	R R		R	12.0	R R	2U 21 7	C	127		21.7	C
			FR	10.0	B	11.4	B	11.7	B	13.0	B	0.8		10.2	Δ
	Main Street		WR	9.0	Δ	10.2	B	10.0	Δ	12.8	B	9.0	Δ	8.9	Δ
6	want Street	Stop	NB	9.0	Α	11.6	B	10.0	B	12.0	C	8.7	A	10.7	B
Ŭ	Wing Street	(All-Way)	SB	10.0	B	10.7	B	15.5	C	19.3	C	9.5	Δ	95	Δ
	9		Overall	97	Δ	11.0	B	13.0	B	17.0	C	93	Δ	9.8	Δ
		#1 0 #2	FR	20.2	B	20.5	C	73	Α	74	A	20.0	C	18.3	C
	Main Street	#1 & #3 Signalized	WB	19.4	B	20.8	C	7.0	N	/A		20.0	N	/A	
7	&		NB	9.9	A	10.1	B	8.4	A	8.9	Α	9.1	A	9.0	Α
Ľ	Center Street	#2 Stop	SB	1.1	A	1.9	A		N	Ά	1	1.0	A	1.6	A
	Center Street	(All-Way)	Overall	9.8	Α	10.6	В	7.9	Α	8.3	Α	7.8	Α	6.2	Α

Table 4.1: Background Conditions Analysis Summary



				Scenar	io #1	(Pre-CO	VID)	Scenari	o #2 (Both Clo	sed)	Scenari	o #3 (Main Clo	sed)
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	ak
				Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS
			EBTL	0.3	Α	0.3	Α		N	/A			N	/A	
		Scenario #1	EBR	0.0	Α	0.0	А		N	Ά			N	/A	
	Main Stroot	Signalized	WBTL	12.8	В	4.6	Α	9.6	Α	10.2	В	9.5	Α	10.2	В
8			WBR	13.7	В	5.9	A	10.6	B	16.3	С	10.6	B	16.3	С
-	Hutton Street	#2 & #3 Stop	NB	17.2	B	19.1	В	10.6	В	12.1	B	10.3	B	12.1	B
		(All-Way)	SBTL	21.6	C	86.3	F	13.2	B	17.6	C	13.1	B	17.6	C
		× <i>3</i> /	SBR	16.5	B	16.5	B	8.9	A	10.2	B	8.9	A	10.2	B
			Overall	12.7	В	24.0	C	11.3	В	15.0	B	11.2	B	15.0	В
			EBIL	12.1	В	25.0		9.6	A	10.4	В	9.6	A	10.4	B
	Main Chus at			10.2	D R	10.3	D R	9.7 10.5	R	10.4	D R	9.7 10.5	R	10.4	D R
9	Main Street	Signalized	WBTR	10.2	B	12.1	B	10.5	B	12.2	B	10.5	B	12.2	B
ŕ	Griswold Street	olghalized	NB	15.6	B	17.5	B	16.5	B	17.8	B	15.9	B	16.8	C
			SB	17.2	B	44.9	D	17.7	B	32.5	C	17.8	B	26.5	C
			Overall	13.1	В	24.1	С	13.5	В	18.4	В	13.3	В	16.3	В
	Main Street		EB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
10	&	Stop (Minor)	WBL	7.9	Α	8.9	Α	8.0	Α	8.6	Α	8.0	Α	8.6	Α
	Cady Street		NB	10.0	В	20.3	С	10.6	В	16.8	С	10.6	В	16.8	С
	Cady Street		EB	8.5	Α	8.9	Α	9.5	А	9.9	А	8.3	А	8.6	Α
		Stop	WB	8.1	Α	8.7	А	9.3	А	10.2	В	7.9	Α	8.4	Α
11		(All-Wav)	NB	8.2	Α	9.4	А	9.4	А	11.4	В	AM Pe Delay (s/veh) 9.5 10.6 10.3 13.1 8.9 11.2 9.6 9.7 10.5 10.9 15.9 17.8 13.3 8.0 10.6 8.3 7.9 8.0 10.6 8.3 7.9 8.0 10.6 8.3 7.9 8.0 10.6 8.3 7.9 8.0 10.6 8.3 7.9 8.0 10.6 8.3 7.9 8.0 11.6 8.2 9.1 8.3 11.6 13.3 10.1 7.7 7.3 0.0* 3.7** 7.3	А	8.9	А
	Wing Street	(* 11 a j)	SB	8.9	В	9.5	А	12.1	В	13.0	В	8.6	А	9.0	A
		-	Overall	8.6	Α	9.2	Α	10.7	В	11.6	В	8.3	Α	8.8	Α
	Cady Street		EB	19.9	С	41.3	E	15.2	C	25.3	D	36.7	E	150.3	F
12	&	Stop	WB	48.7	E	184.1	F	52.7	F	436.6	F	309.6	F	2200.0	F
	Center Street	(iviinor)	NBL	8.4	A	9.2	A	/.6	A	1.1	A	8.2	A	8.7	A
			SBL	9.1	A	9.0	A	8.2	A	8.5	A	9.1	A	9.3	A
12	Cady Street	Stop	EBL	7.8	A	7.6	A	8.4	A	8.3	A	8.3	A	8.1	A
15	م Hutton Street	(Minor)	SB	11.6	ГI R	10.3	R	11.8	R	20 15 5	C	11.6	R R	13.1	R
	Cody Street		FR	11.0	Fr	то.5 ее		11.0	Fr	т <u>э</u> .5	0	11.0	Fr	т <u>э</u> .т	
14	Cady Street	Stop	WB		Fr	<u>ее</u>			Fr	<u>ее</u>			Fr	<u>ее</u>	
	Church Street	(Minor)	SB	10.4	B	10.0	В	11.8	В	11.8	В	11.6	В	11.1	В
			EB	11.7	B	16.1	C	14.1	B	18.4	C	13.3	B	15.7	C
	Cady Street	Stop	WB	9.1	A	11.2	B	10.1	B	11.0	B	10.1	B	10.8	B
15	& Griswold Street	(Minor)	NBL	7.4	А	7.6	Α	7.7	Α	7.9	Α	7.7	Α	7.8	Α
	Griswold Street		SBL	7.3	А	7.5	Α	7.3	Α	7.3	Α	7.3	Α	7.3	Α
	Beal Street	Chara	EB	0.0*	А	0.0*	Α	0.0*	Α	0.0*	Α	0.0*	А	0.0*	Α
16	&	Stop (FR & SR)	WB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
	Griswold Street		SB	3.8**	А	3.9**	Α	3.8**	Α	3.8**	Α	3.7**	А	3.9**	А
	Beal Street	Stop	EB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
17	&	(Minor)	WBL	7.3	Α	7.5	Α	7.3	Α	7.4	Α	7.3	Α	7.4	А
	River Street	(Minor)	NB	9.1	Α	9.9	Α	9.2	А	9.6	Α	9.2	Α	9.6	Α



				Scenar	io #1	(Pre-CO	VID)	Scenari	o #2 (Both Clo	sed)	Scenari	o #3 (Main Clo	sed)
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	ak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak
			hpprodon	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS
	Beal Street	Ston	EB	10.6	В	13.0	В	9.9	А	11.6	В	9.9	А	11.6	В
18	&	(Minor)	NBL	8.1	Α	8.7	А	8.1	Α	8.7	Α	8.1	А	8.7	А
	Northville Road	(SB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fre	ee	
	Seven Mile Road		EBL	1.5**	Α	11.2**	В	1.3**	Α	3.3**	А	3.4**	Α	2.5**	А
19	&	Stop	WB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee	_		Fre	ee	
.,	First Street /	(Minor)	SB	12.7**	B	29.4**	D	10.6**	B	14.4**	B	10.8**	В	11.3**	B
	Failblook Street		SW	10.2**	В	13.2**	В	9.9**	A	6.2**	A	12.8**	В	8.2**	A
			EB	7.5	A	8.1	A	8.1	A	8.4	A	7.4	A	8.0	A
	Fairbrook Street	Stop	WB	6.8	A	7.9	A	7.4	A	8.1	Α	6.7	A	7.7	A
20	&	(All-Way)	NB	7.5	A	8.5	A	8.3	A	8.8	A	7.5	A	8.2	A
	wing Street		SB	7.5	A	8.3	A	8.9	A	9.4	A	7.5	A	8.1	A
			Overall	7.4	A	8.2	A	8.5	A	8.9	A	7.4	A	8.0	A
01	Fairbrook Street	Stop	EB	23.2	C	24.3	C	14./	В	14.1	B	18.7	В	19.6	C
21	& Contor Stroot	(Minor)	NBL	8.5	A	10.2	В	8.3	A	8.4	A	8.3	A	9.6	A
	Center Street		SB	7.0	F	ee		7.0		ee		7.0		ee	
	Seven Mile Road		EBL	7.8	A	9.3	A	7.9	A	8.9	A	7.8	A	9.0	A
22	& Wing Stroot / St	Stop (Minor)	WBL	8.9 1F F	A	8.4	A	8.2	A	8.1	A	8.2	A	8.5	A
	I awrence Blvd		NR	15.5	C	22.5	し し	13.3	B	18.1		13.0	В	21.4	
	Lamonee Diva		SB	17.9	C	41.9	E	23.4	C	105.0	F	14.8	B	33.3	D
			EBL	20.7	C	33.5	C	20.5	C	31.4	C	21.6	C	30.4	C
			EBIR	34.1		27.0 40.5		30.0		29.0		Aut Pea Delay (s/veh) 9.9 8.1 3.4** 10.8** 12.8** 7.4 6.7 7.5 7.5 7.4 6.7 7.5 7.4 6.7 7.5 7.4 8.3 7.8 8.2 13.0 14.8 21.6 23.5 27.3 19.0 17.2 18.4 19.2 27.9 14.7 19.6 5.3** 12.1** 3.4** 7.8 10.9 11.0 14.2 10.9 11.6 11.0 14.2	C	21.1	
				30.3	D	40.5		40.8	D	03.1 04.0		27.3		39.0 25 5	
	Seven Mile Road			10.3	D	20.1 10 5		16.9	D	20.0		19.0	D	20.0	
23	α Sheldon Avenue /	Signalized	NRI	20.2	C	10.5	Л	22.5	C	21.0	C	17.2	B	31.8	C
	Center Street			20.2	C	28.0	C	16.9	B	10.8	B	10.4	B	22 /	C
			SBI	34.8	C	45.8	D	21.6	C	28.4	C	27.9	C	32.4	C
			SBTR	15.6	B	22.4	C	16.1	B	14.4	B	14.7	B	19.4	B
			Overall	24.2	С	28.0	C	21.6	С	24.4	С	19.6	В	24.4	C
			WBL	14.7**	В	22.0**	С	12.4**	В	19.8**	С	5.3**	Α	23.1**	С
	Seven Mile Road	Stop	WBR		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fre	ee	
24	& Hinos Drivo	(NB Hines &	NB	17.2**	С	33.3**	D	13.0**	В	35.5**	D	12.1**	В	73.5**	F
	nines Drive	VVDL / IVIIIE)	SBL	4.9**	Α	4.0**	Α	4.0**	Α	3.8**	Α	3.4**	Α	4.2**	Α
	Seven Mile Road	.	EBL	7.7	А	8.8	Α	7.9	А	8.7	Α	7.8	Α	8.7	Α
25	&	Stop	WB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fre	ee	
	River Street		SB	11.0	В	13.8	В	10.9	В	14.1	В	10.9	В	14.0	В
	SB Northville Road		EBT	11.7	В	15.1	С	11.6	В	14.5	В	11.6	В	14.5	В
24	&	Stop/Yield	EBR	12.4	В	14.3	В	11.0	В	13.9	В	11.0	В	13.9	В
20	N. Seven Mile	(Minor)	WB	14.2	В	91.3	F	14.2	В	87.8	F	14.2	В	88.2	F
	Road		SB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fre	ee	
	NB Northville Road		EBL	14.8	В	33.8	D	15.4	С	32.7	D	15.4	С	32.7	D
27		Yield	NBTL	4.8	Α	5.9	Α	4.8	Α	6.2	Α	4.8	Α	6.2	A
	N. Seven Mile Road	(iviinor)	NBT		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fre	ee	



				Scenar	rio #1	(Pre-CO	/ID)	Scenari	o #2 (Both Clo	osed)	Scenari	o #3 ((Main Closed)		
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM P€	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	
		Control	hprodon	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	
			WBL	21.6	С	22.5	С	21.6	С	24.9	С	21.6	С	24.9	С	
	Northville Road		WBR	10.0	В	16.0	В	9.6	А	15.4	В	9.6	А	15.4	В	
			NBT	41.7	D	142.7	F	53.6	D	120.1	F	53.6	D	120.1	F	
28	& S. Sovon Milo	Signalized	NBTR	60.7	Ε	144.8	F	71.9	Ε	123.3	F	71.9	Ε	123.3	F	
20	S. Seven Mile Road		SBL	62.7	E	49.3	D	38.2	D	43.2	D	38.2	D	43.2	D	
			SBT	11.3	В	12.3	В	11.4	В	12.1	В	11.4	В	12.1	В	
			Overall	39.0	D	63.9	Ε	37.8	D	54.4	D	37.8	D	54.4	D	

* Indicates no vehicle volume present ** Indicates SimTraffic delay was utilized

4.4.1 Signal Warrant Analyses

The signal warrant analysis was re-evaluated at the study intersections of Center Street & Randolph Street, Center Street & Cady Street, and Northville Road & 7-Mile Road based on background traffic volumes.

Study Intersection	1	Cen Rand	ter Stre Jolph S	et & treet	Cen Ca	ter Stre ady Stre	eet & eet	Northville Road & 7-Mile Road			
Scenario		#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	
Warrant 1: Eight Ho	ur	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	
Condition A	Hours Met	1	1	2	0	3	0	8	3	3	
Condition A	Warrant Met	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	
Condition P	Hours Met	2	0	3	3	0	2	5	2	2	
Condition B	Warrant Met	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
Warrant 2. Four Hour	Hours Met	1	0	2	3	2	2	7	2	2	
Warrant 2: Four-Hour	Warrant Met	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	
Warrant 3: Deak-Hour	Hours Met	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	2	2	
Wallant 5. Teak-fiou	Warrant Met	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	
Warrant 4. Dedactrian Volume	Hours Met	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
warrant 4: Peuestrian volume	Warrant Met	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	

Table 4.2:	Background	Signal Warrant	Analysis Summa	ary
				·· J

The results of the background conditions signal warrant analyses are summarized in **Table 4.2**, the warrant charts are included in **Appendix E**, and the data indicates the following:

- Scenario #3 (Pre-COVID): Center Street & Randolph Street meets Warrant 3.
- <u>Scenario #1 (Pre-COVID):</u> Northville Road & 7-Mile Road meets Warrant 1A, 2, and 3.
- <u>Scenario #2 (Pre-COVID):</u> Northville Road & 7-Mile Road meets Warrant 3.
- <u>Scenario #3 (Pre-COVID):</u> Northville Road & 7-Mile Road meets Warrant 3.

The study intersections of Center Street & Randolph Street (Scenario #1) and Center Street & Cady Street (Scenario #1 & #3) are not expected to meet the signal warrants, based on the background volumes; however, the minor street suffers undue delay during the peak hour. Therefore, although the signal warrants are not met, traffic signals are recommended at these study intersections (Scenario #1 & #3), in an effort to mitigate the failing LOS and vehicular delays and improve vehicle queueing under background conditions.



4.4.2 All-Way Stop Control Analysis

All-way stop control was re-evaluated based on background traffic volumes at the study intersections of Center Street & Randolph Street and Center Street & Cady Street. The results of the analysis are summarized below in **Table 4.3**.

	Multi-Way Stop Sign Criterion (MMUTCD Section 2B.07)	Center Street & Randolph Street Met?	Center Street & Cady Street Met?		
Ε.	Signal	No	No		
F.	Crashes	No	No		
G.	Traffic Volumes	No	Yes		
H.	80% Criteria	No	Yes		
Mu	Iti-Way Stop Control Recommended	Yes	Yes		

Table 4.3: Background All-Way	Warrant Analysis	Summary
-------------------------------	------------------	---------

The results of the background conditions all-way stop warrant analyses are summarized above and indicate that the study intersection of Center Street & Cady Street is expected to meet the traffic volume warrants for all 4 hours of available data, based on the background volumes; therefore, all-way stop is recommended for this intersection. Additionally, although the study intersection of Center Street & Randolph Street does not meet the warrants, the minor streets suffer undue delay during the peak hours. Therefore, all-way stop control is still recommended, in an effort to mitigate the failing LOS and vehicular delays and improve vehicles queueing under background conditions.

Table 4.4: Background Intersection Mitigation Summary

Additional mitigation measure and/or delays identified with Background conditional are highlighted in green.

	Intersection	Scenario #1 (Pre-COVID)	Scenario #2 (Both Closed)	Scenario #3 (Main Closed)		
2	Randolph Street & Center Street	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	All Way Stop Control Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.		
8	Main Street & Hutton Street	Signal Timing Optimization Recommended*		n/a		
9	Main Street & Griswold Street	Sig	gnal Timing Optimization Recor	nmended*		
12	Cady Street & Center Street	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	All Way Stop Control Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.		
22	Seven Mile Road & Wing Street / St. Lawrence	A review of network simu operations. Queue lengths v able to find	lations indicates acceptable vere minimal and vehicles were gaps in traffic.	n/a		
23	Seven Mile Road & Sheldon Avenue / Center Street	Option 2: Widen the bridge/culvert across the Johnson Creek to provide a NB left-turn lane with 500- ft of storage length and/or Option 3: Roundabout is recommended.	n/a	Option 2: Widen the bridge/culvert across the Johnson Creek to provide a NB left-turn lane with 500- ft of storage length and/or Option 3: Roundabout is recommended.		
24	Seven Mile Road & Hines Drive		n/a	Delays on the NB approach are due to impacts/queue lengths extending from Seven Mile Road & Sheldon Avenue / Center Street intersection.		
26/ 27	Northville Road & N. Seven Mile Road	Delays for WB Stop of	Signal Recommended Delays for WB Stop control approach, northbound left-turn sight distance limitations.			
28	Northville Road & S. Seven Mile Road	Sig	gnal Timing Optimization Recor	nmended*		

* Details of the proposed signal timing optimization are included in Appendix F



				Scenar	io #1	(Pre-CO\	/ID)	Scenari	io #2 (Both Clo	osed)	Scenari	o #3 (Main Clo	sed)
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	ak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak
				Delay	105	Delay	105	Delay	105	Delay	105	Delay	105	Delay	105
				(s/veh)	203	(s/veh)	200	(s/veh)	203	(s/veh)	203	(s/veh)	200	(s/veh)	203
		#1 & #3	EB	25.8	C	28.1	С	11.1	B	13.9	B	26.3	C	26.8	С
•	Randolph Street	Signalized	WB	20.8	C	18.3	В	9.8	A	11.3	B	21.7	C	19.2	В
2	& Contor Stroot	/ #2 Stop	NB	1.0	A	1.9	A	15.1	C	30.5	D	1.0	A	2.0	A
	Center Street	(All-Way)	SB	7.9	A	10.2	В	40.3	E	31.0	D	6.4	A	8.4	A
			Overall	8.1	A	10.5	B	28.1	D	27.1	D	7.0	A	9.0	Α
			EBIL			20.9	C								
		Scenario #1	EBR			17.8	B								
	Main Street	Signalized	WBIL			17.4	B								
8	&	/ #	WBR	No Cha	nge	25.1			No Cl	nange			No Cł	nange	
	Hutton Street	#2 & #3 Stop	NB		-	8.6	A								
		(All-Way)	SBIL			11.5	B								
			SBR			8.3	A								
			Overall			18.2	B			45.5				45.5	
			EBIL			35.1	D			15.5	B			15.5	В
			EBIR			23.1	С			15.3	В			15.3	В
0	Main Street		WBIL			18.2	B			16.7	B			16.7	В
9	& Griswold Street	Signalized	WBIR	No Cha	nge	20.1	C	No Cha	nge	18.7	B	No Cha	nge	18.7	B
			NB			11.8	В			12.0	В			11.5	В
			SB			19.4	B			10.0	В			15.4	В
				247	C	20.0		10.0	D	10.8	В	22.0	C	10.5	В
		#1 & #3		24.7		22.9		10.9	D	14.0	Б	22.0	C	19.0	Б
10	Cady Street	Signalized		Z0.9		23.7		13.7	D	Z3.0 45.0		20.2		20.1	
12	م Center Street	/ #2 Stop		0.6	A	0.9	A	10.0		40.0	E	1.1	A	10.8	D A
		(All-Way)		0.0	A	6.4	A	11.2	D	20 /		0.7	A	1.7	A D
				0.0 21 5	A	0.4 26.0	A	14.Z	D C	30.4 26.5		0.7 21 5	A	10.0 26.5	D C
				1/ 0	D	20.9	D	12.0	D	12.6		12.0		20.5	
	SB Northville Road			14.0		13.7		13.0		0.0		13.0		13.0	
26	& N. Seven Mile	Signalized		0.0 0.1	A	9.0	A	0.1	A	9.0	A	0.1	A	9.0	A
	Road			0.1 25.4	A	21.0	A	0.1 25.4	A	20.0	A	0.1 25.4	A	20.0	A
				20.4 12.6	B	31.0 1/1 1	B	20.4 11.6	B	30.9 1/1 /	B	20.4 11.6	B	30.9	B
			WDI	25.0	D	22 5	C	25.2	D	14.4	D	25.2	D	14.4	D
				30.Z		22.0		30.Z		42.4		30.Z		42.4	
	Northville Road			13.Z	D	23.9		12.7	D	22.0		12.7	D	22.0	
20	&	Signalizad		29.0	C	44.0	D	32.7		40.4		32.1		40.4	
28	S. Seven Mile	Signalized		34.5	C	40.8 20.2	0	30.7		41.ð		30.7		41.ð	
	Road		SBL	32.9		30.3		29.1		20.3		29.1		20.3	
			2R1	10.2	B	0.2	A	10.2	B	0.2	A	10.2	B	0.2	A
			Overall	27.6	C	29.4	C	27.8	C	28.7	C	27.8	C	28.7	C

Table 4.5: Background Conditions with Mitigation Analysis Summary

Peak Period	Approach	Exis	Existing Conditions				Signalization Improvements				sed N	B LT S	torage	l	Round	dabout	
Period	Approach	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)
	EBL	20.7	С	23	59	23.8	С	23	52	20.7	С	19	45	87	Δ	212	407
	EBTR	34.1	С	184	301	52.9	D	207	331	34.1	С	174	289	0.7	~	212	107
	WBL	38.3	D	23	57	29.4	С	23	54	38.3	D	21	56				
	WBT	18.3	В	49	108	28.1	С	65	119	18.3	В	51	105	4.7	А	33	62
	WBR	17.4	В	15	42	23.6	С	14	37	17.4	В	11	34				
AM	NBL	20.2	В	27	62	21.4	С	28	64	20.2	С	25	62				
	NBT	22.2	C	282	505	53.9	D	416	653	19.0	В	218	406	12.5	В	2004	3555
	NBR	22.2	Ŭ	202	000	00.7	D	110	000	11.3	В	33	68				
	SBL	34.8	С	62	135	30.1	С	46	79	29.1	С	57	130	52	Δ	100	228
	SBTR	15.6	В	127	212	28.4	С	177	278	15.6	В	124	204	0.2	~	100	220
	Overall	24.2	С	N/A	N/A	42.4	D	N/A	N/A	22.6	С	N/A	N/A	8.6	Α	N/A	N/A
	EBL	33.5	С	21	61	32.0	С	24	92	33.5	С	24	64	10.8	R	61	165
	EBTR	27.0	С	151	245	55. 9	E	222	355	27.0	С	160	263	10.0	D	01	105
	WBL	40.5	D	77	175	38.2	D	102	251	40.5	D	116	255				
	WBT	28.1	С	180	296	53.7	D	236	372	28.1	С	277	504	9.1	А	262	713
	WBR	18.5	В	64	180	27.7	С	84	221	18.5	В	143	422				
PM	NBL	43.0	D	51	73	30.9	С	48	74	43.0	D	144	288				
	NBT	28.9	C	3384	6126	59 7	F	3472	6322	21.2	С	306	515	18.0	С	4507	8002
-	NBR	20.7	Ŭ	5504	0120	57.7	L	3472	0022	11.6	В	38	93				
	SBL	45.8	D	81	187	30.9	С	102	279	33.0	С	87	215	14 9	R	517	535
	SBTR	22.4	С	222	346	39.5	D	374	568	22.4	С	245	387	17.7		517	000
	Overall	28.0	С	N/A	N/A	48.6	D	N/A	N/A	25.2	С	N/A	N/A	13.5	В	N/A	N/A

Table 4.6: Scenario 1 - Center St. and Seven Mile Rd. Intersection Mitigation Summary (Background)

Table 4.7: Scenario 2 - Center St. and Seven Mile Rd. Intersection Mitigation Summary (Background)

Peak Period	Approach	Exis	xisting Conditions			Signalization Improvements				Increas	sed N	B LT S	torage	I	Round	dabout	:
Period	Арргоаст	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)
	EBL	20.5	С	12	36	18.7	В	9	29	20.5	С	9	33	7.0	٨	47	105
	EBTR	30.0	С	149	249	33.2	С	178	322	30.0	С	162	278	7.0	А	07	120
	WBL	40.8	D	44	88	21.8	С	40	79	40.8	D	45	105				
	WBT	18.9	В	58	109	20.4	С	54	114	18.9	В	66	135	4.0	А	39	79
	WBR	16.8	В	6	23	16.7	В	7	23	16.8	В	7	22				
AM	NBL	22.5	С	40	73	22.2	С	34	68	22.5	С	34	82				
	NBT	16.0	D	201	276	21.2	C	224	410	15.1	В	146	275	6.2	А	198	393
	NBR	10.9	D	201	370	31.3	C	234	410	11.3	В	34	85				
-	SBL	21.6	С	19	65	22.1	С	17	48	18.7	В	18	50	5.0	٨	71	150
	SBTR	16.1	В	105	188	30.8	С	129	226	16.1	В	104	175	5.0	А	/ 1	192
	Overall	21.6	С	N/A	N/A	29.1	С	N/A	N/A	20.9	С	N/A	N/A	5.8	Α	N/A	N/A



Peak	Approach	Exis	sting (Condit	ions	s Ir	Signa nprov	lizatior /ement	า ร	Increas	sed N	B LT S	torage	I	Round	dabout	
Period	Арргоаст	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)
	EBL	31.4	С	17	44	25.5	С	18	44	31.4	С	20	54	75	Δ	60	122
	EBTR	29.0	С	163	269	45.0	D	244	370	29.0	С	141	222	7.5	A	00	132
	WBL	53.1	D	115	247	35.3	D	90	207	53.1	D	103	212				
	WBT	26.8	С	210	439	34.8	С	205	346	26.8	С	190	374	5.8	А	155	267
	WBR	18.0	В	96	379	21.7	С	52	203	18.0	В	75	298				
PM	NBL	21.0	С	45	76	21.0	С	44	73	21.0	С	54	110				
	NBT	10.0	D	าดา	407	10.7	р	576	1076	16.4	В	172	328	8.3	А	783	1355
	NBR	19.0	Б	202	477	40.7	D	570	1070	11.7	В	41	92				
-	SBL	28.4	С	39	88	25.0	С	40	73	22.8	С	40	79	60	^	100	246
	SBTR	14.4	В	114	189	26.3	С	149	234	14.4	В	112	177	0.3	А	120	240
	Overall	24.4	С	N/A	N/A	35.2	D	N/A	N/A	23.2	С	N/A	N/A	7.0	А	N/A	N/A

Table 4 8.	Scenario 3 -	Center St	and Seven	Mile Rd	Intersection	Mitigation	Summary	(Backd	(iround
	ocenano 5 -	Center St.	and Seven	wine itu.	inter section	Milligation	Summary	Dacky	ji ounuj

Peak Period	Approach	Exis	ting (Conditi	ons	s Ir	Signa nprov	lizatior vement	า ร	Increas	sed N	B LT S	torage	F	Round	dabout	
Period	Approach	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)
	EBL	21.6	С	16	47	21.6	С	18	41	21.6	С	24	54	57	Δ	/10	82
	EBTR	23.5	С	112	196	31.8	С	141	239	23.5	С	111	182	5.7	Γ	77	02
	WBL	27.3	С	17	45	23.2	С	14	46	27.3	С	17	42				
	WBT	19.0	В	67	124	26.3	С	85	153	19.0	В	61	115	4.2	А	38	74
	WBR	17.2	В	10	24	21.0	С	16	41	17.2	В	13	39				
AM	NBL	18.4	В	19	47	15.3	В	33	72	18.4	В	18	48				
	NBT	192	В	224	418	28.4	C	282	544	17.1	В	176	318	7.6	А	278	434
-	NBR	17.2	D	221	110	20.1	0	202	011	11.2	В	31	85				
	SBL	27.9	С	40	99	18.6	В	28	57	24.4	С	41	83	49	Δ	69	140
	SBTR	14.7	В	114	197	20.1	С	114	197	14.7	В	110	185	т. /	~	07	140
	Overall	19.6	В	N/A	N/A	25.8	С	N/A	N/A	18.5	В	N/A	N/A	5.9	Α	N/A	N/A
	EBL	30.4	С	50	166	27.5	С	21	90	30.4	С	20	53	9.6	Δ	158	354
	EBTR	27.7	С	157	290	48.4	D	227	362	27.7	С	153	253	7.0	~	150	334
	WBL	39.6	D	58	157	30.1	С	68	175	39.6	D	63	139				
	WBT	25.5	С	226	488	37.3	D	193	312	25.5	С	164	251	6.6	А	394	658
	WBR	18.2	В	123	437	24.4	С	57	166	18.2	В	51	136				
PM	NBL	31.8	С	40	80	24.9	С	48	74	31.8	С	71	147				
	NBT	<u>ງງ</u> ∦	C	1671	5000	45.0	П	17/1	2254	18.5	В	224	376	11.2	В	3036	6667
	NBR	22.4	C	1074	300Z	40.9	D	1/41	3234	11.5	В	38	92				
	SBL	32.9	С	46	136	26.2	С	98	280	26.7	С	65	184	0.0	٨	504	522
	SBTR	19.4	В	155	313	35.6	D	326	528	19.4	В	208	343	7.0	А	JZ4	52
	Overall	24.4	С	N/A	N/A	39.3	D	N/A	N/A	22.9	С	N/A	N/A	9.3	Α	N/A	N/A



5 SITE TRIP GENERATION

The number of AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips that would be generated by the proposed development was forecast based on data published by ITE in the *Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition*. The proposed development includes single family, attached housing, multi-family units and commercial uses. The following ITE Trip Generation Manual land uses were determined to be the best fit for the proposed development.

Single-Family Detached Housing (LUC 210)

• A single-family detached housing site includes any single-family detached home on an individual lot.

Single-Family Attached Housing (LUC 215)

• Single-family attached housing includes any single-family housing unit that shares a wall with an adjoining dwelling unit, whether the walls are for living space, a vehicle garage, or storage space. Includes duplexes and townhouses/rowhouses, joined side-by-side in a row and each with an outside entrance.

Mid-Rise Multi-Family Home (LUC 221)

• Mid-rise multifamily housing includes apartments and condominiums located in a building that has between four and 10 floors of living space. Access to individual dwelling units is through an outside building entrance, a lobby, elevator, and a set of hallways.

Strip Retail Plaza <40k SF (LUC 822)

• A strip retail plaza is an integrated group of commercial establishments that is planned, developed, owned, and managed as a unit. Each study site in this land use has less than 40,000 square feet of gross leasable area (GLA).

Internal trip capture is the portion of trips generated by a mixed-used development that would begin and end within the development; resulting in no additional trips added to the adjacent road network. The internal trip capture spreadsheet for the proposed development is provided in **Appendix A**. Additionally, a portion of the site-generated commercial trips are already present on the adjacent road network and are interrupted to visit the site. These trips are known as "pass-by" trips and result in turning movements at the site driveways, but do not increase traffic volumes on the adjacent road network. The percentage of pass-by trips was determined based on the rates published by in ITE Trip Generation, 11th Edition.

Table 5.1: Trip Generation Summary

	ITE			Average Daily	AM P	eak Ho	ur (vph)	PM P	eak Hou	ur (vph)
Land Use	Code	Amount	Units	Traffic (vpd)	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Single-Family Detached Housing	210	39	DU	424	8	24	32	26	15	41
Single-Family Attached Housing	215	259	DU	1,923	40	89	129	86	65	151
Multi-Family Home (Mid-Rise)	221	174	DU	784	15	50	65	41	27	68
		To	tal Trips	3,131	63	163	226	153	107	260
		Internal	Capture	190	1	2	3	14	5	19
	w Trips	2,941	62	161	223	139	102	241		
Strip Retail Plaza (<40k SF)	822	17,374	SF	963	25	16	41	58	57	115
		Internal	Capture	190	2	1	3	5	14	19
		Pass-E	<i>34%</i>) <i>(</i> 34%)	327	8	5	13	16	16	32
		Ne	w Trips	446	15	10	25	37	27	64
		To	tal Trips	4,094	88	179	267	211	164	375
	Capture	380	3	3	6	19	19	38		
	Pass-By	327	8	5	13	16	16	32		
		Total Ne	w Trips	3,387	77	171	248	176	129	305



6 SITE TRIP DISTRIBUTION

The vehicular trips that would be generated by the proposed development were assigned to the study roads based on existing peak hour traffic patterns in the adjacent roadway network and the methodologies published by ITE.

Site Generated Traffic	Scenario 1 Baseline Operations (Pre-COVID)	Scenario 2 <i>Main St. & Center St.</i> <i>Closed</i>	Scenario 3 Main St. Closed Only
	Figure 6.1	Figure 6.2	Figure 6.3

The adjacent street traffic volumes were used to develop the global traffic distribution. To determine trips distribution for residential developments using the adjacent street traffic it is assumed that the trips in the AM are home-to-work based trips, and in the PM are work-to-home based trips. Therefore, the global trip generation is based on trips in the AM going from the residential development exiting the study network and returning to the study network in the PM. The ITE trip distribution methodology assumes that new trips will return to their direction of origin, while pass-by trips enter and exit the development in their original direction of travel. The global site trip distributions used in the analysis are summarized in **Table 6.1**.

				New Trips				
Resid	lential					C	Comr	nercial
AM	PM	To/Fro	m	Via		Al	N	PM
15%	9%			Center S	treet	13	%	13%
2%	2%	North	n	Hutton St	treet	2%	6	2%
11%	9%			Griswold S	Street	79	6	11%
16%	16%			Sheldon Av	venue	18	%	16%
5%	6%	Sout	h	Hines D	rive	39	6	5%
14%	16%			Northville	Road	16	%	15%
19%	18%	East	t	7-Mile R	oad	13	%	15%
5%	7%			Randolph	Street	79	6	6%
2%	2%			Dunlap S	treet	29	6	2%
2%	4%	Wes	t	Main Str	reet	5%	6	2%
2%	2%			Cady St	reet	29	%	1%
7%	9%			Seven Mile	Road	12	%	12%
100%	100%			Total		100)%	100%
		Cor	nmei	rcial Pass-by T	rips			
F	From / To			Via	AM			PM
No	rth to South		С	enter Street	43%			40%
So	uth to North		С	enter Street	30%			36%
Ea	ast to West		(Cady Street	13%			13%
W	est to East		(Cady Street	14%			11%
		Total			100%			100%

Table 6.1: Site Generated Traffic Distribution

The vehicular traffic volumes shown in **Table 6.1** were distributed to the roadway network according to the global traffic distribution shown in **Table 7.1**. The proposed development plan has multiple site access points to the adjacent roadway network; therefore, the impact of the development is dispersed throughout the area study intersections. Additionally, the trips were routed to the roadway network based on the available roadway connectively associated with each of the roadway scenarios. For example, vehicles traveling from the site north on Center Street in Scenario 2 would utilize the detour route around the Center Street closure. The site generated traffic is shown on Figures 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 for Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 respectively.



7 FUTURE CONDITIONS (2028)

The future conditions analysis evaluated the projected operations in 2028 *with the proposed development* for the three (3) scenarios as summarized below.

Section 7	Section 7.1	Section 7.2	Section 7.3
	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Future Conditions	Baseline Operations (Pre-COVID)	Main St. & Center St. Closed	Main St. Closed Only
Euturo Traffic Volumos	Background Conditions +	Background Conditions +	Background Conditions + Site
Future manic volumes	Site Generated Traffic	Site Generated Traffic	Generated Traffic

7.1 SCENARIO 1 - BASELINE OPERATIONS (PRE-COVID)

The traffic volumes for this analysis utilized the site generated traffic volumes shown on Figure 6.1 which were added to the background 2028 traffic volumes shown on Figure 4.1 to calculate the future Scenario 1 traffic volumes shown on Figure 7.1. The results of the Scenario 1 future conditions analysis were based on the lane use and traffic control shown on **Figure 2.1** the traffic volumes shown on **Figure 7.1** in **Appendix D**.

7.2 SCENARIO 2 - MAIN ST. & CENTER ST. CLOSED

The traffic volumes for this analysis utilized the site generated traffic volumes shown on Figure 6.2 which were added to the background 2028 traffic volumes shown on Figure 4.2 to calculate the future Scenario 1 traffic volumes shown on Figure 7.2. The results of the Scenario 1 future conditions analysis were based on the lane use and traffic control shown on **Figure 2.1** the traffic volumes shown on **Figure 7.2** in **Appendix D**.

7.3 SCENARIO 3 - MAIN ST. CLOSED ONLY

The traffic volumes for this analysis utilized the site generated traffic volumes shown on Figure 6.3 which were added to the background 2028 traffic volumes shown on Figure 4.3 to calculate the future Scenario 1 traffic volumes shown on Figure 7.3. The results of the Scenario 1 future conditions analysis were based on the lane use and traffic control shown on **Figure 2.1** and the traffic volumes shown on **Figure 7.3 in Appendix D**.

7.4 FUTURE CONDITIONS ANALYSIS SUMMARY

The results of the future conditions analysis are summarized in **Table 7.1** and are presented in **Appendix D**. The results of the analysis indicate that all study intersection approaches and movements are expected to operate similar to background conditions with the following additional delays, highlighted in **Table 7.1**.

In order to improve traffic operations to a LOS D or better for all intersection approaches and movements in the future condition scenarios, the mitigation measures evaluated in the existing and background conditions analyses were investigated in addition to mitigation measures identified as necessary to accommodate the projected site traffic volumes. The recommended mitigation measures are summarized in **Table 7.2** and the results of the analysis with the recommendations is summarized in **Table 7.3**. A comparison between the results of background and future traffic condition analysis is provided in **Appendix F**. Additionally, a figure is provided in **Appendix F** depicting the proportional impact of trip generation at the study intersections of concern.

				Scenar	io #1	(Pre-CO	/ID)	Scenari	o #2 (Both Clo	sed)	Scenari	io #3 (Main Clo	sed)
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak
				Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS
	Randolph Street	Chan	EB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
1	&	Stop (Minor)	WBL	7.8	Α	8.3	Α	7.7	Α	8.2	Α	7.7	А	8.2	Α
	Wing Street		NB	12.2	В	21.0	С	11.3	В	18.3	С	11.6	В	17.0	С
			EB	48.3	Ε	367.5	F	20.5	С	44.7	Ε	31.4	D	237.6	F
2	Randolph Street	Stop	WB	39.7	Ε	257.3	F	19.8	С	29.9	D	34.5	D	122.4	F
2	& Contor Stroot	(Minor)	NBL	9.4	Α	9.5	Α	8.9	Α	8.6	Α	9.1	Α	9.2	Α
	Center Street		SBL	8.6	Α	9.2	Α	8.1	Α	8.5	Α	8.8	Α	9.3	Α

Table 7.1: Future Conditions Analysis Summary



				Scenar	io #1	(Pre-CO	/ID)	Scenari	o #2 (Both Clo	sed)	Scenari	o #3 (Main Clo	sed)
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	ak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak
				Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS
			EB	8.7	А	10.1	В	10.3	В	13.1	В	8.5	А	9.6	А
	Dunlap Street	Chan	WB	9.2	Α	13.0	В	17.4	С	31.6	D	8.9	Α	11.7	В
3	&	Stop (All_Way)	NB	8.7	Α	12.0	В	13.5	В	33.5	D	8.5	Α	11.0	В
	Wing Street	(All-Way)	SB	9.0	Α	10.7	В	11.2	В	16.5	С	8.9	В	10.1	В
			Overall	8.9	Α	11.8	В	14.4	В	27.7	D	8.7	Α	10.9	В
		Companie #1	EBL	22.1	С	26.4	С	16.3	С	20.6	С	27.5	С	47.8	D
		Scenario # I Signalized	EBTR	18.9	В	19.5	В	10.0	В	11.8	В	18.7	В	20.1	С
			WBL	19.2	В	17.6	В		N	/A		19.0	В	20.2	С
	Center Street	Scenario #2	WBTR	20.4	С	21.5	С	12.8	В	22.6	С	24.3	С	52.7	D
4	&	Stop	NBL	1.7	Α	4.0	Α		N	/A		1.2	А	2.7	A
	Dunlap Street	(All-Way)	NBTR	1.4	Α	2.2	Α		N	/A		1.2	Α	1.3	A
		/ Scenario #3	SBL	6.6	Α	6.3	Α	16.0	С	22.9	С	6.2	А	6.0	А
		Signalized	SBTR	8.2	Α	10.6	В	14.1	В	14.9	В	7.5	А	9.2	Α
		5	Overall	7.9	Α	9.9	Α	14.5	В	19.8	С	9.5	Α	17.7	В
	Dunlap Street	Stop	EBL	7.7	А	8.2	Α	8.1	А	8.7	А	8.0	А	8.7	Α
5	&	(Minor)	WB		Fr	ee	-		Fr	ee	-		Fr	ee	-
	Hutton Street		SB	11.0	В	15.0	С	14.5	В	23.5	С	14.1	В	23.3	С
			EB	10.2	В	11.6	В	12.2	В	14.8	В	9.9	Α	10.4	Α
	Main Street		WB	9.1	А	10.4	В	10.4	В	13.8	В	8.6	А	9.0	Α
6	&	Stop	NB	9.0	Α	11.8	В	11.2	В	20.5	С	8.8	А	10.2	В
	Wing Street	(All-Way)	SB	10.1	В	10.8	В	16.5	С	22.1	С	9.5	А	9.6	Α
			Overall	9.8	Α	11.2	В	13.6	В	18.8	С	9.4	Α	10.0	Α
		#1 8. #2	EB	20.2	В	20.7	С	7.4	Α	7.6	Α	20.1	С	18.4	С
	Main Street	Signalized	WB	19.5	В	21.0	С		N	/A			N	/A	
7	&	/	NB	10.2	В	10.4	В	8.6	Α	9.2	Α	9.3	Α	9.2	Α
	Center Street	#2 Stop	SB	1.2	Α	2.0	Α		N	/A		1.0	А	1.7	А
		(All-Way)	Overall	9.9	Α	10.7	В	8.0	Α	8.6	Α	7.9	Α	6.4	Α
			EBTL	0.3	Α	0.3	Α		N	/A			N	/A	
		Scopario #1	EBR	0.0	А	0.1	Α		N	/Α			N	/A	
		Signalized	WBTL	12.8	В	4.6	Α	9.7	Α	10.5	В	9.6	А	10.4	В
0	Main Street		WBR	13.7	В	5.9	Α	11.0	В	16.9	С	10.9	В	16.8	С
0	α Hutton Street	#2 & #3	NB	17.6	В	19.8	В	11.4	В	12.7	В	10.8	В	12.6	В
		Stop	SBTL	21.8	С	106.8	F	13.6	В	18.1	С	13.4	В	17.9	С
		(All-way)	SBR	16.5	В	16.5	В	9.1	Α	10.7	В	9.1	А	10.5	В
			Overall	12.9	В	29.7	С	11.7	В	15.4	С	11.5	В	15.3	С
			EBTL	12.1	В	25.1	С	9.6	A	10.4	В	9.6	A	10.4	В
			EBTR	10.2	В	18.3	В	9.7	Α	10.4	В	9.7	Α	10.4	В
	Main Street		WBTL	10.2	В	12.1	В	10.5	В	11.3	В	10.5	В	11.3	В
9	&	Signalized	WBTR	10.5	В	12.9	В	10.9	В	12.2	В	10.9	В	12.2	В
	Griswold Street		NB	15.9	В	17.8	В	17.0	В	18.1	В	16.4	В	17.1	С
			SB	17.3	В	51.9	D	17.9	В	35.8	D	18.0	В	28.4	С
			Overall	13.2	В	26.3	С	13.7	В	19.5	В	13.5	B	17.0	В



				Scenar	io #1	(Pre-CO\	/ID)	Scenari	o #2 (Both Clo	sed)	Scenari	o #3 ((Main Clo	sed)
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	ak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	ak
				Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS
	Main Street		EB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
10	&	Stop (Minor)	WBL	7.9	А	8.9	А	8.0	А	8.6	А	8.0	А	8.6	Α
	Cady Street	(NB	10.0	В	20.3	С	10.6	В	16.8	С	10.6	В	16.8	С
			EB	8.5	А	9.0	А	9.6	А	10.0	А	8.3	А	8.6	А
	Cady Street		WB	8.1	А	8.7	А	9.4	А	10.2	В	7.9	А	8.4	Α
11	&	Stop (All-Wav)	NB	8.2	А	9.4	А	9.5	А	11.5	В	8.0	А	9.0	А
	Wing Street	(/ Way)	SB	8.9	В	9.5	А	12.2	В	13.1	В	8.6	А	9.1	А
			Overall	8.6	А	9.2	Α	10.8	В	11.7	В	8.3	Α	8.8	Α
			EB	21.6	С	47.7	Е	15.9	С	29.0	D	41.7	Е	216.5	F
10	Cady Street	Stop	WB	58.4	F	258.2	F	67.5	F	564.0	F	410.3	F	3867.1	F
12	& Center Street	(Minor)	NBL	8.4	А	9.3	А	7.6	А	7.8	А	8.3	А	8.8	А
			SBL	9.2	А	9.1	Α	8.3	Α	8.6	Α	9.2	Α	9.4	А
			EBL	7.8	А	7.6	Α	8.4	Α	8.4	Α	8.3	Α	8.1	А
	Cady Street &	Stop	WBL	7.6	А	7.5	Α	7.6	Α	7.8	А	7.6	Α	7.7	Α
13	Hutton Street /	(Minor)	NB	12.1	В	11.8	В	19.7	С	27.3	D	16.1	С	19.1	С
	N. Site Drive		SB	12.9	В	11.9	В	14.3	В	26.8	D	12.9	В	16.3	С
	Cadu Stroot		EB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
14	&	Stop (Minor)	WB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
	Church Street		SB	10.5	В	10.0	В	12.0	В	11.9	В	11.8	В	11.2	В
			EB	12.2	В	17.3	С	15.1	С	19.8	С	14.2	В	16.8	С
15	Cady Street	Stop	WB	9.1	А	11.4	В	10.3	В	11.2	В	10.2	В	11.0	В
15	& Griswold Street	(Minor)	NBL	7.4	А	7.6	А	7.7	А	7.9	А	7.7	А	7.8	А
			SBL	7.3	А	7.5	Α	7.4	Α	7.4	Α	7.4	Α	7.4	А
	Beal Street		EB	4.9**	А	4.8**	А	5.0**	А	5.1**	А	4.8**	А	4.9**	А
16	&	Stop	WB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
	Griswold Street		SB	4.1**	А	4.2**	А	3.9**	А	4.2**	А	3.8**	А	4.2**	А
	Beal Street		EB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
17	&	Stop (Minor)	WBL	7.5	А	7.6	Α	7.5	Α	7.5	Α	7.5	Α	7.5	А
	River Street		NB	9.7	А	10.7	В	9.6	А	10.3	В	9.6	Α	10.3	В
	Boal Stroot		EB	10.7	В	13.3	В	9.9	Α	11.9	В	9.9	А	11.9	В
18	&	Stop (Mipor)	NBL	8.1	А	8.9	А	8.1	А	8.8	А	8.1	А	8.8	А
	Northville Road		SB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
			EBL	1.8**	А	3.6**	Α	2.2**	Α	1.2**	Α	1.6**	Α	1.8**	А
10	Seven Mile Road	Stop	WB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee	1		Fr	ee	I
19	First Street /	(Minor)	SB	14.5**	В	29.6**	D	14.6**	В	10.8**	В	6.2**	Α	12.4**	В
	Fairbrook		SW	6.4**	А	11.8**	В	9.9**	А	6.8**	Α	8.9**	Α	9.4**	А



				Scenar	io #1	(Pre-CO	/ID)	Scenari	o #2 (Both Clo	sed)	Scenari	o #3 (Main Clo	sed)
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	ak	AM Pe	ak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak
				Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS
			EB	7.5	А	8.3	А	8.2	А	8.6	Α	7.5	Α	8.1	Α
	Fairbrook Street		WB	7.0	А	8.1	А	7.6	А	8.2	А	6.9	А	7.8	Α
20	&	Stop (All-Way)	NB	7.6	А	8.6	А	8.4	А	8.9	А	7.5	А	8.3	А
	Wing Street	(/ iii vidy)	SB	7.6	А	8.4	А	9.1	А	9.5	А	7.5	А	8.2	А
			Overall	7.5	Α	8.4	Α	8.6	Α	9.0	Α	7.4	Α	8.1	Α
			EB	33.6	D	133.2	F	17.7	С	24.7	С	24.5	С	62.2	F
21	Fairbrook Street	Stop	WB	37.3	Ε	134.8	F	23.2	С	30.1	D	28.2	D	68.1	F
21	Center Street	(Minor)	NBL	8.6	А	10.3	В	8.4	А	8.5	А	8.4	А	9.7	Α
			SBL	9.4	А	9.5	А	8.3	А	8.7	А	9.1	А	9.1	Α
	Seven Mile Road		EBL	7.8	А	9.3	А	7.9	А	9.0	Α	7.9	А	9.0	Α
າາ	&	Stop	WBL	8.9	Α	8.4	А	8.2	А	8.1	Α	8.2	А	8.5	Α
22	Wing Street / St.	(Minor)	NB	15.6	С	22.9	С	13.4	В	18.3	С	13.1	В	21.7	С
	Lawrence Bivo		SB	18.4	С	44.4	Ε	24.1	С	114.7	F	15.1	С	34.8	D
			EBL	20.8	С	33.8	С	20.6	С	31.7	С	21.7	С	30.7	С
			EBTR	34.3	С	27.1	С	30.2	С	29.1	С	23.5	С	27.8	С
			WBL	38.4	D	40.9	D	41.1	D	54.0	D	27.4	С	39.9	D
	Seven Mile Road		WBT	18.3	В	28.4	С	18.9	В	27.0	С	19.0	В	25.6	С
22	&	Signalizod	WBR	17.6	В	19.0	В	17.0	В	18.5	В	17.4	В	18.7	В
23	Sheldon Avenue /	Signalized	NBL	21.5	С	47.4	D	24.4	С	22.0	С	19.5	В	33.9	С
	Center Street		NBTR	22.9	С	32.0	С	17.2	В	20.8	С	19.7	В	23.8	С
			SBL	38.3	D	53.7	D	22.8	С	30.9	С	30.0	С	36.1	D
			SBTR	16.2	В	23.7	С	16.9	В	14.8	В	15.3	В	20.2	С
			Overall	24.6	С	29.5	С	21.9	С	24.8	С	20.0	В	25.1	С
			WBL	20.2**	С	21.8**	С	8.4**	А	21.5**	С	12.8**	В	43.0**	Ε
24	Seven Mile Road	Stop	WBR		Fr	ee	1		Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
21	Hines Drive	WBL 7 Mile)	NB	18.5**	С	49.8**	Ε	14.4**	В	30.3**	D	15.0**	С	95.1**	F
			SBL	5.1**	А	4.0**	А	3.6**	А	3.7**	А	3.9**	А	4.3**	Α
	Seven Mile Road	Stop	EBL	7.8	А	8.9	А	7.8	А	8.8	А	7.8	А	8.8	Α
25	& Diver Street	(Minor)	WB		Fr	ee	1		Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
	River Street	, ,	SB	12.0	В	15.7	С	11.8	В	15.8	С	11.8	В	15.9	С
	SB Northville Road		EBT	12.1	В	15.6	С	12.0	В	15.0	В	12.0	В	15.0	В
26	&	Stop/Yield	EBR	13.2	В	15.0	С	11.5	В	14.6	В	11.5	В	14.6	В
20	N. Seven Mile	(Minor)	WB	15.4	С	135.0	F	15.4	С	130.8	F	15.4	С	131.4	F
	Rudu		SB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
	NB Northville Road	Viold	EBL	15.5	С	41.0	E	16.2	С	38.1	Ε	16.2	С	38.1	Ε
27	× N. Seven Mile	Minor)	NBTL	4.9	А	6.0	Α	4.9	А	6.3	А	4.9	А	6.3	А
	Road	(NBT		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	



				Scenar	rio #1	(Pre-CO	/ID)	Scenari	o #2 (Both Clo	sed)	Scenari	o #3 (Main Clo	osed)
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak
				Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS
			WBL	21.6	С	22.5	С	21.6	С	24.9	С	21.6	С	24.9	С
			WBR	10.2	В	16.9	В	9.8	Α	16.4	В	9.8	Α	16.4	В
	Northville Road		NBT	43.6	D	157.3	F	58.4	Ε	133.4	F	58.4	Ε	133.4	F
28	& S. Seven Mile	Signalized	NBTR	60.7	Е	158.9	F	71.9	Ε	136.1	F	71.9	Ε	136.1	F
	Road		SBL	82.4	F	56.4	Ε	43.8	D	47.9	D	43.8	D	47.9	D
			SBT	11.4	В	12.4	В	11.5	В	12.2	В	11.5	В	12.2	В
			Overall	44.3	D	69.7	Ε	39.4	D	59.2	Ε	39.4	D	59.2	D
	Cady Street	Char	EB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
29	&	Stop (Minor)	WBL		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
	N.E. Site Dr.		NB	10.7	В	9.8	Α	11.6	В	11.3	В	11.3	В	10.7	В
	Griswold Street	Char	EB	9.0	Α	9.7	Α	8.9	Α	9.3	Α	8.9	Α	9.3	А
30	&	Stop (Minor)	NBL	7.3	А	7.5	Α	7.3	А	7.4	А	7.3	Α	7.5	А
	E. Site Dr.		SB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
	Griswold Street	Clan	EB	9.2	Α	9.5	Α	9.3	Α	9.1	Α	9.3	Α	9.2	Α
31	&	Stop (Minor)	NBL	0.0*	А	7.5	А	0.0*	А	7.4	А	0.0*	А	7.5	Α
	S.E. Site Dr.		SB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
	Center Street	Stop	WB	27.3	D	41.1	Ε	17.8	С	20.0	С	23.3	С	32.6	D
32	&	(Minor)	NB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
	Proposed Beal St.	(SBL	9.5	Α	9.5	А	8.4	А	8.8	А	9.0	А	9.3	А
	Fairbrook Street	Stop	EB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
33	&	(Minor)	WBL	7.3	Α	7.4	Α	7.4	А	7.5	А	7.3	А	7.5	Α
	S.W. Site Dr.	(NB	8.5	А	8.7	А	8.8	А	9.2	А	8.5	А	8.8	А
	Wing Street	Stop	WB	8.9	А	9.8	Α	9.7	А	10.8	В	8.9	А	9.6	А
34	&	(Minor)	NB		Fr	ee			Fr	ee			Fr	ee	
	S.W. Site Dr.	(SBL	0.0*	А	7.5	А	0.0*	А	0.0*	А	0.0*	Α	0.0*	А

* Indicates no vehicle volume present ** Indicates SimTraffic delay was utilized



7.4.1 Signal Warrant Analyses

The signal warrant analysis was re-evaluated at the study intersections of Center Street & Randolph Street, Center Street & Cady Street, and Northville Road & 7-Mile Road based on future traffic volumes.

Study Intersection	n	Cen Rane	ter Stre dolph S	eet & Street	Cen Ca	iter Stre ady Str	eet & eet	Northville Road & 7-Mile Road			
Scenario	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3	#1	#2	#3		
Warrant 1: Eight Ho	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO		
Condition A	Hours Met	2	1	3	0	3	0	8	3	3	
Condition A	Warrant Met	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	
Condition P	Hours Met	2	0	3	3	0	2	6	2	2	
Condition B	Warrant Met	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
Warrapt 2: Four Hour	Hours Met	2	0	2	3	2	2	7	3	3	
	Warrant Met	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	
Warrant 3: Doak Hour	Hours Met	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	2	2	
Wallant 5. Teak-flour	Warrant Met	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	
Warrant 4: Dodostrian Volumo	Hours Met	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Warrant Met	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	

 Table 7.2: Future Signal Warrant Analysis Summary

The results of the future conditions signal warrant analyses are summarized in **Table 7.2**, the warrant charts are included in **Appendix E**, and the data indicates the following:

- Scenario #3 (Pre-COVID): Center Street & Randolph Street meets Warrant 3.
- <u>Scenario #1 (Pre-COVID)</u>: Northville Road & 7-Mile Road meets Warrant 1A, 2, and 3.
- <u>Scenario #2 (Pre-COVID):</u> Northville Road & 7-Mile Road meets Warrant 3.
- <u>Scenario #3 (Pre-COVID):</u> Northville Road & 7-Mile Road meets Warrant 3.

The study intersections of Center Street & Randolph Street (Scenario #1) and Center Street & Cady Street (Scenario #1 & #3) is not expected meet the signal warrants, based on the future traffic volumes; however, the minor street suffers undue delay during the peak hour. Therefore, although the warrants are not expected to meet, traffic signals are still recommended at these study intersections, in an effort to mitigate the failing LOS and vehicular delays under future conditions.

7.4.2 All-Way Stop Control Analysis

All-way stop control was re-evaluated based on the future traffic volumes at the study intersections of Center Street & Randolph Street and Center Street & Cady Street. The results of the future conditions all-way stop warrant analyses are summarized below in **Table 7.3** and indicate that the study intersection of Center Street & Cady Street is expected to meet the traffic volume warrants for all 4 hours of available data, based on the future volumes; therefore, all-way stop is recommended for this intersection. Additionally, although the study intersection of Center Street & Randolph Street does not meet the warrants, the minor streets suffer undue delay during the peak hours. Therefore, all-way stop control is still recommended, in an effort to mitigate the failing LOS and vehicular delays and improve vehicles queueing under future conditions.

	Multi-Way Stop Sign Criterion (MMUTCD Section 2B.07)	Center Street & Randolph Street Met?	Center Street & Cady Street Met?
١.	Signal	No	No
J.	Crashes	No	No
К.	Traffic Volumes	No	Yes
L.	80% Criteria	No	Yes
Mu	Iti-Way Stop Control Recommended	Yes	Yes

Table 7.3: Future All-Way Warra	ant Analysis Summary
---------------------------------	----------------------

Table 7.4: Future Intersection Mitigation Summary

Mitigation measures and delays recommended for Background conditions are highlighted in green and additional delays and/mitigation measures identified with Future conditions are highlighted in blue.

	Intersection	Scenario #1 (Pre-COVID)	Scenario #2 (Both Closed)	Scenario #3 (Main Closed)
2	Randolph Street & Center Street	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	All Way Stop Control Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.
8	Main Street & Hutton Street	Signal Timing Optimization Recommended*		n/a
9	Main Street & Griswold Street	Sigr	nal Timing Optimization Recon	nmended*
12	Cady Street & Center Street	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	All Way Stop Control Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.
21	Fairbrook Street & Center Street	A review of network simulations indicates acceptable operations. Queue lengths were minimal and vehicles were able to find gaps in traffic.	n/a	A review of network simulations indicates acceptable operations. Queue lengths were minimal and vehicles were able to find gaps in traffic.
22	Seven Mile Road & Wing Street / St. Lawrence	A review of network simul operations. Queue lengths w able to find g	ations indicates acceptable vere minimal and vehicles were gaps in traffic.	n/a
23	Seven Mile Road & Sheldon Avenue / Center Street	Option 2: Widen the bridge/culvert across the Johnson Creek to provide a NB left-turn lane with 500-ft of storage length and/or Option 3: Roundabout is recommended.	n/a	Option 2: Widen the bridge/culvert across the Johnson Creek to provide a NB left-turn lane with 500- ft of storage length and/or Option 3: Roundabout is recommended.
24	Seven Mile Road & Hines Drive	Delays on the NB approach are due to impacts/queue lengths extending from Seven Mile Road & Sheldon Avenue / Center Street intersection.	n/a	Delays on the WB and NB approach are due to impacts/queue lengths extending from Seven Mile Road & Sheldon Avenue / Center Street intersection.
26/ 27	Northville Road & N. Seven Mile Road	Delays for WB Stop co	Signal Recommended ntrol approach, northbound left-t	urn sight distance limitations.
28	Northville Road & S. Seven Mile Road	Sigr	nal Timing Optimization Recon	nmended*
32	Center Street & Proposed Beal Street	A review of network simulations indicates acceptable operations. Queue lengths were minimal and vehicles were able to find gaps in traffic	n/a	n/a

* Details of the proposed signal timing optimization are included in Appendix F

				Scenar	io #1	(Pre-CO\	/ID)	Scenari	io #2 ((Both Clo	osed)	Scenari	o #3 (Main Clo	sed)	
	Intersection	Control	Approach	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	ak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	AM Pe	eak	PM Pe	eak	
				Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	
		#1 0 #2	EB	25.8	С	28.4	С	11.4	В	14.5	В	26.3	С	27.1	С	
	Randolph Street	#1 & #3 Signalized	WB	20.8	С	18.2	В	10.0	А	11.6	В	21.6	С	19.0	В	
2	&	/	NB	1.1	А	2.0	А	16.6	С	35.0	D	1.1	А	2.1	Α	
	Center Street	#2 Stop	SB	8.1	А	10.7	В	47.5	Ε	37.6	Е	6.6	А	8.9	А	
		(All-Way)	Overall	8.1	Α	10.8	В	32.3	D	31.6	D	7.0	Α	9.4	Α	
			EBTL			20.9	С									
			EBR			18.0	В									
		Scenario #1	WBTL			17.4	В									
0	Main Street	Jighalizeu /	WBR	Na Cha		25.1	С									
ŏ	& Hutton Street	#2 & #3	NB	NO Cha	nge	8.7	А			nange				lange		
		Stop (All-Way)	SBTL			11.8	В									
		(All Way)	SBR			8.3	Α									
			Overall			18.0	В									
			EBTL			35.3	D			15.6	В			15.6	В	
			EBTR			23.1	С			15.3	В			15.3	В	
	Main Street		WBTL			18.2	В			16.7	В			16.7	В	
9		Signalized	WBTR	No Cha	nge	20.1	С	No Cha	nge	18.7	В	No Cha	nge	18.7	В	
	Griswold Street		NB			12.0	В			12.2	В			11.7	В	
			SB			20.4	С			17.3	В			15.8	В	
			Overall			20.3	С			16.0	В			15.6	В	
		#1 & #3	EB	24.7	С	22.9	С	11.2	В	15.5	С	21.7	С	19.5	В	
	Cady Street	Signalized	WB	25.9	С	23.8	С	14.2	В	26.9	D	25.1	С	25.7	С	
12	&	/	NB	5.8	Α	7.1	Α	18.5	С	59.8	F	8.2	Α	11.3	В	
	Center Street	#2 Stop (All-Wav)	SB	0.6	А	1.5	А	11.6	В	17.2	С	0.8	А	1.9	А	
		(/ //d <i>j</i> /	Overall	5.8	Α	6.6	Α	15.2	С	37.4	E	9.2	Α	11.2	В	
			EBL	32.7	С	37.1	D	32.8	С	35.9	D	32.8	С	35.9	D	
	SB Northville Road		EBR	16.0	В	16.9	В	13.9	В	16.8	В	13.9	В	16.8	В	
26	&	Signalized	NBL	3.2	А	5.7	А	3.2	А	5.7	Α	3.2	А	5.7	Α	
20	N. Seven Mile	olghall200	NBT	0.1	А	0.3	А	0.1	А	0.2	Α	0.1	А	0.2	Α	
	Rudu		SB	25.0	С	26.4	С	25.0	С	25.8	С	25.0	С	25.8	С	
			Overall	13.0	В	12.4	В	12.0	В	12.6	В	12.0	В	12.6	В	
			WBL	35.2	D	33.5	С	35.2	D	42.4	D	35.2	D	42.4	D	
	Northville Road		WBR	13.4	В	26.0	С	12.9	В	24.7	С	12.9	В	24.7	С	
			NBT	30.1	С	47.7	D	33.7	С	42.7	D	33.7	С	42.7	D	
28	∝ S. Seven Mile	Signalized	NBTR	34.5	С	49.0	D	36.7	D	44.1	D	36.7	D	44.1	D	
	S. Seven Mile Road		SBL	35.4	D	40.4	D	30.7	С	34.7	С	30.7	С	34.7	С	
			SBT	10.3	В	4.3	А	10.3	В	4.2	А	10.3	В	4.2	А	
		_			Overall	28.1	С	33.0	С	28.1	С	31.6	С	28.1	С	31.6

Table 7.5: Future Conditions with Mitigation Analysis Summary

Peak	Approach	Exis	ting (Conditi	ons	S In	lization vement	l S	Increas	sed N	B LT S	torage	Roundabout				
Period	Approach	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)
	EBL	20.8	С	22	50	23.9	С	24	54	20.8	С	26	84	03	۸	210	135
	EBTR	34.3	С	191	306	53.6	D	209	365	34.3	С	195	327	7.5	~	217	433
	WBL	38.4	D	21	52	29.6	С	20	46	38.4	D	21	53				
	WBT	18.3	В	49	99	28.3	С	52	117	18.3	В	49	102	5.1	А	35	78
	WBR	17.6	В	17	47	23.8	С	14	38	17.6	В	14	44				
AM	NBL	21.5	В	27	63	22.1	С	18	43	21.5	С	19	48				
	NBT	22.0	C	301	527	5/ 9	D	166	831	19.4	В	225	421	13.8	В	2174	3787
	NBR	22.7	0	501	527	54.7	D	100	001	11.3	В	33	88				
	SBL	38.3	D	81	161	33.7	С	61	108	31.4	С	64	129	5.6	Λ	111	308
	SBTR	16.2	В	127	235	29.8	С	144	234	16.2	В	135	229	5.0	A	144	300
	Overall	24.6	С	N/A	N/A	43.0	D	N/A	N/A	23.0	С	N/A	N/A	9.2	Α	N/A	N/A
	EBL	33.8	С	21	50	31.6	С	25	95	33.8	С	37	94	11 /	D	110	271
	EBTR	27.1	С	150	237	54.1	D	213	331	27.1	С	158	267	11.4	D	112	271
	WBL	40.9	D	80	182	37.4	D	90	235	40.9	D	110	239				
	WBT	28.4	С	193	308	52.3	D	252	420	28.4	С	216	387	10.7	В	422	774
	WBR	19.0	В	65	182	27.7	С	121	318	19.0	В	100	293				
PM	NBL	47.4	D	53	73	36.7	D	46	73	47.4	D	219	479				
	NBT	32.0	C	2086	7600	72.0	F	2620	6261	22.4	С	361	650	22.2	С	5215	9441
	NBR	32.0	C	3700	7007	12.7	1	3037	0204	11.6	В	44	99				
	SBL	53.7	D	94	207	33.7	С	109	294	36.4	D	113	250	17 1	C	111	744
	SBTR	23.7	С	250	407	45.0	D	355	557	23.7	С	241	381	17.1	C	444	/44
	Overall	29.5	С	N/A	N/A	53.1	D	N/A	N/A	26.1	С	N/A	N/A	15.8	С	N/A	N/A

Table 7.6: Scenario 1 - Center St. and Seven Mile Rd. Intersection Mitigation Summary (Future)

Table 7.7: Scenario 2 - Center St. and Seven Mile Rd. Intersection Mitigation Summary (Future)

Peak	Approach	Exis	Conditi	ons	°. Ir	lizatior /ement) S	Increased NB LT Storage				Roundabout					
Period		Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)
	EBL	20.6	С	7	26	19.6	В	10	30	20.6	С	8	28	7 /	٨	61	120
	EBTR	30.2	С	143	247	35.7	D	159	273	30.2	С	164	281	7.4	А	04	139
	WBL	41.1	D	45	92	23.1	С	38	78	41.1	D	52	115				
	WBT	18.9	В	62	119	21.5	С	62	126	18.9	В	67	142	4.0	А	38	76
	WBR	17.0	В	10	33	17.3	В	13	46	17.0	В	10	36				
AM	NBL	24.4	С	40	76	23.1	С	38	67	24.4	С	39	86				
	NBT	17.0		210	202	22.0	C	244	167	15.3	В	162	292	6.4	А	150	284
	NBR	17.2	D	210	393	33.0	C	244	407	11.3	В	35	86				
	SBL	22.8	С	25	73	22.5	С	24	56	19.8	В	21	53	5.4	٨	102	201
	SBTR	16.9	В	117	210	33.4	С	141	235	16.9	В	121	203	5.4	А	105	204
	Overall	21.9	С	N/A	N/A	30.9	С	N/A	N/A	21.2	С	N/A	N/A	6.0	Α	N/A	N/A



Peak Period	Approach	Exis	sting (Conditi	ions	Signalization Improvements				Increased NB LT Storage				Roundabout			
	Арргоасн	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)
	EBL	31.7	С	16	42	26.7	С	15	48	31.7	С	20	50	70	٨	65	106
	EBTR	29.1	С	145	236	48.0	D	240	376	29.1	С	148	244	7.0	A	05	100
	WBL	54.0	D	107	233	40.3	D	80	184	54.0	D	95	195				
	WBT	27.0	С	215	438	37.1	D	182	290	27.0	С	173	335	6.3	А	183	364
	WBR	18.5	В	99	380	23.2	С	55	167	18.5	В	59	248				
PM	NBL	22.0	С	46	77	21.2	С	44	75	22.0	С	53	106				
	NBT	20.0	D	105	000	12.0	р	671	12/0	17.0	В	181	334	9.1	Α	1070	2121
	NBR	20.0	D	400	000	43.0	D	071	1340	11.7	В	40	92				
	SBL	30.9	С	48	98	26.2	С	45	104	24.5	С	43	78	L L	٨	105	250
	SBTR	14.8	В	119	193	26.6	С	163	264	14.8	В	119	192	0.0	А	130	200
	Overall	24.8	С	N/A	N/A	37.3	D	N/A	N/A	23.4	С	N/A	N/A	7.5	Α	N/A	N/A

Table 7.8: Sce	nario 3 - Center St	and Seven Mile Ro	Intersection	Mitigation S	ummary ((Future)
				miligation		i uturo

Peak	Approach	Exis	Conditi	ons	s Ir	lizatior vement	า ร	Increased NB LT Storage				Roundabout					
Period	Approach	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)	Delay (s/veh)	LOS	Avg. (ft)	95th % (ft)
	EBL	21.7	С	18	42	22.2	С	19	52	21.7	С	19	49	60	Δ	58	110
	EBTR	23.5	С	107	177	32.8	С	141	229	23.5	С	110	186	0.0	Λ	50	110
	WBL	27.4	С	15	42	23.9	С	11	30	27.4	С	18	49				
	WBT	19.0	В	67	123	27.1	С	69	127	19.0	В	66	121	4.4	А	35	69
	WBR	17.4	В	17	48	21.7	С	16	48	17.4	В	16	49				
AM	NBL	19.5	В	26	64	15.6	В	28	63	19.5	В	20	53				
	NBT	197	B	224	393	29.6	C	264	481	17.5	В	188	323	8.0	А	247	395
	NBR	17.7	D	227	575	27.0	0	204	101	11.2	В	21	68				
	SBL	30.0	С	56	133	19.4	В	32	59	26.1	С	49	104	52	Δ	75	165
	SBTR	15.3	В	118	194	20.7	С	103	174	15.3	В	111	196	0.2	~	75	105
	Overall	20.0	В	N/A	N/A	26.5	С	N/A	N/A	18.9	В	N/A	N/A	6.2	Α	N/A	N/A
	EBL	30.7	С	53	150	28.5	С	18	43	30.7	С	20	53	10 1	R	10/	246
	EBTR	27.8	С	154	248	50.8	D	212	329	27.8	С	164	274	10.1	D	104	240
	WBL	39.9	D	63	166	31.7	С	70	193	39.9	D	84	189				
	WBT	25.6	С	257	549	39.2	D	217	344	25.6	С	175	293	7.4	А	231	477
	WBR	18.7	В	158	488	25.7	С	86	222	18.7	В	51	141				
PM	NBL	33.9	С	39	79	26.0	С	47	72	33.9	С	87	235				
	NBT	<u></u>	C	1400	4470	F0 2	П	1251	2201	19.3	В	246	446	12.8	В	2355	4890
	NBR	23.0	C	1022	4470	00.Z	U	1201	2201	11.5	В	35	88				1070
	SBL	36.1	С	51	142	27.8	С	83	237	28.8	С	63	157	10 (D	EDE	E 24
	SBTR	20.2	В	145	300	37.5	D	292	475	20.2	С	213	338	10.0	D	525	230
	Overall	25.1	С	N/A	N/A	41.7	D	N/A	N/A	23.4	С	N/A	N/A	10.3	В	N/A	N/A



8 CONCLUSIONS

The study includes the evaluation of three (3) scenarios which are summarized below





Scenario 3 Main St. Closed Only • 2021 Existing Traffic Volumes, adjusted to account for Center Street open • COVID Impacts and Road Closure

- All of the study intersections generally operate well with all Scenarios, with a few exceptions as noted below.
- The recommended improvements identified for existing and background conditions were found to mitigate the future intersection delays at the study intersections with the additional of the site generated traffic volumes.
- The additional delays noted for Background conditions are highlighted in green and additional delays from Future conditions are highlighted below in <u>blue</u>. No mitigation measures are recommended.
- No additional mitigation measures were identified with the additional site generated traffic in the Future conditions.
- The mitigations are generally similar across all evaluation scenarios. The operations and recommendations are summarized in **Table 8.1** and shown on **Figure 9**
- The results of this analysis concludes that the majority of intersections within the City of Northville will experience a negligible increase in traffic volumes associated with the Northville Downs development. Additionally, alternatives for mitigating existing delays are recommended which will also support the projected increases in traffic volumes generated by the proposed development. Furthermore, the recommendations included herein are consistent with the recommendations identified by the City's Mobility Task Force.



	Intersection	Scenario #1 (Pre-COVID)	Scenario #2 (Both Closed)	Scenario #3 (Main Closed)
2	Randolph Street & Center Street	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	All Way Stop Control Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.
8	Main Street & Hutton Street	Signal Timing Optimization Recommended*		n/a
9	Main Street & Griswold Street	Sigr	nal Timing Optimization Recon	nmended*
12	Cady Street & Center Street	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	All Way Stop Control Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.	Signal Recommended Delays for EB and WB Stop control approaches.
21	Fairbrook Street & Center Street	A review of network simulations indicates acceptable operations. Queue lengths were minimal and vehicles were able to find gaps in traffic.	n/a	A review of network simulations indicates acceptable operations. Queue lengths were minimal and vehicles were able to find gaps in traffic.
22	Seven Mile Road & Wing Street / St. Lawrence	A review of network simul operations. Queue lengths w able to find g	ations indicates acceptable rere minimal and vehicles were gaps in traffic.	n/a
23	Seven Mile Road & Sheldon Avenue / Center Street	Option 2: Widen the bridge/culvert across the Johnson Creek to provide a NB left-turn lane with 500- ft of storage length and/or Option 3: Roundabout is recommended.	n/a	Option 2: Widen the bridge/culvert across the Johnson Creek to provide a NB left-turn lane with 500- ft of storage length and/or Option 3: Roundabout is recommended.
24	Seven Mile Road & Hines Drive	Delays on the NB approach are due to impacts/queue lengths extending from Seven Mile Road & Sheldon Avenue / Center Street intersection.	n/a	Delays on the WB and NB approach are due to impacts/queue lengths extending from Seven Mile Road & Sheldon Avenue / Center Street intersection.
26/ 27	Northville Road & N. Seven Mile Road	Delays for WB Stop co	Signal Recommended ntrol approach, northbound left-t	urn sight distance limitations.
28	Northville Road & S. Seven Mile Road	Sigr	nal Timing Optimization Recon	nmended*
32	Center Street & Proposed Beal Street	A review of network simulations indicates acceptable operations. Queue lengths were minimal and vehicles were able to find gaps in traffic.	n/a	n/a

⁶ Details of the proposed signal timing optimization are included in Appendix F





FIGURE 9: INTERSECTION MITIGATION SUMMARY



Appendix A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION



Appendix B

EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS



Appendix C

BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS



Appendix D

FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS



Appendix E

WARRANT SUMMARIES



Appendix F

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

